



The impact of COVID-19 on Higher Education: Rethinking internationalization behind the iceberg *

Gülşah Taşçı^{a †}

^a *Istanbul 29 Mayıs University, Umraniye-Elmalıkent, Istanbul, 34764, Turkey*

Abstract

The Corona virus (Covid-19) pandemic, which was first indicated in Wuhan, China and rapidly became a pandemic, led numerous deaths around the world until today. The global Covid-19 pandemic affected higher education institutions, as it affected all areas of life. The pandemic caught the nations off-guard. The effects of the pandemic on internationalization in higher education institutions were among the important issues emphasized in this process. Due to the pandemic, higher education institutions were closed in most nations. While certain countries attempted to solve the problem through distance education, certain others failed to manage the crisis due to the socio-economic and technological infrastructure problems. That's way, as the impact of the pandemic on the economy was felt both in developed and developing countries, it also led to an increase in prevailing inequalities in several fields. Ironically, the invisible part of iceberg of internationalization in higher education became even more significant. Because the inequalities in the opportunities provided for international students became more pronounced. The possibility of an increase in the decline in number of international students made it necessary to rethink internationalization in higher education in the near future. Thus, this study aimed to investigate the impact of Covid-19 on higher education with a critical approach and to present sustainable internationalization recommendations for higher education institutions.

©

Keywords: Internationalization; higher education; COVID 19; critical paradigm.

1. Introduction

The Corona virus (Covid-19) pandemic, which was first indicated in Wuhan, China and rapidly became a pandemic, led numerous deaths around the world. The global Covid-19 pandemic affected higher education institutions, as it affected all areas of life. Higher education institutions were closed in most nations temporarily due to the pandemic. Nationwide school closures affected more than 90% of the global student population

* A part of this study was presented as a verbal presentation at the 6th International Conference on Lifelong Education and Leadership for All-ICLEL 2020 held in Sakarya, Turkey.

† Corresponding author name. Gulsah Tasci
E-mail: gtasci@29mayis.edu.tr

(UNESCO, 2020). In particular, lower-middle and low-income nations were affected at higher levels by the pandemic. Only a few nations claimed that the pandemic had no impact. Thus, the impact on global higher education was at levels unexperienced since the World War II (Bassett, 2020).

Nowadays, the effects of Covid-19 on higher education are on the agenda of many researchers (Altbach & de Wit, 2020a,b; Amemado, 2020; Amoah & Mok, 2020; Basset, 2020; Blanco & de Wit, 2020; Brandenburg, 2020; de Wit, & Altbach, 2020; Ergin, 2020; Marginson, 2020; Marinoni, van't Land, & Jensen 2020; Rumbley, 2020; Saravanan, 2020; Ogden, Streitwieser, & Mol, 2020; Stein & Silva, 2020). Also, internationalization in higher education has always been on the topic of universities. Internationalization remains a priority in higher education institutions in several countries.

The unexpected closure of higher education institutions all over the world and the adoption of distance education caught the nations off handed. While certain countries attempted to solve the problem through distance education, certain others failed to manage the crisis due to the socio-economic and technological infrastructure problems. Thus, as the impact of the pandemic on the economy was felt both in developed and developing countries, it also led to an increase in prevailing inequalities in several fields. The most important point that stands out with the Covid-19 outbreak is the sustainability of internationalization in higher education. In this context the invisible section of the iceberg of internationalization is getting larger. Some scholars in the field of international higher education believe that inequality will increase further in the post-pandemic era. This is why there is a need to understand students and understand the implications of internationalizing higher education in this process (Amoah & Mok, 2020). In particular, several scenarios on sustainable internationalization in higher education with Covid-19 have been discussed. Thus, this article aimed to discuss the invisible section of internationalization in higher education, which became more evident with Covid-19 based on the perspective of the critical paradigm. In this context, the following research questions were determined:

- What is the impact of Covid-19 on internationalization in higher education?
- Will Covid-19 increase social inequalities in internationalization in higher education?
- How internationalization in higher education could be strengthened after the pandemic?

2. Method

The critical paradigm was employed in the study. Based on the “critical paradigm”, the focus of the study was on the problem of "inequality of opportunity", which was more pronounced by internationalization. Also, following the same chain of thought, the

current article suggests the need for a critical approach to ensure sustainable internationalization in higher education. However, concurrently, it aimed to acknowledge that the critical approach could be supported by several theories to reveal the invisible section of the iceberg of internationalization in higher education. Thus, the problem of inequality of opportunity underlying internationalization in higher education is still an issue that needs more attention when the production of elements that allow the intellectual to evaluate himself/herself as the other is investigated.

2.1. Historical Background of the Critical Paradigm

Historical background of the critical paradigm stretches from Kant to Hegel and Marx. The roots of the critical paradigm are still founded on Marxism. The critical approach and characteristic interest in criticism was the influence of the German philosophical tradition (Delanty, 2011). Max Horkheimer writes that critical theory should be understood as the successor to German idealism (Ng, 2015). More specifically, Horkheimer explains critical theory in relation to "reason" in his book "pure critique of reason" based on Kant's philosophy. For reason is both the object of criticism and the activity that makes criticism possible. As the heir to German idealism, this paradox is central to defining the critique of ideology and to the methodology of critical theory. As this shift from an epistemic situation (Kantian) to a social situation (Marxian) related to the formation of a political subject, critical sociology took its main inspiration (Delanty, 2011).

It is seen that an important part of the thinkers and schools in the paradigm of critical social theory have taken from Marxism (Balkız, 2004). Marx described critical theory as a theory that contributes to abolishing all conditions in which man is a "humiliated, enslaved, lonely and humiliated" being (Marx, 1953, p.385 cited Rebhein, 2018, p. 57). Seen from the Marxist perspective, inequality is an inevitable consequence of the capitalist system (Peet, 1975). Marxism seeks answers for the poor and the powerless. Marxism is generally considered within the framework of a conflict theory. Capitalist development in Marxist analysis; it is presented as a process that results in the concentration of the means of production. Moreover, Tyson (2006) observed that Marxist criticism focused on the relationship between socio-economic classes within and between societies and explained human activities with the dynamics of economic power (Hill, Greaves & Maisuria, 2009). According to Marx (2000), it is emphasized that this process, which strengthens the dominance of one class over another, causes increasing inequalities in the socio-economic structure as a direct result. Moreover, according to Marx (2000), the war between the rich and the poor, rather than fundamental differences between the sexes, races, ethnic groups, and religions, is the greatest war and ideologies come to the fore in this approach, which is the main characteristic of the Marxist theory. Ideology reflects to belief systems of the people such as religion, or political philosophies

such as democracy, aristocracy, autocracy, and economic beliefs such as capitalism. Also, Tyson (2006) stated that the theory argued that “*the achievement and sustenance of economic power was the reason behind all social and political activities, including education, philosophy, religion, government, arts, science, technology, and the media*” (p.54). Tyson (2006) particularly pointed out that the differences between the socioeconomic classes divide people in more important ways than religious, racial, ethnic and gender differences.

In addition, the main purpose of Critical Theory is to improve human liberation by removing injustice. The Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School emerged with the aim of revitalizing Marx's theory. In this framework, it has turned towards and based on the cultural superstructure rather than the economic infrastructure that forms the basis of Marx's theory. In the twentieth century critical theory, significantly, it still inspired recent critical theories such as Habermas, Honneth's, Frankfurt School, and Horkheimer (Devetak, 2013). Horkheimer, one of the leading names of Critical Theory, has analyzed it not only from an economic perspective but also from a cultural perspective. Horkheimer emphasized the necessity of establishing a new unity between philosophy, criticism, analyzed traditional and critical theory, understood, and evaluated Hegel and brought it to critical theory in order to provide predictions (Horkheimer, 1998). Also, Frankfurt School made significant progress in the Horkheimer era. Furthermore, the Frankfurt School, which emerged with a Marxist approach, gradually began to break away from its Marxist roots in the following periods and with the collapse of the second stage radical student movements in the historical development of Critical Theory and the loss of reputation of Marxist theory on a world scale, the Marxist way of thinking came to an end in the Frankfurt School (Bottomore, 2002).

In later periods, as the significance of the Neo-Marxist approach increased, a form of interculturalizing was described and proposed. Thus, Neo-Marxist interculturalizing emphasized equal cultural exchange without exploitation or violence, and in particular, the need to monitor certain cultural interactions to provide fair and equal opportunities for individuals (Jiang, 2011). Neo-Marxism laid down the criterion that cultural interactions and intercultural exchanges in particular is based on a philosophical approach that embraces respect for diverse cultures (Grootveld, 2013). It emphasizes a need for equality between distinct cultures and criticizes the neoliberalism embedded in capitalism. Neo-Marxism is also based on the principle of justice and equality that no culture should dominate unfairly and criticizes the inequality of opportunity. As did Jiang (2011), it advocates the contribution of the Neo-Marxist approach to internationalization in higher education, especially interculturalizing.

The first of these, culture and ideology, was not only a study topic, but an explanatory factor that demolished the supremacy of "class" and "capitalism" in the previous decade. As the return to cultural analysis increased, it was not surprising that intellectuals were

more interested in the literary theory for ideas on topical approaches. Therefore, it is important to observe the increasing number of studies on postcolonial studies. In the 21st century, this approach was no longer just a disciplinary approach, and Post-colonial studies were no longer only studied colonial history, but a political practice (Chibber, 2016). Perhaps the most salient part of the criticism paradigm could be observed in postcolonial studies. As one critic pointed out, the most developed branch of cultural studies was known as post-colonial studies today (Eagleton, 2003).

Historically, the postcolonial theory was constructed on the critique of Eurocentrism, nationalism, colonial ideology, and economic determinism. Leading postcolonial theorists claimed that they unearthed the sources of subaltern agency and incorporated culture as a central mechanism in social analysis. Indeed, they were famous for their insistence on the cultural specificity of the "East". These themes were widely associated with post-colonial studies, which was a part of their appeal to the intellectuals (Chibber, 2016). The first reason for the innovative quality of the postcolonial approach and its popularity was the cooperation between the academic institutions and identity-based policies after the adoption of cultural studies as a discipline after the 1980's with the multiculturalist approach in the process of change (Yetişkin, 2011). Nevertheless, the critical perspective where post-colonial philosophy dissociated the history of power and all types of universal history of capital, which led to the criticism of the forms of nation and nationalism, and the examination of the relationship between power and knowledge based on class and gender-identity should be considered. Furthermore, this philosophy could help generate questions on the re-coding of intellectual production and its appropriation by whom and for whom, through the follow up of the problems created by global capitalism by workers who are not included in the production of social, economic, and political dynamism (Yetişkin, 2011).

3. Internationalization in Higher Education based on the Critical Paradigm Perspective: The Invisible Section of the Iceberg Inequality of Opportunity

In this section, internationalization in higher education is discussed using a critical paradigm in line with the social-economic, social-political- social-cultural lenses.

3.1. Social-Economic Lens:

Inequality is an issue most frequently addressed by advocates of the critical paradigm. However, inequality has been interpreted as an economic problem, the unequal distribution of economic capital (Rehbein, 2018). Also, Marxist theory emphasizes that capitalism is founded and produced on economic inequalities. Marxist theory emphasizes the link between economic inequality and class struggles (Nilsson, 2020). While revealing how inequality is structured and reproduced in his critical social theory's thesis, Marx

explains the different dimensions of economic and social life. This also provides a useful explanatory framework for analyzing the political economy of internationalization (Vavrus & Pekol, 2015).

One of the factors affecting inequality in capitalist societies is economy. Individuals' economic, social, and cultural capital determines their positions in social areas (Bilecen & Mol, 2020). Inequality of opportunity, on the other hand, in Bourdieu (1984) theory transfers the basic elements of habitus and capital, a line of social class or tradition, from one generation to another and actively separates itself. Also, according to Bourdieu (1984), those with a good socio-economic background are also in an advantageous position to enter and continue higher education. As can be seen, the boundaries of student mobility are drawn in a sense. An important method to create equal opportunities and increase the higher education rate is through financing the higher education. Thus, two higher education finance models compete (Gombert et al., 2010):

The first model that considers higher education a market and affirms the tuition (Gombert et al., 2010). Although the economic approach is defined by neo-liberal policies, it would be more accurate to discuss the gradual globalization of capitalism and its increasing hegemony in the pretext of the global market (Koray, 2007). Several researchers argued that globalization was determined by the needs of developed countries, capital, and the rationale of capitalism, and emphasized that capitalism was transformed into a global/social system that goes beyond the economic system (Beck, 2000; Wivel, 2004). Liberal philosophers such as Friedman (2008) argued that democracy is only possible within the capitalist system or the free market. He even argued that more capitalism means more economic and civil freedoms. However, it is clear that this hegemony at both global and social level is only possible thanks to unequal relations and becomes prominent due to the inequalities. On the other hand, it is easier to establish the hegemony of capitalism in nations with limited rights and socio-economic wealth, and it is known that social inequalities in these countries increase further as a result (Koray, 2007).

The second model that considers education a human right and demands free higher education are the most well-known models. According to this approach, education should be a public service equally available for everyone, independent of income and origin, economic and social status (Gombert et al., 2010).

In these days, it was observed that the balancing and protective role of the social state decreased due to the inequalities and problems triggered by the polarization and economic categorization in higher education, and thus, a widespread and multi-dimensional injustice and inequality was inevitable. Under these conditions, several problems such as the increase in poverty, the increase in the working-class poverty, the rise of social exclusion and xenophobia were among the main reasons for the decrease in student mobility in internationalization in higher education in almost every society.

The economic crisis caused by the pandemic seriously affected higher education institutions. The biggest concern is disruption of enrollment of international students due to global lockdown and financial consequences for universities (Pannett, 2020). The world's top destinations for international higher education - the USA, Canada, China, Russia- reported widespread transmission of the virus and massive casualties. However, developing countries were unfortunately more affected by the pandemic (Teixeira & Shin, 2020). Thus, the direction of internationalization in higher education will be determined by the inward mobility of students, and the financial aid provided by the countries for international students. Furthermore, the strategies adopted by the relevant national governments on whether the funding provided to the universities should be increased or decreased will determine internationalization in higher education. However, the economic impact on higher education indicates a marginal decrease in international student enrollment and a decrease in student mobility in most countries (Saravanan, 2020). Unfortunately, it appears that international students are not getting enough of Covid-19 assistance (Doherty, 2020).

This uncertainty will also change the direction of internationalization in higher education. After the coronavirus crisis, mobility models may be restructured. Once Iran was one of the main countries that sent international students, while it is no longer an actor. Vietnam and India increased to some extent, while Brazil and Saudi Arabia declined (Altbach & de Wit, 2020b). Another assumption is that the target countries will shift from Europe, North America and Australia to Asia and the Middle East. According to the estimates, the number of international students will not increase rapidly and may decrease, and the preferred destinations may change. Countries with low per capita income are likely to take time to recover economically (Altbach & de Wit, 2020b).

The pandemic exacerbated inequality among students in higher education. For example, in a growing number of countries, such as Ethiopia and the Philippines, students protested the inequality exacerbated by distance education. Students who did not have internet access or economic means to afford technologies were exposed to inequality of opportunity. Similarly, they experienced accommodation, food and health problems during the pandemic. Students whose main income was based on on-campus employment or scholarships faced financial problems (Bassett, 2020).

On the other hand, during the pandemic, governments were expected to ensure equity in providing financial hardship support to all residents of the country (Quinn, 2020). The pandemic has created quite difficult economic conditions that threaten the sustainability of internationalization in higher education. As a matter of fact, the financing uncertainties in higher education institutions (Muftahu, 2020), the need for distance education or online equipment, and new expenses experienced threaten the sustainability of internationalization in higher education. For example, according to Marginson (2020), he argues that the negative impact of the pandemic epidemic on international higher

education will bring significant financial difficulties to universities and countries that depend on international students' tuition fees, and student mobility flows will be different in various countries as the pandemic is unevenly distributed in different countries and regions. In this case, it will increase the inequality of opportunity among international students. That's why, the direction of internationalization could become even more complex due to simulation classrooms. Reflections of artificial intelligence on higher education will make artificial classrooms attractive for faculty members and curricula (Taşçı & Çelebi, 2020). There are obvious concerns about how artificial intelligence could be strategically used in higher education; however, we have to accept the contribution of artificial intelligence when used accurately in higher education.

Another challenge was the problems experienced during the pandemic in transition to online instruction and learning (Amemado, 2020). In particular, it entailed the inequalities in the access of students to information and communication technologies. In certain countries such as Brazil, students have limited internet access. Thus, it allowed rich students to continue their studies while poor students could not continue their studies and experienced inequality of opportunity (Marinoni, van't Land, & Jensen 2020).

Other problem entailed the difficulties experienced in academic skills during the transition to online classes. The pandemic accelerated the adaptation of students and faculty members to technology and cultural change. However, during the pandemic, it was determined that faculty members and students were biased against online courses, they were unwilling, and experienced difficulties due to infrastructure problems. For example, while various universities in Africa often experienced connectivity issues, lack of infrastructure and problems with data costs associated with online courses, the most serious challenges included financial costs, regulations, the digital divide, and cultural leap for teachers in Asian countries such as India and China. In Europe, the main barriers were identified as lack of student self-motivation and self-organization skills in online education environments (Amemado, 2020).

According to Stein and Silva (2020), who utilized the critical paradigm effectively in higher education recently, efforts to ensure equality should be increased. In addition to redistribution of opportunities and resources to reduce the existing system hierarchies, it is possible to reform the economic system in response to the regulation of the national political system, and especially to the crises in capitalism, or by adopting alternative economic systems that employ the existing models. They emphasized the importance of radical reconstruction of the system to achieve higher equity and sustainability.

3.2. Social-Politic Lens:

Inequality is the central problem of any critical theory (Rehbein, 2018). One of them is the social-politic lens. When examined in this perspective, it could be suggested that social policies are in constant and significant change in both meaning and application

due to current developments. Considering that social policy is a set of state-oriented and community-oriented policies, it is inevitable that social policy would adapt to current changes in political and social structures. Thus, it is very important to address the inequality of opportunity from the perspectives of higher education finance and social rights. Because only those who can benefit from educational opportunities could use these freedoms. For example, during the pandemic, students who could not pay dormitory fees faced inequality of opportunity. Therefore, it is possible to suggest that the emphasis on the strategic planning of social policies in internationalization of higher education during the pandemic emphasized these problems.

Political tensions and policies natural disasters and health crises can have a significant impact on national and local economies and institutions (de Wit & Altbach, 2020). With the Covid-19 outbreak, the priorities of internationalization policies in higher education have also changed with the cancellation of courses or closing courses (Martin & Furiv, 2020). For example, it has also revealed the need for higher education institutions to make their learning curriculum and environments more flexible. In addition, the ability of many higher education leaders to manage this process (Salihu, Nayel, & Rabiatal-Adawiah, 2020) and their stakeholders have revealed their inadequacy in terms of technology, equipment, and usage skills.

Given the socio-political aspect of internationalization, as international experience becomes more important for students to secure employment, rescaling inequality from local to global requires more attention (Vavrus & Pekol, 2015). For example, Marx (2000) believed that equality was based on the abolition of classes. Based on the Marxist approach, social policies that tackle the inequalities of opportunity in internationalization in higher education are analyzed as a product of capitalist development. In particular, the problems introduced by capitalism are explained with their association with the class struggle and economic crises. In this context, in Marxist approach, inequality of opportunity and social policies are the means to extend the life of capitalism, let alone its transformation. Thus, in Marxist approach, the inequalities of opportunity in internationalization in higher education are not respected, and neither a social state nor a social policy is deemed necessary, contrary to the liberal approach. In the liberal approach, it is accurate to discuss social policies that emerge under necessary conditions which could be described as social repair. Focusing on issues such as the problems created by the liberal economy and growing inequality, they tend to reconstruct their economic approach based on concerns such as morality (Sen, 1987) or distributive justice (Rawls, 2001). In this approach, not only “equal basic freedoms for all” are sufficient to ensure justice, social and economic inequalities should be corrected “in a way that would benefit the disenfranchised the most” (Rawls, 2001, p.133). However, as these debates continued, it was observed that the global problem of inequality of opportunity grew, especially in higher education, the chance of international students to share the big pie decreased.

The analysis of internationalization in higher education with the critical paradigm would demonstrate that since social politics is a field that has a close relationship with economy and politics, the changes that range from the neglect of socio-economic rights to the marketization of social services based on the current approach and policies would be inevitable (Koray, 2007). Critical social theory with a Marxist orientation provides a useful explanatory framework for analyzing the political economy of internationalization (Vavrus & Pekol, 2015). In short, it was observed that the balancing and protective role of the social state decreased due to the inequalities and problems triggered by the polarization and economic categorization in higher education, and thus, a widespread and multi-dimensional injustice and inequality was inevitable (Koray, 2007).

The lack of emergency action plans during the pandemic complicated the process for the students (Bassett, 2020). Due to the pandemic, prospective international higher education students could not take the required exams and international students could not travel to their campuses or return to their homes. International education programs were canceled. Faculty members were asked not to travel to affected countries or to avoid travel abroad altogether. Furthermore, other factors such as technology, immigration system, visa requirements, educational diplomacy and related policies also affect student mobility. After the Covid-19 pandemic, international students were affected by these factors. With the introduction of travel restrictions during the pandemic, international students who went back to their native countries were forced to either stay there or remain in the host country. HEIs tried to find different solutions to these problems, such as working with governments to ensure the repatriation of students and providing additional support to international students detained in host countries (Marinoni, van't Land, & Jensen, 2020).

Important issue is that social politics will become a determining factor in national choice of students in internationalization in the near future. Problems in the field of health for international students (Jenei, Cassidy-Matthews, Virk, Lulie, & Closson, 2020; Titrek, Hasmihi, & Ali, 2016) are one of the most encountered problems in the internationalization of higher education. With the pandemic process, it has become even more important that the health system of the host country is satisfactory for international students. For example, a country with a better health insurance and health system could be preferred. On the other hand, opportunities, scholarships, financial support or awards available for the students will affect their destination.

3.3. Social-Cultural Lens:

Higher education represents an important area for understanding the ways in which social inequalities are produced and reproduced (Bilecen & Mol, 2017). One of the factors affecting inequality in capitalist societies is cultur. Inequality of opportunity, on the other hand, in Bourdieu (1984) theory transfers the basic elements of habitus and capital, a

line of social class or tradition, from one generation to another and actively separates itself. The limits of social mobility and access to activities are the limits of a social class. The limits of social mobility and access to activities are the limits of a social class (Rebhein, 2018, p.58).

In fact, all social state regulations, or social policy, which is an integration of demographic, economic, political, social, cultural, institutional social and political order (Roebroek, 1993, p.124). Thus, in internationalization in higher education, it is necessary to address social policies from a wider perspective and to associate both its presence and its goals with the social system and especially the culture. Therefore, while focusing on social policy in internationalization in higher education, it seems more meaningful to address the arguments and justifications based on ideological, cultural, political, and economic systems that tackle the problems in a holistic framework.

4. Conclusions

This article aimed to discuss the invisible section of internationalization in higher education, which became more evident with Covid-19 based on the perspective of the critical paradigm Today we do not only face the global health crisis induced by the Covid-19 pandemic, but also the consequences of inequality, insecurity, and political polarization. Will the pandemic exacerbate international student inequality? In other words, how can we strengthen internationalization in higher education and see the invisible section of the iceberg?

Under these conditions, it becomes difficult to maintain social justice and equality in internationalization in higher education. Nevertheless, on the one hand, the increasing unemployment and employment structure and the flexibility of working conditions, on the other hand, certain restrictions in the social security system threaten social integration even in many country, and the important problem of social exclusion becomes prominent. Due to the current pandemic, low growth, low national, institutional and household income, a collapsed or at least recessed higher education are among the predicted outcomes. A higher education system with economic problems is absolutely unsuitable for international higher education, including cross-border education. Although there will be an extreme decrease in student mobility in the near future, the next few years are very likely to see a growth in student mobility in certain destinations based on stakeholder reactions.

The pandemic has implicitly changed the direction of internationalization relations in many higher educations around the world: Social, political, economic, geographical, and cultural. These will be among the new determinants influencing the decision of international students to study in higher education. According to Stein and Silva (2020), who utilized the critical paradigm effectively in higher education recently, efforts to ensure equality should be increased. In addition to redistribution of opportunities and

resources to reduce the existing system hierarchies, it is possible to reform the economic system in response to the regulation of the national political system, and especially to the crises in capitalism, or by adopting alternative economic systems that employ the existing models. They emphasized the importance of radical reconstruction of the system to achieve higher equity and sustainability.

In conclusion, the invisible section of the iceberg of sustainable internationalization in higher education was discussed with the perspective of the critical paradigm. As a result of the discussion, perhaps the most important issue that needs to be addressed is the fact that internationalization in higher education should be addressed from a more intercultural perspective. During the pandemic, the "theory and practice" approach has to change due to the need for a more hermeneutic basis for internationalization in higher education, which should be integrated with the cultural infrastructure. Thus, it is time to discover the "invisible section of the iceberg" of internationalization in higher education. Internationalization in higher education should be reconsidered as a "habit" where intercultural learning with a collective mind is improved.

Finally, internationalization could be possible only through critical paradigms by providing higher education freedom and equality of opportunity including theory and action. Justice and equal opportunities are the foundations of social democracy. Equal opportunities in internationalization of higher education would be emphasized with the pandemic where student expenses such as accommodation and food and the introduction of higher education fees, and especially student mobility. In fact, inadequate national social policies on internationalization in higher education led to a need for fair participation in higher education financing, through the contribution by taxation based on personal income. Thus, how social policies based on social inequality with a critical approach could be developed? Researchers need to focus more on that question. Otherwise, internationalization in higher education could only serve a certain class and lead to elitist education or is it possible to sustain internationalization in higher education under the monopoly of developed countries? In fact, "reaching the ultimate goals of internationalization - intercultural learning and universal knowledge" does not seem possible in the near future under these conditions. During the pandemic, the invisible section of the iceberg of internationalization in higher education, in other words, the gap between the opportunities available for different nations has been growing. I leave it to your discretion whether the need to deepen the theoretical foundations of international higher education in the global village, where the rich and the poor are already distinct, would be beneficial.

References

- Altbach, P. G., & de Wit, H. (2020a). Postpandemic outlook for higher education is bleakest for the poorest. *International Higher Education*, 102 Special Issue, 3-5.

- Altbach, P. G., & de Wit, H. (2020b). COVID-19: The internationalization revolution that isn't. *International Higher Education*, 102 Special Issue, 16-18.
- Amemado, D. (2020). COVID-19: An unexpected and unusual driver to online education. *International Higher Education*, 102 Special Issue, 12-14.
- Amoah, P. A., & Mok, K. H. (2020). *Weekend reading: The covid-19 pandemic and internationalisation of higher education: International students' knowledge, experiences and wellbeing*. HEPI, 99 Banbury Road, Oxford OX2 6JX.
- Bassett, R. M. (2020). Sustaining the values of tertiary education during the covid-19 crisis. *International Higher Education*, 102 Special Issue, 5-7.
- Beck, U. (2000). *What is globalization?* Polity Press: Cambridge.
- Bilecen, B., & Mol, C. V. (2017) Introduction: International academic mobility and inequalities. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 43(8), 1241-1255.
- Blanco, G., & de Wit, H. (2020). Higher education associations to covid-19. *International Higher Education*, 102 Special Issue, 11-12.
- Bottomore, T. B. (2002). *The Frankfurt School and its critics*. ABD: Psychology Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984), *Distinction*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Brandenburg, U. (2020). Internationalisation in higher education for society – IHES in the times of corona. *Sociální pedagogika | Social Education*, 8(1), 11–24.
- Chibber, V. (2016). *Postcolonial theory and the specter of capital*. (Çev.Afife Yasemin Yılmaz) İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, Politika Dizisi.
- de Wit, H., & Altbach, P. G. (2020). Internationalization in higher education: Global trends and recommendations for its future. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*.
- Delanty, G. (2011). Varieties of critique in sociological theory and their methodological implications for social research. *Irish Journal of Sociology*, 19(1), 68-92.
- Devetak, R. (2013). *Critical theory*. Theories of international relations. (pp. 162-186) New York, NY, United States.
- Doherty, B. (2020). *We feel abandoned: International students in Australia Facing Coronavirus Alone*. <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2020/apr/17/we-feelabandoned-international-students-in-australia-facing-coronavirus-alone>
- Eagleton, T. (2003). *After theory*. Basic Books, New York.
- Ergin, H. (2020). Crisis upon Crisis: Refugees and covid-19. *International Higher Education*, 102 Special Issue, 9-10.
- Friedman, M. (2008). *Kapitalizm ve özgürlük*. (Çev.Nilgün Himmetoğlu-Doğan Erberk). Plato Film Yayınları.
- Gombert, T., Bläsüus, J., Dahm, J., Krell, C., Timpe, M. (2010). *Sosyal demokrasinin temelleri*. Sosyal Demokrasi Akademisi Bonn, İstanbul.
- Hill, D., Greaves, N.M., Maisuria, A. (2008). Does capitalism inevitably increase inequality? In: Holsinger D.B., Jacob W.J. (eds) *Inequality in Education*. CERC Studies in Comparative Education, 24. Springer, Dordrecht.
- Horkheimer, M. (1998). *Akil tutulması* (Çev. O. Koçak). İstanbul: Metis.
- Jenei, K., Cassidy-Matthews. C., Virk, P., Lulie, B., & Closson, K. (2020). Challenges and opportunities for graduate students in public health during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Canadian Journal of Public Health. Special Section on Covid-19: Letter to The Editor, Springer.

Jiang, X. (2011). Why Interculturalisation? A neo-Marxist approach to accommodate cultural diversity in higher education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 43(4), 387-399.

Koray, M. (2007). Sosyal politikanın anlamı ve işlevini tartışmak. *Çalışma ve Toplum*, 4,19-56.

Marginson, S. (2020). *Covid-19 and the market model of higher education: Something has to give, and It won't be the pandemic*. Oxford, UK: Centre for Global Higher Education. <https://www.researchcghe.org/blog/2020-07-20-covid-19-and-themarket-model-of-higher-education-something-has-to-give-and-it-wont-be-thepandemic/>

Marioni, G., Van't land, H., & Jensen, T. (2020). The Impact of covid-19 on higher education around the world: IAU Global Survey Report. https://www.iauaiunet/IMG/pdf/iau_covid19_and_he_survey_report_final_may_2020.pdf

Martin, M. & Furiv, U. (2020). Covid-19 shows the need to make learning more flexible. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20200324115802272>

Marx, K. (2000) [1843]. *On the Jewish question. selected writings*. ed. David McLellan, Oxford.

Muftahu, M. (2020). Higher education and covid-19 pandemic: Matters arising and the challenges of sustaining academic programs in developing African universities. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, 5(4),417-423.

Ng, K. (2015). Ideology critique from Hegel and Marx to Critical Theory. *Constellations*, 22 (3).

Nilsson, M. (2020) Economic inequality, Marxist Theory, and Swedish-language working-class literature. *Studia Neophilologica*, 92 (2), 222-237.

Ogden, A. C., Streitwieser, B., & Mol, C. V. (2020). *How COVID-19 could accelerate opportunities for IHE*. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20200403133447141> 04 April 2020.

Pannett, R. (2020). *Coronavirus Squeezes universities' finances as foreign students stay home*. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/coronavirus-squeezes-universities-finances-asforeign-students-stay-home-11585490401>

Peet, R. (1975). Inequality and poverty: A Marxist-Geographic Theory. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 65 (4), Dec., 564-571.

Quinn, C. (2020). *Top study destinations divided on COVID-19 financial support for international Students*. <https://thepienews.com/analysis/top-study-coronavirus-intl-students/>

Rawls, J. (2001), *Collected papers*. (Samuel Freeman). Harvard University Press.

Rehbein, B. (2018). Critical Theory and social inequality. *Tempo Social, revista de sociologia da USP*, 30 (3), 49-65.

Roebroek, J. M. (1993). Images of the future: The basic income challenge. *Policy Studies Review*, Spring/Summer, 12(1), 114-132.

Rumbley, L. E. (2020). *Coping with COVID-19: International higher education in Europe*. The European Association for International Education (EAIE). <http://www.eaie.org/>

Saravanan, M. (2020). Economics of internationalisation of higher education in the post-pandemic era. *Journal of Development Economics and Management Research Studies (JDMS), A Peer Reviewed Open Access International Journal, July-September*, 53-60.

Salihu, M. J., Nayel, M. R., & Rabiatal-Adawiah, A. R. (2020). Sustainable higher education leadership: A conceptual approach from the functionalist paradigm for higher institutions of learning. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews- (HSSR)*, 8, (2), 8 - 12.

- Sen, A. (1987). *On ethics and economics*. The Royel Lectures, Blackwell: Oxford.
- Stein, S., & Silva, J. E. (2020). Challenges and complexities of decolonizing internationalization in a time of global crises. *ETD- Educação Temática Digital, Campinas, SP* 22(3), 546-566.
- Taşçı, G. & Çelebi, M. (2020). Eğitimde yeni bir paradigma: “Yükseköğretimde Yapay Zekâ”. *OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 16 (29),2346-2370.
- Teixeira, P. N., & Shin, J. C. (2020). (Editors) *The international encyclopedia of higher education systems and institutions*. Education Reference Module Humanities and Social Sciences. Springer, Dordrecht.
- Titrek, O., Hashimi, S.Y., Ali, S. A. (2016). Challenges Faced by International Students in Turkey. *The Antropologist*, 24 (1), 148-156.
- Tyson, L. (2006). *Critical theory today*. New York. Routledge.
- UNESCO (2020). *School closures caused by Coronavirus (Covid-19)*.
<https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse>
- Vavrus, F., & Pekol, A. (2015). Critical internationalization: Moving from theory to practice. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education*, 2(2).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.18275/fire201502021036>
- Wivel, A. (2004). The power politics of peace: Exploring the link between globalization and European integration from a realist perspective. *Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association*, 39 (1).
- Yetişkin, E. (2011). *Post kolonyal düşünce özel sayısı*. Toplumbilim, Bağlam Yayıncılık.