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Abstract

Success and Failure Factors of Foreign Direct Investment in Transnational Education

Yuen Ben Siu

This study identifies the success and failure factors of foreign direct investment in transnational education. With western tertiary education markets becoming more saturated, it becomes essential for higher education institutions (HEI) to pursue new and lucrative opportunities internationally. One approach to internationalisation is the establishment of international branch campuses (IBC). This method provides the highest level of control but incurs the most risk, and failure can result in irrecoverable damage to reputation and substantial loss of resources. A review of the literature shows that numerous facets should be considered when establishing an IBC, but there are limited studies that holistically address what makes them successful or how success can be measured. Three research questions were devised to address the gaps in the extant literature. A three-stage exploratory mixed methodology is implemented consisting of expert surveys, case studies and a quantitative survey. The results show five factors that contribute to the success of an IBC. Additionally, eight classifications of success measures and a framework for establishing an IBC were identified. A key finding is the importance of the HEI factor; the remaining factors should be considered once it has been established that the HEI is able to open and operate an IBC efficiently. Furthermore, this study is one of few that presents a holistic view of how to operate an IBC successfully. The results of this thesis present HEI managers with the key considerations when developing an IBC and academicians with scope to further understand what makes IBCs successful.
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“As a developed country, we are operating at the knowledge frontier. We no longer have the choice in this globalised world to compete on low wages and low skills. We compete on knowledge, its creation, its acquisition, and its transformation into commercially successful uses”. (The Department of Business, 2009)

1. Introduction

1.1 Contextual Background

Foreign Direct Investments (FDI) remain a viable form of international market entry, with the number of investments increasing by 233% in the last decade (2006-2016), despite the economic crisis in 2008 (UNCTAD, 2016). One cause for the increased number of FDIs is the rise of saturated markets in Western countries (Buckley et al., 2010), and this is no different in higher education (HE). The number of people entering into HE around the world is likely to increase to 160 million by 2025 (Jones, 2001). Furthermore, forecasts by the British Council (2016) show that developed western countries (e.g. the UK, US, France and Germany) are showing the least amount of growth between now and 2020, with the most lucrative markets either being in Asia or more specifically the BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India and China) nations. The increasing foreign market potential has forced the Higher Education Institution’s (HEI) management to consider additional sources of revenue as Western markets have started to become increasingly saturated and there is an overbearing need to be self-reliant (McBurnie and Pollock, 2000).

With the growing demand for off-shore education, there is a need for HEIs to consider transnational education (TNE). There are several forms of TNE that include franchising, distance learning and International Branch Campuses (IBC)
(Vignoli, 2004). The latter represents the option which bestows the greatest level of control to the HEI, but also incurs the highest level of risk (Hitt et al., 2012). Given the importance of quality, establishing IBCs represents an attractive approach to internationalisation for HEIs.

The increased need for IBCs can be analysed from the viewpoints of both students and the country as a whole. Firstly, there are an increasing number of students that are looking for cost-effective alternatives for foreign education (Wilkins and Huisman, 2011a) especially those students that are unable to travel. Therefore, IBCs provide a suitable means of accessing international markets that are not conventionally accessible. Secondly, with many countries looking to develop their economies and tertiary education sector, more education hubs are being established (Becker, 2010; Ho Mok et al., 2008; Robertson, 2010a), that are presenting HEIs with lucrative benefits.

The repercussions of IBCs failing is severe given the amount of resources needed (Caruana, 2008), with one campus reporting losses of approximately S$80 million (Alexander, 2007), as a result of closing. Furthermore, losses go beyond the financial aspect and can impact the reputation of the HEI, which is becoming increasingly important (Marginson, 2004). Moreover, reputational damage transcends just the HEI and can also negatively impact and reduce confidence in the host country and TNE as a whole (Gribble and McBurnie, 2015) (Hemsley-Brown and Goonawardana, 2007). Therefore, reflecting the necessity to further understand the factors that increase success and reduce failure.

For practitioners to fully realise the benefits of an IBC, more research is required given the infancy of the topic (Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014). Currently, HEI managers have little experience in establishing IBCs given the
relatively small number of institutions that have established one. The ICU (2016) recognises that there are 11,930 universities in the world, and only 204 have IBCs which represents just under 2%. However, the number of IBC’s are increasing at an approximate rate of 10% a year (C-BERT, 2015). Therefore, one way in which the lack of experience can be addressed is through further academic research, which to date has yielded several studies, but little has it focused on a holistic view of what makes IBCs successful and the process of establishing an IBC. The following review presents the importance of IBCs as a part of TNE, in addition to the potential areas that contribute to its success.

1.1.1 Success and Failure of International Branch Campuses

As of 2015, a total of 277 IBCs have opened globally, with over half of these being opened in the last decade (C-BERT, 2015). Furthermore, many countries are focusing on expanding and improving their tertiary education sector, and the number of education hubs has increased (Gondwe, 2011). Therefore, countries are actively encouraging HEIs to establish IBCs. However, 30 campuses have closed, which represents a failure rate of approximately 10%. Given the substantial resources and potential damage to an HEI’s reputation, there is a need to understand what makes IBCs successful.

IBCs is one approach of TNE (with others including licensing) and represents a form of FDI in the higher education context. Current literature on FDI underlines the importance of the OLI theory to identify the key determinant of this type of investment. However, there is a need to develop this foundational theory further to suit more contexts (Mathews, 2006). Therefore, there is a need to
understand how the most relevant aspects of Dunning’s (1973) OLI theory (ownership and location advantage) can be applied in the context of IBCs.

Current literature focuses on numerous areas, such as strategic choices when establishing an IBC (Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014), which are determined by host country uncertainty and difference. This is also linked to the topic of standardisation and adaption, which includes the work of Shams and Huisman (2011) who utilise the I-R paradigm to demonstrate which aspects of an IBC require adaption to suit the host country. Both studies represent the need to understand the operations of an IBC. For the most part, there is little consideration in the current literature for a holistic theory or framework to understand how an IBC can be established and operated successfully.

One exception to this is the recent research conducted by (Wilkins, 2016) which identifies three areas of consideration when assessing risks and opportunities related to establishing an IBC, which includes environmental, industrial and organisational factors. However, similar to other studies on IBC, the findings are based on the literature, and limited primary data is included. Nonetheless, the study further substantiates the need to understand the potential causes of success and failure and also how this can inform HEI management when establishing IBCs.

There are many benefits of IBCs cited by many authors that include enhancing international reputation and providing an additional source of revenue (Mahani and Molki, 2011; Naidoo, 2007; Van Vught, 2008), but there is little insight into how the success of IBCs can be measured. However, Chalmers (2011) and Lewis (2016) suggest that measures are centred around enrolment
and should be in line with the HEI’s mission. Therefore, there is a need to understand measures and establish indicators of success.

To this end, this study contributes to existing literature by compiling existing theories and confirming their contribution to the success of an IBC, thereby identifying the potential factors that contribute to the success of an IBC. Furthermore, despite the numerous benefits of IBC, measuring success is an under-researched area in IBC literature.

1.2 Study Aim and Research Questions

Given the issues outlined in the previous section, there is a need to undertake further research concerning IBCs. As domestic tertiary education markets become saturated in western countries, HEIs need to exploit lucrative international markets. Currently, there are a limited number of models and studies, which holistically address how IBCs operate and which factors contribute to success. Moreover, it is critical that HEI managers are able to understand the various components that would reduce the likelihood of failure. Additionally, a comprehensive framework for the successful operation of an IBC based on primary data is not available and needs to be identified. Finally, there is also a need to understand how success can be measured, and how appropriate indicators can be established. Thus, the aim of the study and the research questions are as follows:
The aim of this study is to identify which factors contribute to the success and failure of foreign direct investment in transnational education and to establish suitable measures for success.

Research Questions:

1. Which factors contribute to the success or failure of foreign direct investment in transnational education?
2. What are the appropriate measures of success and failure in foreign direct investment in transnational education?
3. Identify a framework for the successful establishment and operation of an international branch campus.

The following section provides an outline of how the aim and research questions are addressed through empirical research.

1.3 The Research Approach and Process

To address the research aim and questions outlined above, an empirical approach supported by the post-positivism research philosophy was applied (Allison and Pomeroy, 2000). A detailed review of the extant literature concerning international business, FDI, TNE and IBC formed the basis of this study. Adopting the OLI theory (Dunning, 1973; Dunning, 1988; Dunning and Wymbs, 2001), a new conceptual model was developed, and potential measures were identified. Based on the literature, four factors and associated sub-factors were recognised. For instance, resource (Horton, 2003), knowledge (Dunning and Lundan, 2008),
and organisation assets (Li and Guisinger, 1992) were recognised to contribute to the HEI advantages. Other factors include location advantage (Sadoi, 2008), internalisation (Williams, 1997) and relationships (Barringer and Harrison, 2000). The conceptual model presented denotes one of the few (if any) studies to utilise the FDI theory as a basis for TNE.

To test the conceptual model, a mixed method approach using two qualitative stages and a single quantitative stage was used. As the literature on IBC is still in its infancy, a relatively limited knowledge about it exists, and thus an exploratory approach was followed (Creswell, 2013). Expert interviews carried out through a Delphi technique were held with practitioners and academicians (n=19) to identify: 1) success and failure factors for IBCs, and 2) success and failure measures for IBCs. A blend of convenience and judgmental sampling was used to recruit respondents who were spread over seven countries. Data from the interviews were analysed using cognitive mapping (Tegarden and Sheetz, 2003) and resulted in the identification of five success factors (with 20 sub-factors), six categories of measures and a framework.

In the second stage, a case study approach was used which included ten interviews and secondary sources. The questions in the interviews were based on the findings of the previous stage and were designed to identify factors that resulted in the success or the failure of an IBC. Secondary sources were also used to supplement and address gaps in the information (Noor, 2008). A comprehensive list of IBCs was used to identify the population, and wherever possible, the contact details of relevant personnel was retrieved and contacted. Subjects were selected based on their role in the HEI and their knowledge of the IBC. Additionally, two interviews were required, one each from the home campus
and the IBC. Analysis of the data confirmed that the five factors were evident in the chosen IBCs; specific indicators of success measures were identified, and enhancements to the framework were underlined.

In the third and the final stage, online surveys were used to collect data. The survey includes questions concerning the factors and sub-factors identified in the qualitative stages. The aim was to determine the importance of the factors, the relative sub-factors within them, and the importance of the success measures. The sample list from the previous stage was used as it represented the sample population (N=204). Given the data collection method, extensive consideration was given to the design and delivery of the survey (Ganassali, 2008). A total of 87 respondents (i.e. 42%), which represents an approximate response rate of 1 in 2.5, were collected as a result. After data manipulation, which includes the creation of composite variables (Babbie, 2014) and dichotomisation (Altman and Royston, 2006), the data was analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 21. Frequency and descriptive tests were used to identify the importance of the factors and the priority of the sub-factors within them. Similar analysis was conducted on the success measures. The approach adopted in this study is one of the few studies that utilises multiple stages of primary data collection, in particular, the inclusion of a quantitative element.

1.4 Thesis Structure

This section briefly outlines the contents and structure of the thesis, which consists of seven chapters.
Chapter 1 introduces the topic of the thesis. A brief background is provided, and gaps in the literature that justifies the need for the research are identified. The aims and research questions are presented along with an overview of the research approach.

Chapter 2 presents a comprehensive and critical assessment of the extant literature. The literature review is divided into four sections, which will address the topics of international business, foreign direct investment, transnational education and international branch campuses. The purpose of the review will be to establish the potential factors and measures of success. The chapter is concluded with the presentation and discussion of the proposed conceptual model.

Chapter 3 details the methodology and the methods used to complete the empirical investigation. The research philosophy is discussed and justified, and the research questions are defined. Following this, the key issues related to the mixed method approach are discussed.

Chapter 4 presents the data analysis of the expert interviews. The development of the five factors is presented (with the HEI factor being discussed in full) followed by the success measures. Also, a potential framework is identified. Finally, a discussion is presented based on the findings.

Chapter 5 introduces the second stage of the qualitative analysis. The case studies comprise of ten (five successful and five failed) campuses. The key developments to the five factors, measures and framework, are discussed and the chapter concludes with a discussion based on the findings.
Chapter 6 presents the analysis of the final stage of analysis. The results of the quantitative surveys are discussed. Again, the key developments, with an emphasis on the relative importance of the five factors and measures are addressed. This is concluded with a discussion on the findings.

Chapter 7 provides an overall discussion of the findings with a specific attention to how each of the research questions have been addressed. This includes defining the final factors and measures and a discussion concerning the framework.

Chapter 8 concludes the thesis and demonstrates the main contribution to theory as well as the ways in which policy makers and HEI managers can utilise and implement the findings. The chapter is concluded by acknowledging the limitations and providing insights into future avenues of research.

1.5 Summary and Conclusion

This chapter presented an introduction to the thesis. An overview of the background to the research problem and the gaps in the current understanding that need to be addressed are presented. The three research questions that are to be addressed and the aim of the thesis are outlined. A brief overview of how the research questions are addressed is depicted. Finally, a full outline of the eight chapters of the thesis and the contents of each one of them is presented. The following chapter discusses the four main bodies of literature relevant to this study.
2. Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the three main areas of literature relevant to this thesis, starting broadly with international business and subsequently focusing on international branch campuses. The discussion focuses on addressing the gaps that exist within the extant literature. This chapter concludes with a conceptual model to be tested empirically.

2.2. International Business

2.2.1 Introduction

Leung et al., (2005) suggests that the globalising world has led to an increased interest in the study of International Business (IB). This section covers the key theories within IB literature that are relevant to this study.

2.2.2. Definition and Need for International Business

IB, in its simplest form, relates to “firms that engage in international trade or investment” (Peng, 2004, p. 100). The basis of the current IB theory is arguably derived from a range of business disciplines, which include economics, corporate strategy, organisational development and other subjects linked with the understanding of transnational companies (Grosse and Behrman, 1992). Furthermore, IB research can be categorised into a series of general topics (which form the areas in the remainder of this IB section), and they include:
- Internationalisation/ Globalisation
- Competitive and Comparative Advantage
- Developing Economies/Markets (including Culture)
- Foreign Direct Investment

2.2.3. International Business Theory

This section examines five areas of IB theory within the current literature, which covers the areas previously mentioned. These areas represent key issues that need to be considered for addressing the research questions in this thesis.

Internationalisation/ Globalisation

Firstly, it is essential to distinguish the difference between internationalisation and globalisation; in essence, both elements share the basic concept of cross-border trade (i.e. the buying and selling of goods between countries). However, globalisation reflects the “flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, ideas... across borders...” (Knight, 1999, p. 14) whereas, internationalisation addresses the process of becoming global (Acedo and Jones, 2007; Ulrich et al., 2012). Furthermore, Knight (2011) suggests that the internationalisation of higher education is a method of reacting to the impact of globalisation.

The increase in multinational organisations (UNCTAD, 2016) has been in response to the increase in competition and continuous change in the business
environment. Hence, organisations are required to look further afield for new opportunities, and this is no different for Higher Education Institutions (HEI).

The key issue to consider here is how to exploit the new opportunities and gain a foothold in new global markets. Gupta et al., (2008) suggest that to stay globally dominant, four key issues need to be taken into consideration: 1) exploiting and identifying market opportunities worldwide and establish the necessary presence in all key markets, 2) converting global presence into a competitive advantage, 3) cultivating a global mind-set and 4) developing global strategies and taking into account the rapid growth of emerging markets. Therefore, there is a need for an organisation to globalise results from identifying opportunities in new international markets.

The increased number of global organisations can also be attributed to maturing markets, predominately found in developed countries. A range of authors (Alexander and Myers, 2000; Doh, 2005; Orr, 2010) recognise Vernon’s (1966) international product life cycle (as seen in Figure 1), which demonstrates how mature markets in developed countries represent new opportunities in developing countries. However, given that time has elapsed since this model’s creation, scepticism towards its applicability has been raised (Ayal, 1981; Cantwell and Salmon, 2016; Vernon and Wells, 1986). The implication of the international product life cycle for transnational education (TNE) is that the education market in developing countries may become more attractive for HEIs.
Despite the range of reasons for organisations to globalise, there are associated problems and drawbacks. Examples of the broader areas will be discussed below.

Leung *et al.*, (2005) indicates that the majority of problems originate from developing countries that have been hindered by the destabilising effects of globalisation such as the number of professional jobs decreasing as a result of outsourcing to low-wage countries (Myers Jr, 2014). This implies that HEIs need to consider the negative impact of their decision when investing in developing countries, which includes the effect on employee morale when certain jobs are outsourced to other countries. However, it is far more likely that the opening of a new campus will create additional employment opportunities rather than
decrease them. In addition, the establishment of further HEIs will also benefit the growth and development of the country.

When globalising, firms face a broad range of barriers that need to be overcome. A key aspect of this is how to overcome the “liability of foreignness” and local competition (Caves, 1974; Dunning, 1973; Gardberg and Fombrun, 2006; Kahiya and Kahiya, 2017; Petersen and Currie, 2008; Yen et al., 2016; Zaheer, 1995) which include observing factors that would put organisations at a disadvantage when entering a new country. In the case of HEIs, it implies the necessity of understanding the new environment as it will indicate the viability of the investment and the organisation’s ability to compete.

Governments are an essential factor to consider. Hence, Grosse and Behrman (1992) demonstrate their importance as they set the regulations with which organisations need to comply with. In some cases, this can inhibit organisations by restricting market access (Sampson and Snape, 1985; Wolfmayr, 2008) and controlling price, which includes entry and exit taxes (Li and Sun, 2015). The latter has become more substantial since the economic recession, as governments have undertaken increased protectionist measures (Orr, 2010), thereby making it increasingly difficult to enter new foreign markets competitively.

A further issue that needs to be addressed when globalising is the “Country of Origin” (COO) effect. It has been suggested that the COO has a substantial effect on how a company internationalises and how it conducts business abroad” (Wächter et al., 2003, p. 2). The COO is a key issue as it affects the consumers’ perception of a product, service or brand, especially in the absence of clear and relevant attributes information (e.g. lack of technical information) (Gürhan-Canli
and Maheswaran, 2000; Maheswaran, 1994). Furthermore, the stereotyping of certain countries (Agrawal and Kamakura, 1999; Han, 1989) has been recognised as a key indicator of quality. The key consideration for TNE is its impact on consumers’ evaluation of a programme or an HEI (an issue to be addressed further in Section 2.3). For example, the UK has benefited from the positive branding of “best in the world” (Binsardi and Ekwulugo, 2003), thus increasing the attractiveness of the UK as a destination to study, due to the higher perceived quality of the education provided.

**Competitive and Comparative Advantage**

This section firstly examines the Competitive Advantage (CompeAdv) and then the Comparative Advantage (CompaAdv) in literature. Both areas also contribute to the literature related to the theory of the firm (discussed in Section 2.4.3). This topic further aids in identifying potential consideration for Higher Education Institutions (HEI) when investing abroad. Furthermore, Porter’s (2000) theory of national competitive advantage indicates that factors, such as support from the government and the local industry are key aspects when considering whether to internationalise to that country.

CompeAdv is the concept of gaining a profitable and sustainable advantage over rivals within the same industry (Porter, 1998). CompeAdv can be derived from (but not only) customer value (Barney, 1991; Woodruff, 1997), information technology (Powell and Dent-Micalef, 1997) and branding (Hall, 1993). However, Peng (2001) and Lubit (2001) suggest that the most valuable, unique and hard to imitate resource is knowledge and expertise. For HEIs, brand
recognition is argued to be the highest priority for potential students during the selection process (Debowski, 2003; Robertson, 2010b). This suggests that for TNE, the focus needs to be on how to compete in new countries.

Literature shows that CompeAdv is linked to a “resource based view” concept (Barney, 1991; Beard and Sumner, 2004; Orr, 2010; Peng, 2001; Rouse and Daellenbach, 1999). However, Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) indicate that this view neglects the managerial process of collecting and using knowledge. As a result, the theory of “dynamic capability” was developed (Teece et al., 1997). This addressed the issues of managers’ capabilities for utilising resources to address the changing environment. Following the assessment of an organisation’s resources, a “strategic fit” needs to be created (Lynch, 2006). This is the concept of matching an organisation’s resources and capabilities with the environment, which then forms the basis for establishing a CompeAdv (Cartwright and Schoenberg, 2006; Thompson and Strickland, 2003; Zajac et al., 2000). This implies that HEIs not only need to have the resources but to achieve an advantage, they have to be utilised correctly.

Comparative Advantage (CompaAdv) relates to the trade between two countries due to one country’s ability to produce a product at a lower price (Doole and Lowe, 2008; Kotabe and Helsen, 2009). Similar to CompeAdv, this mainly focuses on an organisation’s resources. However, in this case, it relates to the creation of those resources before they can be exploited to gain an advantage (Hunt and Morgan, 1995).

Despite the study of CompaAdv being identified as key in the field of IB (Bartel and Lichtenberg, 1987; Hunt and Morgan, 1995; Peng, 2004), it is not a crucial element for the purpose of this research. This is due to CompaAdv being
strongly linked with unskilled labour and the production of goods, which in some 
cases, represents an important determinant of inwards FDI for countries because 
it represents increased employment opportunities and the possibility of 
technology spillovers (Waldkirch, 2011). Therefore, it implies that CompaAdv 
may not directly affect TNE.

**Developing Economies and Markets**

A Developing Country (DGC) can be defined as “...beyond the level of least 
developed but still relatively poor and non-industrialised” (Page and Connell, 
2006, p. 533). In contrast, the WTO (2011) shows that countries choose to select 
whether they are categorised as a developed country (DDC) or DGC. The largest 
of the DGCs are Brazil, Russia, India and China (known as the BRIC countries) 
and these countries’ economies are now larger and experiencing higher levels of 
growth than G6 ones (BBVA, 2012). Therefore, these countries and other DGCs 
will continue to attract further interests due to increased investment opportunities.

Along with the DGC and DDC, the WTO also recognises “Least Developed 
Countries” (LDC) as a third category. The LDCs are those that are highly 
disadvantaged and are least likely to escape poverty; they have three 
characteristics which include: 1) low income, 2) weak human assets and 3) 
economic vulnerability (UNCTAD, 2011). Currently, there are 52 countries 
classed as LDCs (UNCTAD, 2016). Although these countries may not be 
attractive areas of investment (in general and in the case of education), they 
represent an opportunity in the future (Lynn, 2009).
The final thought when considering the definition of DDC, DGC and LDC is the “North and South” concept. In general, the North consists of mainly the DDCs and the South includes predominately the DGCs and LDCs (Mcinroy and Jackson, 2016) as indicated in Figure 2. Furthermore, investments traditionally flow from the North to the South (Flam and Helpman, 1987; Krugman, 1979). Kraay et al., (2005) indicate that investments from the North to the South represent 181% of the South’s wealth. Despite the traditional flows of North to South investments, there has been an increase in the number of South to South investments (Aykut and Goldstein, 2007; Lynn, 2009). This can be seen in China’s continually increasing level of investment (approximately $26 billion as of the end of 2013) into Africa (UNCTAD, 2016). The implications of further South to South investment reflects the growing potential of competition in those countries.

Figure 2: North-South Divide Global Map has been removed due to Copyright restrictions

Source: (Jolly, 2008)
The benefits of FDIs in education is that it facilitates the development of those countries, in particular, DGCs (Iwai et al., 2004; OECD, 2002). Furthermore, FDIs generate the need for a skilled labour force; consequently, this creates a demand for higher education (Mughal and Vechiu, 2009). With the increased amount of skilled labour (as a result of people receiving higher education), new FDIs from more advanced industries can be attracted. Consequently, the new skilled labour force will require further training. This represents a long-term cycle of industry development (see Figure 3) within a DGC as a result of FDIs and higher education. Therefore, there is a need to better understand the impact of educational FDIs in different countries.

**Figure 3: FDI and Higher Education Development Cycle**
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Source: Authors Own Model

**Culture**

This section focuses on culture. There are various definitions of culture, but a critical review of cultural studies by Yaprak (2008) identifies this definition
of culture as the most relevant in the context of international business. The
definition is as follows:

“That complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (as cited in Yaprak, 2008, p.217)

Culture is a key area of study, as it greatly impacts organisations’ ability to operate in new countries. Thus, organisations need to factor in diverse cultures of international markets to survive in those markets (Zou et al., 1997). Moreover, culture can also dictate the most appropriate method for international market entry (Kogut and Singh, 1988). More specifically, in TNE, culture has a great impact on factors such as learning styles (Caruana, 2008; Heffernan et al., 2010).

The most prevalent theory on international culture is Hofstede’s (1980) dimensions of culture framework, which has been recognised by many authors (Kogut and Singh, 1988; Leung et al., 2005; Peng, 2004; Rosenbloom and Larsen, 2003; Soares et al., 2007; Yoo and Donthu, 2002). The dimensions of this framework include power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, masculinity and long-term orientation. All these aspects, except long-term orientation, affect learning styles (Barkema and Vermeulen, 1997), which has been discussed in Section 2.4.3.

Although Hofstede’s framework provides a host of benefits for analysing culture, it is not without its limitations. Authors suggest that this study views “culture as static”, which requires progress beyond stereotyping. For instance, looking beyond the assumption made about learning styles due to culture (Caruana, 2008; Yaprak, 2008). Further criticisms of the framework include the need for further testing in more countries to identify further dimensions, the
assumption of cultural homogeneity among nations, the research being based on one organisation and being outdated (Baskerville, 2003; Jones, 2007a; McSweeney, 2002; Soares et al., 2007).

Overall, when investing abroad, there is a need to culturally examine each country individually to ensure a full understanding of the differences (such as learning styles), which will allow HEIs to develop appropriate educational programmes. Therefore, there is a need to understand how culture impacts an international branch campus (IBC).

2.2.4. Methods of Internationalisation/ Market Entry

Selecting the appropriate international market entry method is crucial as failure to do so results in a waste of resources (Agrawal and Kamakura, 1999). There are a variety of market entry methods, all with varying degrees of involvement (see Figure 4).

Figure 4: International Market Entry Methods has been removed due to Copyright restrictions

Adapted: (Phillips et al., 1994)
The key market entry method categories that are recognised in literature (detailed in Table 1) are exporting, licensing and foreign direct investment (Agrawal and Kamakura, 1999; Bennett and Blythe, 2002; Czinkota and Coskun Samli, 2007; Li, 1995). It is important to consider the risk associated with selecting an entry method and the key considerations include: 1) entry mode risk, 2) country risk and 3) over-dependence on foreign markets (Burgel and Murray, 2000). This section discusses both exporting and licensing. Furthermore, as a critical area of this research focuses on the FDI, this has been discussed in-depth in the following section (Section 2.2).

Table 1: International Market Entry Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exporting</td>
<td>“Exporting means manufacturing a product in one country and selling it in another” (Bennett and Blythe, 2002, p.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>“Under a licensing agreement, one firm, the licensor, permits another to use its intellectual property in exchange for compensation designated as a royalty” (Czinkota and Ronkainen, 2007, p.291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment (FDI)</td>
<td>“Foreign Direct Investment represents international investment flows which acquire properties and plants. The international marketer makes such investments to create or expand a long-term interest in an enterprise with some degree of control.” (Czinkota and Ronkainen, 2007, p.295).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exporting represents a low risk but a high-cost approach (Hitt et al., 2012), which is made up of both direct and indirect exporting (Klug, 2007). Firstly, direct exporting is conducted by the organisation itself through selected channels; secondly, indirect exporting represents exporting through agents. The main
advantage of direct exporting is the potential for higher returns. However, the organisation needs to overcome market entry barriers on their own (Tielmann, 2010).

Licensing has the lowest risk and costs associated with it. Thus, it is less resource intensive than FDI. However, it requires a suitable licensing partner (Czinkota and Coskun Samli, 2007; Froot and Stein, 1991) and comes at the expense of less control as well as lower returns (Hitt et al., 2012). Licensing is already used in TNE as a method of international expansion. However, the licensor has less control over the programme delivery, and this can affect the quality of education provided (Adam, 2001; Campbell and Van der Wende, 2000; Middlehurst, 2001; Morshidi, 2006). Therefore, licensing is a low-cost method for international market entry, but this is at the cost of control, which directly influences quality.

2.2.5 Conclusion of IB theory

IB is the broadest area of literature to be addressed. Many considerations have been identified and relate to how an organisation can globalise (i.e. competitive advantage, developing economies, culture and market entry method). The identified areas are also relevant in the TNE context. However, what is not apparent is how these theories can be applied. This has been further developed in the subsequent sections.
2.3. Foreign Direct Investment

2.3.1. Introduction

As documented in the previous section, the three key methods of market entry are exporting, licensing and Foreign Direct Investment (FDI). The latter represents the highest risk and most resource intensive option for international market entry (Hitt *et al.*, 2012) and is the focus of this section.

2.3.2. Definition of Foreign Direct Investment

FDI has been defined as:

"reflecting the objective of obtaining a lasting interest by a resident entity in one economy ("direct investor") in an entity resident in an economy other than that of the investor ("direct investment enterprise")." OECD (2010, p. 7-8)

Furthermore, FDI is a key area of research (Buckley, 2002; Peng, 2004); in particular, how it functions and the purpose it serves (i.e. the benefits and drawbacks to both the host country and the investor). This makes up a fundamental element of the research to be conducted for this thesis.

In the context of TNE, the five leading exporters of higher education are Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States and the top importing countries of education are China, India, Korea and Japan (Bashir, 2007). However, in the context of IBCs, the three leading exporters are the United States, the United Kingdom and Russia and the three leading importers are China, the United Arab Emirates and Singapore (OBHE, 2016).
2.3.3 Methods of Foreign Direct Investment

FDI can be segregated into three approaches. It is essential first to define these approaches. However, mergers and acquisitions represent a method of investment rather than an approach (i.e. mergers and acquisitions are a method of totally owned or joint venture investments) (Head and Ries, 2008). Therefore, only Total Ownership (TO) and Joint Ventures (JV) has been discussed. However, Thomson Reuter (2016) provides a comprehensive data set related mergers and acquisitions, which provide valuable insight into areas such as the timeline, value of transactions and the nature of the investments. Hence whilst some useful secondary sources exist, they are partial and not focused on the objectives of the current study, and so the need for primary data is evident.

Firstly, JV can be classed into two categories “equity joint ventures” and “contractual joint ventures”. These are defined by Küpper (2008, p. 23) as follows:

“A contractual joint venture covers the cooperation of two or more firms where the benefits, costs and risks are shared with each other without involving equity...... An equity joint venture can be described as a separate organisation, which is set up jointly owned by two or more participating companies”

The author further identifies a process of establishing JV, and this includes five stages: 1) identifying the incentive for collaboration, 2) alliance planning, 3) partner selection, 4) alliance structure and management and 5) contractual agreement. Also, for a JV to be classed as international, one of the participating organisations must be located in a separate country (Almor, 2001).

JV have a variety of advantages and disadvantages for the investor (Tascheva, 2008). The main advantages are increased efficiency, shared
resources and reduced risk. In contrast, the disadvantages are the possibility of slower returns and management conflicts.

The second investment method is TO, which involves a high investment by a single organisation into a foreign market (Almor, 2001). Furthermore, it can involve the purchase of land and operations that tend to be controlled by the investing organisation (Clarke and Chen, 2009). Moreover, the authors identify that the key advantage of TO is that it provides the highest level of control. However, this level of control comes with the inherent drawback of the high initial investment and increased risk.

With both methods defined, attention falls upon whether JV or TO is the preferred choice of FDI. It is argued that the advantages of JV make it a preferred choice due to the ability to share expertise and the opportunity to partner with a firm in the host country who will have knowledge of the local environment (Abe and Zhao, 2000; Schaumburg-Müller, 2009). Furthermore, in some countries, governments do not permit foreign investment without a partner (Moosa, 2002). Despite the benefits of JV, it has been suggested that multinational companies prefer TO (Almor, 2001; Moosa, 2002; Schaumburg-Müller, 2009), which is further supported by Almor (2001) who indicates that certain manufacturers prefer TO as it allows the organisation to retain proprietary knowledge. Hence, the key benefit of TO is the increased level of control. Both methods of FDI are factored in as IBCs can be established using either approach (Becker, 2009). However, there is little indication to suggest which method is more successful. Thus, further research needs to be conducted.
2.3.4. Selection/ Determinant Criteria for FDI

The pioneering theory on FDI determinants is Dunning’s (1988; 2001) “OLI” theory, which is identified to be the predominant framework for FDI. The three determinants are as follows: the ownership advantage that an organisation has, the benefits of an overseas location (over the domestic one) and the benefits of internalisation (Dunning, 2000). This theory has been recognised by many authors (Bevan and Estrin, 2004; Doh, 2005; Grosse and Behrman, 1992; Kimura, 1989; Peng, 2001; Qiu, 2003; Sadoi, 2008). However, the theory has also been challenged, particularly, for its inability to incorporate new internationalisation strategic features as time progresses and its sole focus on existing resources (Lall, 2000; Mathews, 2006).

The “OLI” theory provides an initial framework for categorising the potential criteria that make FDIs successful. A fourth element of “relationships” has been added due to the potential for JV (i.e. multiple organisations working together), which is an area that is not fully addressed by the “OLI’ theory. Overall, these criterions reflect what organisations will need to consider before any form of investment take place. Also, it can indicate how countries can increase their attractiveness as a host country, which is beneficial for economic growth and spill overs (Moran, 2012).

Ownership Advantage

Ownership Advantage (OA) is a key determinant as it refers to both tangible (such as products and technology) and intangible assets (such as patents, branding and knowledge) (Kimura, 1989), which can be exploited in
foreign countries. For an organisation to consider FDI, it must first assess whether the organisation’s resources are sufficient and can be leveraged to compete against local organisations on foreign territory (Head and Ries, 2008; Shan and Song, 1997). This demonstrates the need for strong resources, which include: infrastructure, technology, finance, staffing and time (Horton, 2003; Wilson and Amine, 2009) but also the need to match these resources with the host country’s environment to achieve a strategic fit (Dunning and Wymbs, 2001; Lynch, 2006). Thus, there is a need to understand how resources contribute to the success of an IBC and how a CompeAdv can be achieved.

OA is an especially important factor when the method of FDI is TO, as it allows the organisation to exploit its advantage without the need to share knowledge with other organisations (Makino and Beamish, 1998). Establishing an IBC contributes to the OA element of the OLI theory if HEIs can exploit its brand name, knowledge and intellectual properties (Dunning and Lundan, 2008; Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014). However, as already identified, TO may not always be suitable given the restrictions imposed in some countries. Nonetheless, more research is needed to understand what elements of an HEI impacts success of an IBC.

Having knowledge of the local market is beneficial and increases the attractiveness of a location. The absence of awareness on issues such as legal, political and the economic environment causes uncertainty and can deter the FDI (Carstensen and Toubal, 2004; Tschoegl and Guillen, 2000). However, despite being knowledgeable, an organisation, regardless of its resources and size, will always have imperfect information regarding the market (Lall, 2000). Nonetheless, gathering additional knowledge on the market before entering the
host country reduces the risk of the investment and consequently improves the chances of success.

**Location Advantage**

The second determinant is location advantage, which is crucial in the selection of a host country (Bevan and Estrin, 2004) and also indicates how countries can attract FDIs. According to Sadoi (2008), there are six key location advantages:

“*market size and growth prospects, natural and human resource endowments...... physical financial and technological infrastructure, openness to international trade and access to international markets, the regulatory and policy framework and policy coherence, and the investment promotion.*” (Sadoi, 2008, p. 148)

These elements are further discussed next to identify more potential success and failure criteria.

Financial benefits represent another key determinant in any investment, which in FDI is mainly derived from tax incentives and increased revenues (Artige and Nicolini, 2005). However, Bevan and Estrin (2004) suggest that when considering financial benefits, it is essential to examine the trade-off between potential costs (e.g. communication, sending personnel and dealing with cultural and language issues). Therefore, identifying countries that offer financial incentives should aid the survival of foreign subsidiaries, attract FDIs to countries and increase the rate of success of FDIs.

Another factor to be considered is the proximity to the target market (Eichengreen and Tong, 2007; Li and Guisinger, 1992), as it has been recognised
that a key motivation for FDI is to move the final stage of production towards the end user to better suit their needs (Kimura, 1989). Another determinant for FDI is the potential market size (Artige and Nicolini, 2005; Li and Guisinger, 1992), which can be represented by the GDP of the country and the value of the targeted segment. Furthermore, a factor that results in the success of an FDI is the size and growth of the market, which increases the attractiveness of certain countries. Also, Calvet (1981) cites that two conditions need to be met: 1) the organisation must possess a substantial advantage over local counterparts and 2) the market being imperfect.

Despite close proximity to the target market, the host country needs to enable organisations to set up globally competitive facilities (Lall, 2000). This suggests that HEIs should locate themselves close to the target market to become successful. However, regardless of how lucrative the market is, the organisation needs to be able to operate competitively within it.

The knowledge base of the country can also be a key determinant for selecting a host country (Artige and Nicolini, 2005; OECD, 2002; Spar, 1998). Moran (2012) states that FDI inflows and human capital have a high correlation. To illustrate this, it has been shown that in the biotechnology and semiconductor industry, technologically advanced organisations primarily seek countries which possess a technological advantage (Kimura, 1989; Shan and Song, 1997), which when combined with low labour costs can increase the appeal of certain countries (Spar, 1998). In essence, for FDI to be successful, the right kind of human resources need to be available for the foreign subsidiary to utilise. Also, it increases the possibility of the host country to benefit from spillovers. Thus, HEIs can play a significant role in developing a country’s knowledge base.
A country’s government plays a significant role, as it provides the rules and regulations within which the investor must operate (Calvet, 1981; Dunning and Wymbs, 2001; OECD, 2002). Governments tend to implement accommodating policies to attract FDI’s that are likely to benefit the country (Artige and Nicolini, 2005; Lall 2000). For instance, to increase employment, governments may favour labour intensive and low technology investments (Lall, 2000).

Changes in regulations can also enhance a country’s location advantage because new opportunities can emerge. An example of this is the deregulation of the Latin American banking system in the 1990s (Tschoegl and Guillen, 2000), which led to the investments by two large Spanish banks. Furthermore, new policies (although very limiting) were introduced in China to attract FDI to improve the then lagging automotive industry (Wang, 2003). In the context of TNE, the pending approval of the Foreign Education Providers Bill will provide new opportunities in India for HEIs (Sharma, 2007) as it presents an attractive market due to the increasing demand for higher education (Morgan, 2010a). Therefore, changes in regulations can result in new opportunities for organisations.

Another factor related to regulations are trade barriers and openness (Artige and Nicolini, 2005). This can both reduce and increase the attractiveness of investing in certain countries. In some cases, such as China, countries do not allow wholly foreign-owned companies (OECD, 2002). Furthermore, governments may also be highly protective and impose trade barriers to allow domestic organisations to compete against advanced foreign counterparts (Wang, 2003). To enable this, a mandatory remit may be enforced requiring a joint venture with a local partner in the country or having to meet specific levels of local content (Moran, 2012). Thus, regulations can both benefit and hinder an
organisation when considering FDI. Therefore, understanding how these regulations can affect the investment is crucial, as not doing so can result in failure.

Although existing regulations are important, it has been possible for organisations to bargain with governments to achieve a compromise on some regulations, to benefit both the investor and the government (Calvet, 1981; Lall, 2000). Also, when considering the determinants for the selection of a host country, it is essential not only to consider what the country currently has to offer but also to examine its flexibility to meet the needs of the organisation (Spar, 1998). Therefore, investors need to consider methods of bargaining with the government on current and pending regulations when selecting an attractive host country.

Another determinant for choosing a host country is the “destination country effect” which gives rise to the possibility of a bidding competition (Head and Ries, 2008) between countries for investment within a country. Through the application of Porter’s five forces model, it is suggested that an attractive country with many potential investors may swing the power from the investor to the host country, allowing the latter to select the best investments for the country (as seen in Figure 5). Therefore, HEIs that are focused on attractive destinations for investment, such as China and India, are likely to encounter global competition. However, the manifestation of this trend in TNE has not yet been identified. Hence, HEIs need to consider methods of making their investments appeal to the host country (i.e. branding and the ability to attract students from neighbouring countries).
Some location advantages have been identified, but there is limited research regarding which advantages in the host country are the most significant contributors to the success of an IBC.

**Internalisation Advantage**

The third FDI determinant is internalisation, also known as the transaction cost theory and forms an element of the theory of the firm (see section 2.4.3). It reflects the advantage of producing abroad rather than adopting an alternative method, such as licensing or franchising (Bevan and Estrin, 2004). In essence, internalisation identifies why organisations generate and/or exploit ownership advantages internally rather than buy or sell the rights abroad (Dunning, 2000; 2001). Also, Dunning (2000) identifies that this final component amalgamates the ownership and the location advantage as it assesses how an organisation can exploit its ownership advantage in the potential host country. The reasons for internalisation are mixed, with Williams (1997) and Dunning and Wymbs (2001) citing three different reasons, which are indicated in Table 2. However, Dunning
and Wymbs (2001) are biased towards technology and information due to the context of their research.

Table 2: Reasons for Internalisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Risk and uncertainty, resulting in the multinational firm internalising risks and the risk management process.</td>
<td>1. Information Asymmetry - the assumption that one party lacks information relative to another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The result of economies of scale in an imperfect market</td>
<td>2. Bounded Rationality - the human inability to process all information in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The market not pricing externalities to transactions.</td>
<td>3. Asset Specificity - the need to commit large sums of money to produce specialised products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internalisation theory suggests that as long as transaction costs exceed those incurred by internal hierarchies, it will be beneficial to a firm to engage in FDI (Beamish and Banks, 1987; Dunning, 2000; Morck and Yeung, 1992). The transactional costs are related to imperfections in markets (which in essence are market failures), which can be overcome by organisations creating an internal market to avoid excessive costs i.e. fluctuating exchange rates (Dunning, 2000; Williams, 1997). In the context of TNE, there are few or no elements that can be internalised that will result in a direct benefit to the HEIs regarding economies of scale, which is due to the HEIs being in the service sector. Thus, the services production and consumption are simultaneous (Li and Guisinger, 1992), which also increases the need for HEIs to have local facilities in foreign countries to serve new markets. Thus, for TNE, HEIs need to consider the benefits of direct investment in foreign countries over alternative methods, which include licensing courses to local institutions.
Relationships

This section examines the relationships that investors are likely to encounter and how they can be managed. These relationships may affect the success or failure of FDI in any industry, but more specifically, of TNE.

International Joint Ventures (IJV) represents one of the most dominant forms of FDI in both developing and developed countries (Beamish and Banks, 1987). The benefits of these investments include revenue enhancement, cost reduction, creating additional value and most importantly, gaining access to foreign markets (Barringer and Harrison, 2000). Conversely, it has been recognised that some organisations are pessimistic about the benefits of IJV due to the high failure rates (Ireland et al., 2002; Niederkofler, 1991; Park and Russo, 1996). Furthermore, it has been suggested that IJV is not suitable if internalisation benefits are sought and concerns are raised about control issues (Beamish and Banks, 1987; Geringer and Hebert, 1989; Isobe et al., 2000). Furthermore, a proportion of IBCs are established using an IJV, but there is little research concerning how this impacts the success of an IBC.

To aid in the success of IJV, two factors need to be considered. Firstly, how to select the correct partner and secondly, how to form a relationship with the selected partners; these will be examined in turn. Luo (1998) suggests that when selecting a partner, three attributes should be considered: strategic, organisational and financial; these attributes allow for a fit between the partnering organisations. However, this model was only tested in the context of China. Thus, it may not be applicable in all countries due to issues such as culture. Furthermore, to address the relationship building, Barringer and Harrison (2000) suggest that there are six areas to consider when forming an inter-organisational
relationship, which includes transaction costs, resource dependency, strategic choice, stakeholder theory, learning theory and institutional theory. Therefore, this suggests that a key aspect for IJV in TNE is the correct selection of partners based on a good fit to benefit both the partners.

Exercising the right amount of control is paramount as it has been postulated that IJVs that lack control and are entered into ill-prepared are likely to result in failure and missed opportunities (Chalos and O’Connor, 2004; Ding, 1997; Geringer and Hebert, 1989; Mjoen and Tallman, 1997). Three dimensions have been recognised relating to control, and these are cited by Geringer and Hebert (1989, p. 241), as the 1) focus of control i.e. the scope of activities over which the parent organisation exercise control, 2) extent of control achieved by the parent organisation and 3) mechanisms the parent organisation use to exercise control. The authors further state that for IJVs to perform well, not only should the organisation consider these three dimensions but also the synergy between the organisation’s internationalisation strategy and the aims of the IJV. Notwithstanding, control remains ambiguous, as the elements that need to be controlled need to be clarified in the context of IBCs. Therefore, further research is required on this topic.

Opportunism represents another issue and is one of the key threats to the success of IJV, which can ultimately lead to the termination of relationships (Lu and Hebert, 2005; Steensma et al., 2008). This occurs when organisations seek to gain their own benefit at the expense of the other partner/s, which can increase transaction costs (Hawkins et al., 2008; Luo, 2007; Tsang, 2000; Yan and Gray, 2001). The causes of opportunism can be derived from potential information sharing and a volatile environment (Beamish and Banks, 1987; Luo, 2007;
Madhok, 1995; Madhok, 2006). However, this may not be an issue if joint ventures are established with mutual trust and commitment (Park and Ungson, 1997). Additionally, issues of opportunism can be reduced through the use of agreements and having criteria to detect early signs of opportunism (Merchant and Schendel, 2000). Thus, trust is identified as a significant factor when establishing IJVs.

To lessen the issue of opportunism, several remedies can be considered. This includes control, risk and trust involved in IJVs (Das and Teng, 2001). Heffernan and Poole (2004) identifies three components of trust which include credibility, integrity and benevolence. Moreover, the study of trust is key as it has been argued that it co-evolves with learning and more importantly control (Inkpen and Currall, 2004). Furthermore, Madhok (1995) adds that both the trust and control aspect are crucial for achieving flexibility and efficiency, and neither can be neglected.

Mutual forbearance represents a method of developing trust by passing up short-term gains that encourage long-term partnership in the event of difficult times (Beamish and Banks, 1987; Boersma et al., 2003; Das and Teng, 2001). This, in turn, results in efficient contract execution and joint profit maximisation (Demirbag and Mirza, 2000; Demirbag et al., 2003; Tatoglu, 2000).

With the importance of trust distinguished, the methods for developing trust need to be addressed. Das and Teng (1998) suggest that to build trust, four methods can be considered. These are as follows: trust from risk taking, equity preservation, communication and adaption. Ultimately, trust is a key aspect for HEIs when selecting a partner/s for an IJV as it influences several factors, which are directly related to the success or failure of the investment.
Another potential problem with IJVs is the issue of stability, which refers to the survival of the joint venture and has been linked to the failure of IJVs (Dhanaraj and Beamish, 2004; Gomes-Casseres, 1987). Instability, ultimately, results in the dissolution of relationships and the venture, which can be the result of opportunism (Kogut and Singh, 1988; Krishnan et al., 2006). Methods of liquidation include dissolving the venture, acquisition by one partner of the whole venture or sale to a local partner who will continue to operate the organisation (Geroski et al., 2010; Osland and Cavusgil, 1996). Moreover, the risk of an IJV dissolving increases over time, and the lifespan of the investment depends on how much is to be learnt from the partnering organisations (Mata et al., 2010; Nakamura, 2005); this issue becomes prominent after a period of time, even within TNE. Therefore, stability, as well as sustainability, reflect a key consideration when assessing long-term objectives and the length of partnerships with other organisations.

The area of partner selection has been later addressed in Section 2.4.5, but the main principles of trust and control apply to TNE. However, the importance of relationships for IBC and how they are managed needs to be further understood.

2.3.5. Benefits and Drawbacks of Foreign Direct Investment

The determinants and criteria recognised in the previous section are likely to contribute to the success or failure of FDI. Sequentially, the investment provides benefits and drawbacks to the investor and the host country. This section aims to identify the potential advantages and drawbacks to both parties.
It is assumed that the investor and the host country seeks to maximise benefits and reduce drawbacks if the investment is to be successful. Thus, the identified benefits and drawbacks can reflect the possible factors for defining and judging the “success” and “failure” of FDI for both the investor and the host country.

Benefits to the Host Country

It has been argued that the benefits of FDI to the Host Country (HC) are still questionable (Chung et al., 2003). However, the recognised benefits can be classed as either primary, secondary or externalities (Moran, 2005), as seen in Figure 6. The primary and secondary benefits occur regardless of externalities, but in some cases, the latter may require some externalities. Therefore, in the case of TNE, the HC should primarily benefit from a better product (i.e. improved teaching) and secondary benefits such as increasing demand for local education related suppliers. Furthermore, an HC can use these criteria to identify whether they are successful in attracting the right FDI to encourage growth.
One benefit of FDI to the HC is financial (Lall, 2000; Schulz, 2006). For instance, income can be generated from collecting income tax from subsidiaries (Caves, 1974; Kose et al., 2006), as well as exports (Dhingra et al., 2016; Wei and Liu, 2006). Also, this can aid in boosting elements of the HC’s economy such as creating jobs (Hunya and Sass, 2005; Javorcik, 2014). Moreover, growth may occur through a series of spillover effects, which include skills, technology and knowledge (Blomström and Sjöholm, 1999; Gorg and Greenaway, 2004; Johnson, 2006; Schulz, 2006; Vahter and Masso, 2007). It is suggested that FDI’s primary benefit is to increase the productivity of the host country by learning from foreign counterparts. This is achieved by improving the local organisation’s ability to allocate their resources, make technology transfers (Bevan and Estrin, 2004;
Buckley et al., 2007) and transferred/upgraded skills (OECD, 2002) and management, which is derived from the introduction of experts and development of possible training facilities in the new country (Lall, 2000). The best form of investment to enable such effects are joint ventures (Sadoi, 2008).

**Drawbacks to the Host Country**

A negative impact to the host country, as a result of increased FDI, is the minimised survival of local firms that are less efficient compared to the foreign competition (Chung et al., 2003). Similarly, this can also occur through overcrowding (Lall, 2000). Hence, the negative effects consist of stifling the development of domestic capabilities and increasing the dependence on foreign organisations. However, the “infant industry” theory suggests that due to developing countries having a limited market, additional barriers need to be created by governments for foreign counterparts to compensate for idiosyncrasies that a domestic organisation may possess (Wang, 2003).

An additional damaging effect to the host country is the effect on the environment. It has been suggested that organisations may exploit relaxed environmental regulations as a rationale for foreign investment (Hoffmann et al., 2005; Kobrin, 1976; Rugman and Verbeke, 1998). Therefore, organisations entering the HC need to consider their effects and identify methods for reducing their impact on the environment.
Benefits to the Investor

The realisation of the criteria mentioned in Section 2.2.4 can be translated into benefits to the investor, which are mainly derived from the location advantages. However, literature is primarily focused on the benefits to the HC rather than to the investor. Therefore, this section suggests the possible benefits of FDI to the investor.

Dunning and Lundan (2008) indicate that there are four main motives for organisations to invest abroad, which represent potential benefits. However, these motives are limited and additional motives have been identified. For instance, Franco et al., (2010) exclude efficiency and strategic assets seeking and instead suggest a new motive, non-marketable asset seeking. This involves the acquisition of assets that cannot be directly transferred through market transactions. Furthermore, other motives for FDI include escaping restrictive legislation and competitive reasons (Johnson and Turner, 2016). For the context of this research, these have been classed as environmental motivations, thus adding a fifth motive. The five factors that can be examined to measure the success or failure of investments from the perspective of the investor is detailed in Figure 7. These areas are the key headings for the remainder of this section.
Natural Resource Seeking

Natural resource seeking refers to organisations that are looking to acquire resources at a lower cost or do not exist within the investor’s home country, which relates to organisations trying to achieve a comparative advantage (Dunning and Lundan, 2008). In the context of TNE, this factor has little or no effect as HEIs do not seek to invest with the intention of seeking natural resources. Nonetheless, this remains a prominent factor in other industries such as manufacturing.

Market seeking

Market seeking/oriented organisations look to invest in countries where they can supply their goods and services, either to the country itself or to a neighbouring one to gain a profit (Dunning and Lundan, 2008; Franco et al., 2010;
Fung and Zhang, 2002; Meyer and Estrin, 2001). Furthermore, market seeking organisations tend to favour joint ventures as a means of acquiring local intelligence (Meyer and Estrin, 2001). For TNE, the opportunity to increase revenues by investing abroad could be a key motivator. Therefore factors such as financial incentives and market attributes should be considered.

As with any investment, there are financial incentives for entering a new market, whether it is an increase in revenue or tax incentives (Artige and Nicolini, 2005). The increased revenue is a fundamental aspect of FDI for the investor (Dunning, 1994) and the additional funds can be used to support other international trade and service their home country’s activities (Sabi, 1988). Therefore, a benefit of FDI is that it allows the investor to access new markets. This, in turn, provides the possibility of seeking new investment opportunities in emerging markets, which are less saturated (Clegg and Wang, 2004; Tschoegl and Guillen, 2000). Thus, market penetration provides a possible measure for the success of FDI from the perspective of the investor. Consequently, HEI’s engaged in TNE have the potential for increased revenue from new markets, which could be used to fund operations in the home country.

A benefit of FDI to the investor is that it allows the organisation to serve the local market better, which is known as a horizontal form of FDI (Artige and Nicolini, 2005). In cases whereby an organisation has already established a customer base in a foreign country, FDI provides an option to manufacture the final product closer to the target market (Kimura, 1989; Morck and Yeung, 1992). For HEIs, the main target is to establish campuses closer to lucrative student markets.
Efficiency Seeking

Efficiency-seeking (export-oriented) suggests that organisations will try to rationalise their value chains. Therefore, organisations locate parts of their value chains in different locations to maximise benefits and reduce costs (Fung and Zhang, 2002; Johnson and Turner, 2016). This factor is argued to be similar to natural resource seeking as it is related to comparative advantage (Franco et al., 2010). Furthermore, it has been suggested that FDI has changed focus from efficiency seeking to market seeking (Palmade and Anayiotas, 2004). For TNE, it is far more likely that HEIs will be more motivated by the market than efficiency, which is more relevant to other industries such as manufacturing.

Strategic Assets/Capability Seeking

Strategic asset seeking organisations follow this motive to meet long-term objectives (Johnson and Turner, 2016). A reason for organisations to invest abroad is to identify new potential assets such as foreign technology (Deng, 2009; Franco et al., 2010; Makino et al., 2002). Also, it has been identified that certain locations can benefit the investor by upgrading their knowledge and learning experiences of “upstream capabilities” (e.g. R&D) and “downstream capabilities” (e.g. advertising and distribution) (Blalock and Simon, 2009; Caves, 1996; Dunning and Wymbs, 2001; Liu, 2008). However, it has been argued that this benefit may only exist in specific contexts and is bound to certain geographical locations (Anand and Delios, 2002; Driffield and Love, 2003). Nevertheless, the purpose is to increase the existing knowledge base of the organisation, and within TNE, this could be presented in the form of research collaborations.
Environmental Motives

As previously mentioned, the four motives suggested by Dunning and Lundan (2008) are insufficient to address all motives. Therefore, other factors need to be considered, which are grouped as environmental motives as they are related to the entities within an organisation’s environment, which can include the economy, political stability and environmental policies.

An example of this is known as ‘restrictive investments’, where the prime objective of the investment is to avoid restriction put in place either by the domestic or host countries’ governments (Busse et al., 2010; Konishi et al., 1999). Additionally, a benefit of FDI can include overcoming barriers, such as import tax set by a foreign country’s government, to reach a target market that other methods such as exporting cannot reach (Belderbos and Sleuwaegen, 1996; Chung et al., 2003; Lall, 2000). Furthermore, Johnson and Turner (2016) suggest that some organisations seek out locations known as “pollution havens” which have liberal environmental regulations. Therefore, the relationship with governments needs to be factored in, concerning the regulations and policies that are imposed.

What is apparent from the discussion of benefits is that there are limited measures of success, but numerous advantages and drawbacks exist, which can be transformed into measures. For instance, realising the benefits of FDI is an indicator of success. Furthermore, coverage of the benefits remains generic, and further research is needed to understand how these apply to an IBC. Some of these are addressed in Section 2.4.5.
**Drawbacks to the Investor**

As previously stated, the literature predominately focuses on the several advantages of FDI. However, there are also associated drawbacks. Additionally, the specific disadvantages of IBC’s are discussed in section 2.4.5. The main drawback is the risk involved, given the high associated costs, which is closely linked to uncertainty (Girma et al., 2005; Helpman et al., 2003; Kozłowska, 2015). Generally, risks associated with FDI are categorised as either a country risk or a credit risk (Loredana and Loredana, 2016; Petrović and Stanković, 2009). The former refers to issues such as the macro-environment and competition, while the latter relates to the host countries financial stability (e.g. being able to repay foreign debts).

Ultimately, there is a need to reduce risk by understanding and evaluating uncertainty in the target HC’s (Hayakawa et al., 2013), which can be used as a method of screening out countries that pose high risks and identify the most suitable hosts (AlHajhouj, 2002).

**2.3.6 Conclusion**

The literature surrounding the topic of FDI illuminates several considerations for HEIs. The main topics discussed are the approaches to FDI, determinants and the main advantages and drawbacks. However, these areas only present theoretical implications for IBCs, with various posited linkages being made. Firstly, the “OLI” theory provides a sound foundation for understanding what facets contribute to the success of FDI. However, as indicated previously, this model requires adaption (Lall, 2000; Mathews, 2006). Thus, how this theory applies to IBC presents an avenue for further research. This supports the purpose
of this thesis to understand which factors are important and how they contribute to the success of IBCs. Additionally, the use of the “OLI” theory to understand IBCs reflects one of the few studies to do so. Furthermore, the importance of relationship has been stressed due to investment requirements in certain circumstances, which relates to not only whom but how relationships should be fostered. Finally, the benefits and drawbacks to both the investor and HC have been discussed, which could be converted to indicators of success and failure. Again, there is a need to understand which measures are the most significant and relevant to IBCs. To this point, the FDI literature has been addressed broadly. Thus, the following section discusses the key topics within TNE which apply to FDIs.
2.4 Transnational Education

2.4.1. Introduction

The previous sections detailed and critically analysed the literature on IB and FDI. This section addresses the final key topic; the issues and theory within TNE. The need for research within this area is recognised by McBurnie and Pollock (2000) who postulates that TNE is a growing area of interest, as it becomes increasingly necessary for HEI’s to become self-reliant.

2.4.2. Definition and Need for Transnational Education

As internationalisation of Higher Education (HE) increases in importance, the concept of the “borderless university” has been created as transnational programmes have become a major factor in many universities’ mainstream activities (Feast and Bretag, 2005). Additionally, the increase in demand for high-quality education has further amplified the demand for offshore education (Debowski, 2003). Furthermore, Jones (2001) suggests that for a country to meet both short- and long-term educational objectives, it would require either building world class universities or adjusting current HEIs by incorporating viable alternatives to address unfulfilled demands (i.e. distance learning).
Definition of Transnational Education

As previously addressed, TNE represents a key area of research due to the increase in demand. Therefore, it is essential to define and recognise the forms of TNE. To address the former, TNE has been defined as:

“the delivery of educational programmes, award or credit bearing, by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in countries other than their own.” Drew et al., (2008, p. 4)

The fundamental criterion that separates TNE is the delivery of education by an institution outside of where the host is based.

There are several variations of TNE; Vignoli (2004) highlights seven forms, which include: franchising, programme articulations, branch campus, distance learning arrangements, off-shore institution, large corporations and international institutions (a description of each is detailed in Table 3). The seven categories of TNE can be divided into two groups; the initial four are in the context of universities while the remaining are related to private institutions and corporations. Furthermore, IBCs are the key focus of this research; therefore, the emphasis has been placed on this category.

Table 3: Forms of Transnational Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franchising</td>
<td>The process whereby a higher education institution (franchiser) from a certain country grants another institution (franchisee) in another country the right to provide the franchiser's programmes/qualifications in the franchisee's host country, irrespective of the students' provenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme articulations</strong></td>
<td>Inter-institutional arrangements whereby two or more institutions agree to deliver jointly a study programme in terms of study credits and credit transfer, so that students pursuing their studies in one institution have their credits recognised by the other in order to continue their studies (&quot;twinning programmes&quot;, &quot;articulation agreements&quot;, etc.). These may -or may not- lead to joint or double degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Branch campus</strong></td>
<td>A campus established by a HEI from one country in another country to offer its own educational programmes/qualifications, irrespective of the students' provenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance Learning</strong></td>
<td>Arrangements and virtual universities, where the learner is provided with course material via post or web-based solutions, and self-administers the learning process at home. There is a growing number of such institutions, whose programmes/ qualifications may or may not belong to the HE system of a particular country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-shore institution</strong></td>
<td>An autonomous institution established in a host country but saying to belong, in terms of its organisation and educational contents, to the education system of some other country, without having a campus in the pretended mother country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large corporations</strong></td>
<td>They are usually parts of big transnational corporations and organise their own HEIs or study programmes offering qualifications which do not belong to any national system of higher education;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International institutions</strong></td>
<td>Institutions offering so-called &quot;international&quot; programmes/ qualifications which actually do not refer to any specific education system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Vignoli (2004)
Transnational Education Statistics

Demand for HE has increased by approximately 47% with an increase of nearly 35 million students worldwide between 1999 and 2009 (UNESCO, 2011). Moreover, the global gross tertiary enrolment ratio increased from 14% in 1992 to 32% in 2012 (Grove, 2015), with many countries showing significant increase in enrolment as seen in Figure 8 (British Council, 2012), thus, further demonstrating the increasing potential of the HE market.

Figure 8: Enrolment in Tertiary Education 2009 and 2020

Source: (British Council, 2012, pp. 38)
The general increase in demand for HE has had a causal effect on the growth in demand for international education. Furthermore, it has been forecasted that international students will increase from 1.8 million in 2000 to 7.2 million by 2025 (Böhm et al., 2004). However, this forecast has been overpowered through time with the forecasts in demand reaching 3.7 million (Banks et al., 2007). It has been suggested that the high forecast may have been the result of optimism from stakeholders (Verbik and Lasanowski, 2007). However, despite the differences in forecasted demand, all reports agree that China and India have the highest number of international students.

In addition to the increase in the number of students, the origin of the students has also altered. UNESCO (2011) identified that enrolment from East Asia and the Pacific has more than doubled between 1970 and 2007, whereas the number of students from North America and Western Europe has halved. This indicates that the education market in Asia is growing and the Western market is in decline. To further demonstrate this, demand for TNE in Asia (excluding China) is forecasted to reach 500,000 students by 2020 (Datta et al., 2014) and China alone has an HE student population of 16 million (Knight, 2006). This supports the need to explore developing countries as well when considering TNE.

2.4.3. Issues in Transnational Education

This section highlights the key issues associated with TNE and HE. The areas covered are Higher Education Institutions (HEI), selection criteria, branding of HEIs, competition, governments (including regulatory bodies and regulations),
quality, financial crisis and tuition fees, culture and learning, programme delivery and academic staff and technology and online delivery.

**Higher Education Institutions**

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) cover all higher education providers, which include universities both physical (i.e. with a campus) and digital (i.e. predominately online) and can be defined as establishments that

“[provide] higher education and [are] recognized by the competent national authority of a participating country as belonging to its system of higher education; for the purposes of Action 1 B - Joint Doctoral programmes, the concept of HEI includes also doctoral/graduate/research schools and research organisations on the condition that they provide doctoral training and research activities, and deliver doctorate degrees recognised as such by the relevant authorities of the country concerned;” (EACEA, 2013)

HEIs can behave in a similar fashion to any organisation, which means there is a need to understand why they operate the way they do. To achieve this, the Theory of the Firm is considered.

The Theory of the Firm comprises of various economic principles as to why a firm operates the way it does. Principally, the focus is on the neo-classical perspective which suggests that firms attempt to maximise profits (Jensen, 1988). However, there are suggestions that research needs to move beyond the ‘black box’ concepts of neo-classical theory and this has resulted in research diversifying into transaction cost theory, resource-based view, principal-agent theory and the knowledge-based perspective (Choi and Wacker, 2011; Holmstrom and Tirole, 1989; Nonaka et al., 2000). Furthermore, despite these
representing standalone theories, there is evidence to suggest that they are interlinked, such as the resource-based view and knowledge-based perspective (Hitt et al., 2016). However, Nonaka and Toyama (2002) suggest that the existing theories related to the theory of the firm (i.e. neo-classical, transaction cost and resource-based view) are focused on tangible products and may not be directly applicable to intangible products. This is particularly important given the shift to a knowledge economy.

The discussion of the theories related to the Theory of the Firm in this section focuses on the neo-classical and the knowledge-based perspective. With transaction cost theory and the resource-based view being discussed in sections 2.2.3 and 2.3.4 respectively.

As stated the neo-classical perspective is focused on profit maximisation. Thus, there is a need to consider the inputs and outputs of a firm. Besanko and Braeutigam (2013) identify that inputs are the productive resources that are used to manufacture a product or service, which primarily include capital (e.g. machinery) and labour. Outputs are the amounts of a good or service that is produced. Furthermore, there is a need to determine the right level of input that would maximise profits and this can vary based on the market (McWilliams and Siegel, 2001).

Within the context of higher education, there is a variety of research which focuses on identifying the key inputs and outputs (see Table 4). Although numerous inputs and outputs have been suggested, there are common themes. Firstly, the main inputs are staff (number and cost), capital (physical i.e. buildings and facilities and financial i.e. research income), general overheads and
students. Secondly, the main outputs can be categorised as achievement and learning, research, economic value, student numbers and staff.

**Table 4: Summary of Inputs and Outputs in Higher Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coelli (1996)</td>
<td>1) Total Staff Number 2) Non-Staff Expenses 3) Academic Staff Numbers 4) Other Expenses 5) Administration Staff 6) Other Administration Expenses</td>
<td>1) Student Numbers 2) Publications Index 3) Total Staff Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan and Datta (1998)</td>
<td>1) Faculty 2) Other Expenditures 3) Financial</td>
<td>1) Undergraduate Teaching 2) Graduate Teaching 3) Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avkiran (2001)</td>
<td>1) Undergraduate Enrolment 2) Postgraduate Enrolment 3) Research Quantum 4) Student Retention Rate 5) Student Progress Rate 6) Graduate Full-Time Employment Rate 7) Overseas Fee-paying Enrolments 8) Non-overseas Fee-paying Postgraduate Enrolments</td>
<td>1) Undergraduate Enrolment 2) Postgraduate Enrolment 3) Research Quantum 4) Student Retention Rate 5) Student Progress Rate 6) Graduate Full-Time Employment Rate 7) Overseas Fee-paying Enrolments 8) Non-overseas Fee-paying Postgraduate Enrolments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salerno (2003) – Study in the UK</td>
<td>1) General Academic Expenditures 2) Research Income 3) FTE Undergraduates 4) FTE Postgraduates</td>
<td>1) Number of Successful Leavers 2) Number of Higher Degrees Awarded 3) Weighted Research Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) FTE Academic</td>
<td>6) Mean A-Level Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC (2012)</td>
<td>1) Labour Hours</td>
<td>2) Intermediate Inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drengenberg and Bain (2016)</td>
<td>1) Cost of Labour</td>
<td>2) Cost of Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Economic Returns</td>
<td>2) Student Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite inputs and outputs being identified in higher education, determining the specific measures of either is complex due to a large number of variations amongst multiple outputs, which can be subjective to the individual HEIs, especially as most of the measures are orientated around quality (Massy et al., 2012; NRC, 2012). Bain and Drengenberg (2016) suggest that one of the issues that contribute to the complexity is the lack of common measures for outputs and that consumers collaborate in producing the product for inputs. Therefore, the authors present the emergent feedback organisation (EFO) framework. The framework suggests that HEIs should research and define quality (i.e. outputs) within their own context, which can subsequently be used to measure performance and for control purposes. Consequently, HEIs can then learn and reflect on the information collected. Ultimately, the specific inputs and outputs are case sensitive and need to be adapted to each HEI.

The knowledge-based perspective represents a more recent and additional consideration, when attempting to understand firms. Nonaka et al., (2000) suggest that firms cannot be viewed as static (i.e. the firm will interact and grow with its surrounding environment) nor should they be restricted to the boundaries of ownership (i.e. the resource based view refers to the ownership of
resource). Furthermore, there is a need to look beyond firms just maximising profits but also as knowledge creating entities. Therefore, the primary focus is on how knowledge is created, utilised and shared, which has been recognised as key to establishing a sustainable competitive advantage (Chen et al., 2016; Nonaka and Toyama, 2002; Sveiby, 2001).

The knowledge based perspective furthers the neo-classical view which primarily focuses on the input and outputs. Instead, the emphasis is placed on the transformation of inputs into outputs which utilises the skills and knowledge of the firm (Nonaka et al., 2000). Furthermore, the authors suggest that knowledge is both an input and output (i.e. people or intellectual property) and is invisible which makes determining specific inputs and outputs difficult, which contrasts with the neo-classical perspective. However, like the neo-classical perspective, consideration for maximising output knowledge is needed e.g. identifying with one unit of knowledge input, how much knowledge can be created (Ghemawat et al., 2000; Nonaka and Toyama, 2002; Nonaka et al., 2000). Overall, the knowledge based perspective is particularly pertinent to higher education given the focus on knowledge creation and enhancement.

Overall, the theory of the firm provides additional insights into understanding how HEIs operate. In particular, establishing what the particular inputs and outputs are, and how inputs can be transformed into outputs. However, given the subjectivity, it can be difficult to identify and define what they are in the context of IBCs. This further supports the need for this research, which will identify which factors will result in success (i.e. inputs) and how success can be measured (i.e. outputs).
Selection Criteria and Demand for Higher Education Institutions

Students’ selection criteria are an area of research that has received vast attention (Binsardi and Ekwulugo, 2003; DesJardins et al., 1999; Kusumawati, 2010; Mitra, 2010). Thus, understanding the requirements of potential students represents a fundamental aspect of HE research. Selection criteria can be classified as “university related” and “personal issues” (Soutar and Turner, 2002). Additionally, for the purpose of TNE, an international perspective is also considered, which is detailed below and summarised in Table 5.

Firstly, the “university related” factors refer to the type of courses, reputation, campus atmosphere, teaching staff and type of university (Soutar and Turner, 2002), cost and HEI communications (Joseph and Joseph, 1998) and career opportunities (Maringe, 2006). Secondly, “personal issues” factors include distance from home, family views and the effect of friends (Soutar and Turner, 2002), all of which are supported by Kusumawati (2010), who further suggests that financial aid is also crucial. The final factor is the international considerations, which refers to criteria related to the host country, which is key for TNE (Mazzarol and Soutar, 2002). The main implications of each of these factors are addressed below.

University Related Factors

Mitra (2010) states that the most important factors are the reputation of the HEI and recognition of the qualification, due to its beneficial effect on students’ employability or further education. This is supported by Binsardi and Ekwulugo (2003), Joseph and Joseph (1998) and Mazzarol and Soutar (2002), all of whom
argue that recognition of the course is the most important factor. However, in some cases, countries may adopt a protectionist behaviour and not recognise international qualifications, such as Portugal (Adam, 2001). Nonetheless, recognition is an important factor when selecting an HEI, as it can signify the quality of the degree.

The reputation of the HEI is another area of consideration during the selection process (Mazzarol and Soutar, 2002). This is supported by Gray et al. (2003), who suggest that in Asia, a major concern is reputation alongside career prospects. Further research into HEI reputation indicates that students’ perceptions are linked with “contact elements” such as campus facilities, faculty members and other employees (Nguyen and LeBlanc, 2001); in particular, quality of academic staff has been emphasised (Beneke, 2011). Conversely, despite the importance of reputation, it does not always rank as a priority factor. Instead, issues such as course content and location have a larger impact (Moogan et al., 1999). However, it has been recognised that improvements in teaching and learning can go unrecognised because of their lack of status (Marginson, 1998; Marginson, 2004). Therefore, reputation is a crucial aspect of the selection process, which may also have a significant role in attracting international students.

The course itself represents an important factor for the selection of HEIs (Joseph and Joseph, 1998; Maringe, 2006; Moogan et al., 1999; Wagner and Fard, 2009). The course selection is determined by the requirements of the course, ability to specialise, availability of jobs and HE opportunities, the influence of family friends and other reference groups (Hemachandra and Kodithuwakku, 2007) and the interests of the student (Pivo, 2005). Furthermore, it has been
suggested that students are likely to select a course depending on their future aspirations for employment, rather than an interest in the subject (Maringe, 2006). Regardless of the rationale behind the selection of the course, it remains another crucial selection criterion and can be influenced by others.

Another prominent issue is cost and finances. It has been identified that students are,

“...adopting a consumerist approach to their HE decision making.... as a result of this, students consider programme and price related issues as more important than other elements of universities marketing mix” (Maringe, 2006, p.466)

The importance for HEIs to focus on cost is of clear importance (Jackson and Weathersby, 1975; Wagner and Fard, 2009) and Jackson (1978) postulates that given no financial barriers, all high school/college students would opt for HE. Besides, it has also been recognised that in some cases, a higher fee has been associated with a higher level of student service and, students may be willing to pay the desired amount (Drewes and Michael, 2006), implying that value for money may influence selection. Therefore, to attract more students, HEIs should consider adjusting price variables (such as fees and scholarships) and provide better service (Binsardi and Ekwulugo, 2003) to provide the most value for money.

To aid the cost factor, HEIs offer financial aids (Tierney, 1980) such as scholarships. For instance, the University of Georgia awards a high number of scholarships (known as HOPE). As a result, there was an increase in attendance (Dynarski, 2000) and a separate study led to a similar conclusion which suggests that students are 8.5% more likely to attend universities if financial aid is available
(Jackson, 1978). However, it has been illustrated that financial aid can come at a cost to the public and their respective government (Tierney, 1980).

**Personal Factors**

The location of HEIs can play an influencing role in the selection process (Moogan *et al.*, 1999). Research into the “distance from home” reveals that students tend to select HEIs closer to their homes (Drewes and Michael, 2006); in particular, students from low-income families who are more sensitive to costs (Gibbons and Vignoles, 2009). Also, it has been recognised that proximity of HEIs can affect whether students will go into HE. Research indicates that the further away from home an HEI is, the less likely it is for the students to progress into HE (Frenette, 2004; Spiess and Wrohlich, 2010). This has been argued to be related to the higher transaction costs such as travelling (Spiess and Wrohlich, 2010). However, other research indicates that distance has no or little effect on students’ choice of HEIs (DesJardins *et al.*, 1999; Gibbons and Vignoles, 2009; Hoxby, 2000; Pivo, 2005). Instead, the importance of distance from home is purely dependent on the priority of the student (Moogan *et al.*, 1999). Therefore, by developing IBCs in new countries, it fulfils the needs of those students who want a foreign education closer to their home.

The effects of family and friends are significant (hereafter referred to as significant people) in the selection of HEIs (Hemachandra and Kodithuwakku, 2007; Joseph and Joseph, 1998; Mazzarol and Soutar, 2002) such as recommendations made by alumni or current students (Mazzarol and Soutar, 2002). Thus, it has also been identified that significant people can influence
potential students by shaping their expectations. However, despite Joseph and Joseph (1998) recognising the importance of significant people in their research. They further suggest that “peer and family” influences are not as important as factors such as course recognition and the HEIs’ reputation. Martin (2001) concurred with the findings, further noting that significant people are simply a source of information. In addition to significant people, other key influencers are “high school faculty” (or college faculty), who have a large impact on the perception of HEIs (Kealy and Rockel, 1987; Maringe, 2006). Therefore, this reflects significant people and reference groups as an information source rather than the main influencer.

**International Factors**

In addition to the “university related” and “personal issues”, the HC of the HEI also needs to be considered as the student will need to reside there during their studies. A variety of factors has been recognised that affect international students’ selection of a HC, which includes the ease of entry, immigration procedures and the cost of living (Binsardi and Ekwulugo, 2003; Kusumawati, 2010). Additionally, Mazzarol and Soutar (2002) suggest that knowledge and awareness of the host country, its environment, social links and geographic proximity impact the decision to study overseas. However, proximity is primarily an issue for HEIs which attract students away from their home countries and not studying at an IBC. Thus, this criterion is not a key factor for this research.
The literature covered in this section underlines the key choice criteria for students as a whole. Further specific criteria for choosing IBCs are discussed in Section 2.4.5.

Table 5: Summary of Student Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Related</th>
<th>Personal Issues</th>
<th>International Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Courses</td>
<td>Distance from Home</td>
<td>Ease of Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Family Views</td>
<td>Immigration Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>Reference Groups</td>
<td>International Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of University</td>
<td>Cost of Living</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Links</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Branding of Higher Education Institutions

Before an institution can be considered, the student first needs to be aware of it (Sevier, 2001). Thus, branding represents an important issue in TNE (Beneke, 2011; Binsardi and Ekwulugo, 2003; Mitra, 2010; Robertson, 2010b). A HE brand can be defined as:

“perception or emotion maintained by a buyer or a prospective buyer describing the experience related to doing business with an academic institution or with its product and service” (Beneke et al., 2011, p.34)

As competition increases for both domestic and international students, it forces universities to operate more like a business (Bunzel, 2007). Therefore, a priority for good HEIs is to ensure that the reputation of the institution remains intact. This is a core issue for TNE, as establishing a good brand at home may aid successful
investments abroad (i.e. Oxford University, Cambridge University, MIT, Harvard University and Yale are all highly regarded and recognised HEIs around the world). However, it has been argued that despite the importance of image and reputation, branding has little effect in HE (Hemsley-Brown and Oplatka, 2006) and can act as a distraction to the HEI (i.e. the management aspect rather than the teaching element) (Waeraas and Solbakk, 2009).

A variety of branding strategies can be adopted in the context of higher education. It has been suggested that HEIs adopt “standardised” or “adapted” brand strategies (Gray et al., 2003). Moreover, the author suggests that in both strategies the core offering (i.e. the degree) remains consistent. However, the latter adapts to local market conditions, which is likely to be the case for TNE.

An effective brand needs to consist of two components: awareness and relevance (Sevier, 2005). Awareness refers to whether the target audience has noticed the message, and relevance relates to whether the message is salient to them and aids in building relationships or satisfies a need they have. Furthermore, research identifies that the most important aspect of a brand is the name of the university (Chapleo, 2008; Saeed and Ehsan, 2010). To demonstrate examples of successful HEI brands, research by Chapleo et al., (2011) has identified five institutions and the rationale behind their success (as seen in Table 6). This indicates that HEIs need to consider the needs and wants of their target audience, and this varies across borders. What is effective in one country may not be the case in another. Therefore, this suggests that the principles identified here to enable a successful brand need to be reapplied to the various offshore markets in the context of TNE.
Table 6: Five Examples of HEI Successful Brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEI</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham University</td>
<td>• International Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee University</td>
<td>• Regionally Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transformational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire University</td>
<td>• Successfully raised profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Newer campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Business focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmith’s University</td>
<td>• Distinct within the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of West of England (UWE)</td>
<td>• Successful Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong Advertising Straplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong positioning statements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from: Chapleo, 2008)

A method for measuring the success of a brand includes observing factors, such as the various international ranking systems and performance, with the goal of maintaining a high position amongst them (Beneke et al., 2011; Bunzel, 2007). In the USA, the various ranking tables are key to the selection of HEIs (Jevons, 2006). However, research in Canada demonstrated that a fall in ranking for large HEIs resulted in a higher number of students preferring that institution (Drewes and Michael, 2006). Further research supports this and reveals that branding has little effect on ranking and perceptions of universities (Bunzel, 2007). Therefore, this suggests, that HEIs’ ranking provides a source of information for potential students, especially in foreign countries, enrolling at foreign HEIs, where the student may not be aware of the institution. In the context of TNE, it is possible that the ranking reflects the quality that an HEI can provide in its home country.
and can affect their perception of that institution. Thus, the effect on whether this impacts enrolment in HEIs’ foreign courses or specifically, in this case, their foreign campuses needs to be better understood.

There is a range of factors that can create barriers for successfully branding an HEI (Chapleo, 2007; Hemsley-Brown and Goonawardana, 2007; Jevons, 2006). However, there are also steps that can be taken to reduce these barriers (as seen in Table 7). The factors associated with a successful higher education brand include support from leaders, a clear vision, internal support, location (consistent brand of town/city) and use of public relations (Chapleo, 2008; Chapleo et al., 2011). This can be important for IBCs as HEIs could be establishing themselves in countries with little knowledge of the HEIs’ reputation. Therefore, a better understanding of how IBCs can overcome these barriers is needed.

Table 7: Barriers to Branding in HEI and Possible Resolutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Branding</th>
<th>Resolution to Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues of defining roles within a HEI</td>
<td>Branding is being more accepted as an important issue in HEIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support and acceptance of the branding concept</td>
<td>Develop an understanding of the current perceptions of the institution and promote a desired brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculties and specific schools represent a brand on their own i.e. a business school</td>
<td>Despite the issue of differentiation, it is possible to develop this by fully understanding historical and cultural legacies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to identify a clear branding principle or differentiating factor</td>
<td>Increase internal acceptance of the branding concept in order to create a real and sustainable brand. This can be achieved by establishing loyalty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted From: Chapleo, 2007)
The benefit of ensuring a good brand for HEIs is the perception of reduced risk amongst students, which affects their ability to attract increased applications (Beneke et al., 2011). Despite this, Beneke et al. (2011) state that branding an HEI is difficult due to two factors: firstly, it is the sum of a range of student experiences and secondly, identifying what is being sold is difficult. Furthermore, it has been suggested that due to the lack of purpose and clarity in HEI brands, it will be a long time before “…universities’ marketing achieves maximal effectiveness…” (Jevons, 2006, p. 467). Despite the benefits of branding, it does present a variety of issues as HEIs are difficult to brand. Nonetheless, branding arguably influences students' selection of HEIs but what is not apparent is how HEI branding impacts IBC and whether it has a similar effect.

**Competition**

Competition has been argued as being beneficial as it increases efficiency and drives institutions to better serve their customers (Marginson, 1998). As already discussed, the increased efforts to efficiently brand HEIs has been the result of increased competition. As increased competitive pressure becomes a predominant factor in HE; HEIs need to develop increasingly competitive strategies (Curran, 2000; Ming, 2010). However, it has been suggested that there is an animosity towards applying marketing techniques or indeed, business models to HE (Hemsley-Brown and Oplatka, 2006). Regardless, HEIs have increased their focus in attracting a higher share of applicants (Kealy and Rockel, 1987).
Heffernan and Poole (2004, p. 76) cite that “... the ability to differentiate has become the key strategic challenge facing universities operating within increasingly competitive international markets”. Therefore, this suggests that HEIs need to develop effective strategies to attract potential students in a market that has an increasing number of competitors. Research suggests that the most important facets for sustaining a competitive advantage are course and career information, and physical aspects (Joseph and Joseph, 2000; Lynch, 2006; Mazzarol, 1998), which reflects the HEI’s positioning.

The correct positioning is vital, as Marginson (1998) argues that as the cost of fee rises, the economic value of the degree itself is worth more than the learning achievement. Thus, demand for “elite” institutions will increase as more students prioritise the HEIs reputation when entering HE. This is further substantiated by Marginson (2004), who states that students will opt for higher status universities, even if the teaching standard is weaker. Thus, it is important to position correctly in both local and global markets and try to maintain a high status, as they represent a potential area of competitive advantage for IBCs.

An additional source of competitive advantage is through differentiation. Curran (2000) concludes that competitive edge is derived from institutions that could create successful research departments. Furthermore, it is suggested that research performance is a key indicator of an HEIs’ status (Marginson, 2004). Therefore, the four main areas of deriving a competitive advantage are positioning, differentiation, reputation/status and research. Hence, these aspects are key considerations for HEIs, which can be furthered to identify whether they apply to IBCs or not.
Quality Issues

Once any form of TNE is established, additional factors need to be considered, such as quality assurance and recognition (Vignoli, 2004). Firstly, quality assurance covers two aspects, the quality of the education provided and the qualification awarded. Secondly, recognition covers quality. However, it addresses the course itself rather than its delivery. Furthermore, Vignoli (2004) postulates “how TNE should be” and this includes issues, such as compliance with the legislation in both home and host countries, academic quality of both the programme offered and the staff within the institution and transparency of the TNE institutions regarding issues such as educational policies (i.e. entry requirements).

There is no one indicator of quality in HE, but authors have argued the importance of relevant issues. For instance, it has been suggested that attracting high-quality students, and the prestige of the institution is an indicator of quality for HEIs (Hoxby, 2000). However, it has been argued that measuring quality in this manner is flawed (Bennett and Bennett, 2002). Hence, the authors suggest that examining the value added is more appropriate. Moreover, quality is different depending on the person. Chua (2004) demonstrates this by categorising quality into three factors: input (i.e. ranking and reputation), process (i.e. teaching) and output (i.e. employability). HEIs will need to consider what the key indicators of quality are when investing offshore and ensure that they are “fit for purpose” (Woodhouse, 1999).

The key framework for the recognition of qualifications was set out at the Council of Europe/UNESCO Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications in the European Region (Adam, 2001). Furthermore, regulations are a major factor
for HEIs in both developing and developed countries (Bashir, 2007). The key issues are to maintain standards and provide quality assurance (Jones, 2001). Additionally, organisations have been established to monitor quality within TNE. This includes the following:

- The Global Alliance for Transnational Education (GATE)
- The Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA)
- The United Kingdom Quality Assurance Agency (QAA)

Thus, it is crucial to acknowledge the relevant regulations in the various countries to ensure that quality issues are met. This inevitably affects foreign HEIs in offshore campuses.

As previously mentioned, there are a variety of regulatory bodies that observe quality in TNE. GATE ensures that HEIs maintain quality standards set out in its ten principles of TNE (Jones, 2001). Furthermore, it has been suggested that the appropriate methods of assessing quality be conducted in a “country to country” approach (Jackson, 2006). Additionally, regular visits to offshore partners may be necessary to maintain quality and should be a mutual commitment between the foreign and home institution (Jackson, 2006; Weir et al., 2005). This suggests that there are several contributing factors to maintaining quality. However, this is a larger issue for institutions offering courses at a partner institution, where there is less control. In the case of IBCs, there is more control, as the HEI controls all aspects of the course (Rumbley and Altbach, 2007). However, despite additional control, specific processes for monitoring quality need to be further understood.
Despite the benefits of maintaining quality, it does have associated costs and these are mainly attributed to high costs, caused by examining the partner institutions (Jackson, 2006). Moreover, Kim and Lee (2006) suggest that poor quality control leads to sub-par degrees that will reduce the benefit to the student and society. Thus, it is important for HEIs to factor in these issues when considering appropriate strategies to maintain standards.

**Environment Issues**

There are a variety of rationales why HEIs are globalising and Knight (2004) indicates that social/cultural, political, economic and academic factors are amongst the key components.

HEIs entering the global market of HE will face additional problems derived from international sources. Examples of these problems range from global issues such as the financial crisis (still evident in 2011) to country-specific factors. Moreover, to exemplify the latter, Feast and Bretag (2005) examined the effects of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) on an HEI’s ability to function effectively. This study highlighted that it created additional administrative pressures and forced a change in methods of teaching. Also, this study emphasised the importance of having a well-coordinated contingency plan and the need for compatible technology between the host and the investing country. This suggests that it is essential that HEIs adapt to situations as they arise.

As established in section 2.3.5, risk is associated with uncertainty; thus due diligence is an important aspect when entering any form of investment, as Aleksynska and Havrylchyk (2013) suggest that one of the principal reasons for
an investment to fail is poor due diligence. There are several definitions of due diligence, but they evolve from a similar concept. Generally, it is a process which involves the discovery of information to ensure a comprehensive understanding of an investment by focusing on the identification of market opportunities and how they can be realised and mitigate risks (Braun, 2005; Howson, 2003; Perry and Herd, 2004; Puranam et al., 2006). Furthermore, it has been identified that this a continuous process and does not only occur at the beginning of an investment (Spedding, 2009). Werlau (2001) extends this to state that carrying out due diligence can be challenging and to overcome it; the investment needs to be experienced.

Culture and Learning Styles

Culture has a large impact on TNE as it affects two issues, learning styles (Bodycott and Walker, 2000; Caruana, 2008; Heffernan et al., 2010; Hofstede, 1994; Miliszewska and Horwood, 2004; Rostron, 2009) and interactions with the local environment, which can affect the survival (Zou et al., 1997), success (Tschoegl and Guillen, 2000) and failure (Li and Guisinger, 1992) of foreign investments. Areas related to the environment has already been addressed. Thus the focus pivots to learning styles.

Hofstede (1994) postulates that depending on which end of the continuum a country falls on its cultural dimensions will dictate certain learning style traits. These traits are highlighted in Table 8.
Table 8: Hofstede's Cultural Dimension Learning Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Dimension</th>
<th>Small Power Distance</th>
<th>Large Power Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Distance</td>
<td>Student based education - Learning represents impersonal “truths”</td>
<td>Teacher cantered education - Learning represent personal wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>Individualism - Learning is for the young only - Learn how to do</td>
<td>Collectivism - Permanent education - Learn how to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>Masculine - Best students are norm - System rewards students’ academic performance - Student failure is a disaster</td>
<td>Feminine - Average student is the norm - System rewards student’s social adaption - Student failure is a relatively minor incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>Weak Uncertainty Avoidance - Students are comfortable with: - Unstructured learning situations - Vague objectives - Broad assignments - No time tables - Teachers may say &quot;I don't know&quot;</td>
<td>Strong Uncertainty Avoidance - Students comfortable with: - Structured learning situations - Precise objectives - Detailed assignments - Strict time tables - Teachers should have all the answers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from: (Hofstede, 1994, p.115-118)

A similar study has also been conducted which links deep, surface and strategic learning to Hofstede’s cultural dimensions (Manikutty et al., 2007). This study postulates that learning styles are affected by culture. However, research also indicates that some assumptions made on these cultural dimensions are misleading. Mitsis and Foley (2005) and Wong (2004) argue that cultures with high uncertainty avoidance and Confucian thinking are likely to prefer teacher-driven environments, but their research identified that these cultures required
student-driven environments. Therefore, HEIs should avoid stereotyping students based on cultural norms (Kennedy, 2002) and the teaching environment and the course provided should be tailored to the specific needs of the market (i.e. the students).

Following on from culture, it has been suggested that learning styles differ depending on the country or region. There are several examples including:

- Chinese and Australian students prefer visual aids and “concrete” material (such as lectures and real-life linkages) (Heffernan et al., 2010).

- Arabic students are active learners and require an active learning environment (Gündüz and Özcan, 2010).

- French students like to be challenged, putting forth their own ideas and have no problem working to tight schedules, unlike Chinese and Indonesian students (Evans et al., 2008).

This demonstrates that HEIs need to cater to students from various origins, who have differing learning styles. Furthermore, HEIs need to consider how to adapt to the aforementioned learning styles when investing abroad (Joy and Kolb, 2009; Littrell, 2005).

However, it has been postulated that in some contexts, culture has little effect on learning styles (Zualkernan et al., 2005) and suggest that certain learning material is cross-cultural. Nonetheless, HEIs need to observe how different cultures need to be catered to (Evans et al., 2008) when attracting students from other countries or investing abroad.
Programme Delivery and Academic Freedom

It is crucial for service organisations to satisfy their customers’ needs, as they represent a future source of revenue (Boulding et al., 1993; Cronin et al., 2000). Furthermore, Joseph and Joseph (1998) and Oldfield and Baron (2000) recognise that service quality is crucial for promoting HEIs. Additionally, issues related to service quality for HEIs include three factors as suggested by Oldfield and Baron (2000); requisite (encounters which are essential for students to fulfil their obligations), acceptable (encounters which are desirable but not essential) and functional factors (encounters of a practical nature). Thus, HEIs need to provide a service suitable for their target market, whether it is abroad or in the home country.

Another issue with TNE is academic freedom, which is defined as “the right of scholars to inquire and speak freely, according to the standards of their profession, without interference or fear of retribution.” (Gottfredson, 2010, p. 1). This fundamentally addresses the political issues of censorship, which affects countries such as China. Furthermore, researchers have recently examined academic freedom in Hong Kong since its reunion with China, which is one of the few jurisdictions that expressively protects academic freedom (Currie et al., 2006). However, academic freedom has been challenged in Hong Kong, since the Robert Chung affair as detailed in Petersen and Currie (2008). Therefore, this is likely to prohibit certain activities at an HEI such as the content taught on specific programmes, and the areas that can be researched.

The issue of academic freedom has previously been a major barrier to establishing IBCs. An example of this was cited by Robertson (2010a), which details that the staff at the University of Warwick (UK) voted against the
development of an IBC in Singapore, as a result of academic freedom issues. The matters of academic freedom and censorship have not only affected the education sector but have influenced the failure of other international market entries, such as Google’s entry into China (Yang, 2016).

**Technology and Online Delivery**

With the increased number of people using the internet, it is inevitable that distance learning will also rise in popularity (Muilenburg and Berge, 2005). As a result, virtual HEIs and distance learning are emerging competitors for traditional institutions. This represents a less resource intensive method of entering the higher education market (Turoff *et al.*, 1999). Furthermore, it has been suggested that an alternative to traditional TNE is distance learning and the use of cyber schools (Jones, 2001). Additionally, it has also been suggested that technology is key for competing in the global education market (Lloyd, 2000). Thus, making this entry arguably more competitive as barriers to entry are reduced for distance education providers.

There are many benefits of distance learning including increased flexibility, interactivity and interoperability (Miliszewska, 2007). Additionally, distance learning usually reaches a wider student base, meets the needs of the students who are unable to study on campus, can include guest speakers who would normally be unable to attend a campus, link students outside different social groups and is self-paced (Valasidou, 2006). This demonstrates the appeal of distance education and the factors which make it a suitable alternative to traditional methods. Furthermore, it shows that offshore students can attend
foreign universities from their home countries, which acts as another source of competition for IBCs.

There are several issues with distance learning, with the fundamental problem being the lack of face to face interactions, which has been argued to provide students with less guidance and feedback (Miliszewska, 2007). Besides, it has been suggested that students still prefer personal contact, as Turoff (1999) found that 20% of students enrolled in successful online courses still preferred face to face classes. This is further supported by research which indicates that the largest barrier to distance education is the social element (Muilenburg and Berge, 2005), which is linked to the enjoyment of the course. Despite these drawbacks, Turoff (1999) recognises that the integration of technology is crucial in this form of teaching. This is supported by the argument that students prefer a blend of online and traditional methods, which mainly utilises the internet as a supplement (Miliszewska, 2007). However, it has also been indicated that HEIs should be aware that global availability of distance learning course should be treated as a threat, as it represents a potential substitute for their courses (Lloyd, 2000; Mula, 2009).

2.4.4. Benefits and Drawback of Transnational Education

There are several benefits of TNE to the HEI (which are summarised in Table 9) as indicated by Vignoli (2004), which include: offering wider learning opportunities, making education more competitive, benefits to the home institution by establishing links with foreign institutions and providing a new source of income. Additionally, TNE provides developed countries with the opportunity to exploit new HE markets in developing countries.
The drawbacks for the HEIs include the risk inherent in this type of investment due to the high amount of resources required (Caruana, 2008). Further risks are related to branding, as the poor performance of a foreign campus could devalue the HEIs brand (Hemsley-Brown and Goonawardana, 2007). Also, regulations in certain countries require HEIs to partner with local institutions and this forces the partners to share knowledge (Geringer and Hebert, 1989), which can be used to create duplicate courses. Ultimately, the main risks for HEIs are wastage of resources and damage to the brand name.

The benefits to the HC include boosting the available “talent” amongst the labour market (Mughal and Vechiu, 2009; Robertson, 2010a), which is essential for economic growth. However, the impact of TNE on economic growth has been a point of debate due to the “brain drain effect” (Varghese, 2007). Thus, a solution for this is the use of IBCs as the host country would retain skilled labour, but also benefit from foreign education. Furthermore, the HC can benefit from increased revenue from students in neighbouring countries if the HEI promotes itself to those countries to increase enrolment (Ziguras, 2003). This would generate income for the host country through living costs associated with international students.

There are a variety of drawbacks associated with TNE for the host country, which has mainly been identified by Adam (2001). The author argues that the negative aspects of TNE include challenging the quality and traditional educational values and disrupting the HE structures in the HC. Thus, it can affect local HEIs ability to compete, which will encourage governments and the host country institution to establish provision to appropriately address this issue (Bennell and Pearce, 2003).
Finally, it has been suggested that the main problem is the potential for poor quality education being provided in host countries (Adam, 2001; Vignoli, 2004). Thus, appropriate quality assurance procedures need to be established to counteract this risk. Additionally, there are also issues with consumer protection as it has been argued that not enough information is divulged on the quality of the provider and qualification (Adam, 2001; Vignoli, 2004). Moreover, the drawbacks include a lack of compatibility with the local environment which results in employability issues in the student’s home country (Adam, 2001). Therefore, host countries need to ensure that the education being provided by foreign HEIs is of high quality and is contextually relevant.

Table 9: Summary of Benefits and Drawback of TNE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEI</th>
<th>Host Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td><strong>Drawbacks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establishing links with foreign institutions</td>
<td>• The risk of wasted and damaged resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New source of income for the exporter.</td>
<td>• Brand image can be adversely affected, if not properly controlled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity to exploit new higher education markets in developing countries.</td>
<td>• Certain countries will require HEP to partner with a local HEI and this will lead to the two partners sharing knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• However, the impact of TNE on economic growth has been debated due to the 'brain drain effect'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disruption to the educational standards and established higher education structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lowered survival rate of own HEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential for low quality and transparency of HEP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.5. FDI in Transnational Education – International Branch Campuses

The FDI equivalent in TNE are IBCs, which have become an increasingly popular form of investment (Ahmad, 2015). Although IBCs can be established with partners (i.e. a joint venture), substantial investment is required concerning both time and finances. IBCs have been defined as:

“off-shore’, operations in higher education where the unit is operated by the source institution (though can be in a joint venture with a host institution) and where the student is awarded the degree of the source institution.” (Robertson, 2010b, p. 198)

As of 2015, there are 277 IBCs (including those that are pending), which derive from 205 unique HEIs (C-BERT, 2015). In total, there are 35 investing countries and 81 host countries. Regarding the investing countries, the United States has the highest number of IBCs (101) followed by the UK (42) (as seen in Figure 9). Furthermore, the top five countries make up almost 70% of the total number of IBCs. Concerning the host countries, China has the highest number of IBCs (33) followed closely by Dubai (30) (as seen in Figure 9). Additionally, the top five countries equate to 37% of the total IBCs, which shows that unlike the investing country, the host countries are more widely dispersed.
Figure 9: Top 5 Investing and Host Countries

Adapted From: C-BERT (2015)

Focusing on the pattern of campus opening and closures (as indicated in Figure 10), the majority of the campuses were opened between 2002 and 2008. The sudden drop in investments in 2008 is arguably related to the financial crisis, but the number of investments has returned to pre-crisis levels. Concerning closures, the majority occurred between 2007 and 2015 with 19 IBCs closing. Nonetheless, it demonstrates that IBC’s are regaining popularity, but at the same time, the risks of failure are also increasing.
Figure 10: Campus Opening and Closures

Adapted From: C-BERT (2015)
Benefits and Drawbacks of IBC

This section details the different benefits and drawbacks of IBCs for HEIs and the host country (HC). These issues supplement the overall benefits of TNE (see section 2.4.4) and are summarised in Table 10.

IBCs are beneficial to HEIs and the HC. For the latter, the benefit can include reducing the brain drain effect (Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014; Jones, 2001), as the student remains in the country while receiving a foreign education. Furthermore, IBCs allow students the convenience of a foreign education with the reduced costs of not living abroad (Wilkins and Balakrishnan, 2015). However, this does reduce the financial return to the home countries, by way of reduced revenues derived from international students’ living costs (Robertson, 2010a). Furthermore, the increased number of IBCs can increase the performance of local HEIs as competition increases (Knight, 2011).

There are differing motives for establishing an IBC for the HEI, which include generating an additional channel of revenue, increased knowledge collaboration, establishing a presence abroad and the belief that international engagement will improve education quality (Altbach and Knight, 2007; Mahani and Molki, 2011; Marginson, 2006; McBurnie and Ziguras, 2007; Morgan, 2010b; Naidoo, 2007; Rizvi, 2005; Shams and Huisman, 2012; Van Vught, 2008; Verbik and Merkley, 2006). Also, this method can carry benefits such as increasing value for money due to increased face to face interaction (Feast and Bretag, 2005), which is not prevalent in distance learning.

The benefits of IBCs have increased as countries are proactively trying to attract HEIs into their HE markets. These include an increased number of
financial incentives being offered by host countries, gaining access to wider markets and the increased number of educational hubs (Rumbley and Altbach, 2007). However, despite these incentives, HEIs may still opt to withdraw from the investment. For instance, Yale withdrew from investing in the UAE despite receiving funding, as they were not confident in the ability to offer high-quality education offshore (Becker, 2009). However, it has been argued that establishing IBC can reduce quality assurance issues in TNE (Bennell and Pearce, 2003; Caruana, 2008), which provides students with more visibility. Regardless, it has been argued that quality is a key area to consider for IBCs.

Along with the benefits of IBCs, there are drawbacks for the HEIs and the HC. A disadvantage for the HEI is that IBCs require substantial resources to establish and are of high risk, which makes these options unfeasible for some HEIs (Caruana, 2008; Rumbley and Altbach, 2007). Also, there is the potential for damage and reduced confidence in the HEI’s brand, the HC and TNE (Gribble and McBurnie, 2015; Morgan, 2010b; Rumbley and Altbach, 2007) if the IBC performs poorly.

There are also strategic drawbacks for the HEIs which include IBCs acting as a distraction from the home institution’s core business, especially around research (Robertson, 2010a). Furthermore, there are issues surrounding the sustainability of student numbers to allow IBCs to continue and the availability of home faculty to send overseas (Altbach, 2011). Thus, there are not only drawbacks for investing in an IBC, but there are also issues relating to its viability and implementation.

The drawback for the host country is mainly covered by the drawbacks of TNE in general (see Section 2.4.4). The only further drawback is the wasted
funding of the host countries’ governments to support new IBCs, if they fail. Thus, this demonstrates the need for host countries to provide adequate support for IBCs.

Although there are many benefits and drawbacks, there are no clear measures of success and failure or means of determining the key outputs of IBCs, but like the FDI section, these can be inferred from the above discussion (i.e. the realisation of the benefits). Thus, further research is required to identify the importance and relevance of the measures of success for IBCs.

Table 10: Benefits and Drawbacks of IBCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>HEI</th>
<th>Host Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased control</td>
<td>• Reducing the brain drain effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Becoming established in a foreign country</td>
<td>• Highly demanded foreign education with reduced costs of not living abroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gaining a competitive advantage and enhance branding</td>
<td>• Reduced issues with Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased incentives from countries actively developing the higher education markets</td>
<td>• Increased Face to Face teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Substantial resources required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Damage to brand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Issues with Governments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Viability of BCs in the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Problem with academic staffing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Distraction from core business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Wasted funds if BC fails

- Drawback of TNE (see section 2.4.4)

- Problem with academic staffing

- Distraction from core business
The remainder of this section draws upon some of the previously mentioned areas from TNE but relates them specifically to the context of IBCs.

**Strategic Choice and Variations of IBCs**

There are five broad methods of establishing an IBC (Lane, 2010; Lane and Kinser, 2013; Verbik, 2015) which are detailed in Table 11. It is arguable that wholly owned campuses incur the highest level of risk but gives the HEI the highest levels of control (in comparison to other forms of TNE) (Lane, 2010; Verbik, 2015). Furthermore, it has been suggested that “large scale” wholly owned campuses are the most likely to be sustainable in the future (Wilkins and Balakrishnan, 2015). In contrast, renting and academic partners carry the least risk, as the initial investment in infrastructure is not required. However, there is the potential for unpredicted costs to impact the operations of the IBC such as rent increases (Verbik, 2015). Finally, when considering government partners and private investors, it is possible that these partnerships are spawn from invitations (Verbik, 2015).

**Table 11: Types of IBCs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of IBC</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self - Funded</td>
<td>Carries the most risk as it can be difficult to recover costs. Provides the greatest stability and control. No issues as a result of partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wholly Owned</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Funding</td>
<td>Local government covers the costs and owns the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Partners</strong></td>
<td>Local government tends to be targeting foreign HEIs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country may have an education hub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Provided</td>
<td>Private Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted From: Lane and Kinser, 2013; Verbik, 2015)

There are many reasons as to why an HEI would choose one method over another, such as available finances and adversity to risk (Wilkins et al., 2011). However, it is not clear whether any type is significantly more successful than another, thus warranting further investigation.

In addition to the above variations of IBC, there are four strategies that an HEI can use to establish an IBC (as seen in Figure 11), which is based on institutional difference and uncertainty (Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014; Phillips et al., 2009; Wilkins et al., 2011). However, it is important to establish that regardless of strategy, IBCs should be considered an extension of the HEI and be integrated as part of the overall mission and must act according to its intention over time (Farrugia and Lane, 2013). The level of uncertainty or difference dictates which approach is the most suitable for establishing an IBC. For instance, high levels of both difference and uncertainty should mean that HEIs should avoid establishing an IBC, as the risks are too high. However, it has been argued that an HEIs’ attitude to risk could also explain whether an IBC is established or not.
(Wilkins et al., 2011). Therefore, the model can be used for guidance, as other factors could contribute as to whether establishing an IBC is viable.

Figure 11: Four Strategies for establishing an IBC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Uncertainty in Host Country</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Low Institution Difference in a Host Country</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low risk, complexity and effort</td>
<td>Moderate risk, complexity and effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardise structures and process from the home campus</td>
<td>Establish joint ventures or obtain funds and assurances from host country government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Adapt</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate risk, complexity and effort</td>
<td>High risk, complexity and effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt structures and processes to suit host country</td>
<td>Risk is too high avoid establishing an IBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from (Philips et al., 2009)

Standardisation and Adaption

As presented above (in Figure 11), two of the strategies, transfer and adapt, refer to either a standardised or an adapted approach.

A cause of failure has been related to the inability to adapt practices suited to the local environment (Lane, 2011) as it is not sufficient to simply move a programme as is, from the home country to the host (Farrugia and Lane, 2013; Schoepp, 2015). A key issue related to adaption is the need to tailor a standardised curriculum (Miliszewska et al., 2003; Shams and Huisman, 2011), which factors in different learning styles and student experiences (Fountain and
Alfred, 2009; Prosser and Trigwell, 1999) and cultural clashes (Dunn and Wallace, 2006; Littrell, 2005). Furthermore, adaption can be achieved by stating the intended contribution to the host country, and its subsequent success can be measured by evaluations from the host country (Farrugia and Lane, 2013). However, resistance to adaption can occur as this has been associated with reduced quality, which ultimately impacts the home campus negatively (Lane, 2011).

Although local adoptions demonstrate flexibility and can better address the needs of the domestic market, it is equally important to ensure that the standards and ethos of the home campus are upheld (Farrugia and Lane, 2013; Weinman, 2014). A key contributor to this is the use of home staff, which ensures consistency. Students selecting IBCs expect to be taught in the same manner as the home campus, which includes seeing the home faculty (Shams and Huisman, 2011). Additionally, as part of standardising the student experience, a similar quality of students need to be enrolled at the IBCs; but this may be more feasible at lesser ranked HEIs. Furthermore, the ability to recruit top quality students becomes more difficult as competition increases. However, it has been established that the home campus cannot fully be emulated abroad, but measures have to be put in place to ensure that they are comparable (Wilkins and Balakrishnan, 2015).

The concepts of adaption and standardisation are not mutually exclusive items and can be demonstrated along a continuum with the extreme ends being full standardisation or adaption (as seen in Figure 12) (Kinser and Lane, 2014). Therefore, an IBC does not need to adopt an approach in isolation. Instead, a hybrid approach that incorporates elements of each can be used. However, what
remains to be understood is which approach is the most commonly adopted at 
IBCs and whether the posited effects of either approach impact the success of 
an IBC.

Figure 12: Adaption Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardised Curriculum</th>
<th>Hybrid Curriculum</th>
<th>Adapted Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No consideration for local conditions</td>
<td>Master Syllabus, with some cultural adaption</td>
<td>Freedom to address learning outcomes based on local needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted From: Kinser and Lane, 2014)

Shams and Huisman (2011) suggest the importance of global integration 
versus local responsiveness (known as the I-R Paradigm). In essence, they 
reflect standardised (centralised) and adapted (decentralised) approaches 
respectively; whereby an integrated approach standardises key elements of the 
IBC and visa-versa for responsiveness. In the author’s paper, they focus on three 
aspects’ curriculum, research and staff; each one has a separate axis, and the 
more integrated the campus is, the closer to zero (centre) it is plotted (similar to 
that seen in Figure 13). However, they go on to state that the model could be 
developed to include more items. Nonetheless, this paradigm also suggests that 
certain elements of an IBC can be standardised or adopted rather than applying 
either concept holistically.
Environment Monitoring and Host Country Selection

Environmental issues are a predominant matter for HEIs, not only to ensure that it is understood but how organisations react and respond to the forces within it (Farrugia and Lane, 2013). HEIs operate in an environment that is vastly different from the one in the home country (Fegan and Field, 2009; Lane and Kinser, 2008; McBurnie, 2015; Shams and Huisman, 2011; Vinen and Selvarajah, 2008). Moreover, HEIs need to conform to regulations both in the HC and the home country (Shams and Huisman, 2011). Fundamentally, HEIs need to learn how to operate and take advantage of the local conditions (Lane, 2011).

The environment can be a key contributing factor as to why an HC is selected. There are three principal reasons to establish an IBC in a particular country. They are as follows: 1) the IBC offers something different that has not already been provided 2) the IBC provides a better alternative to current offerings and 3) absorbing excessive demand (Altbach and Knight, 2007; Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014; Lane, 2011). Furthermore, the selection of an HC may be determined by the quality of the local education market; as inadequate local

Figure 13: I-R Paradigm

(Adapted From: Shams and Huisman, 2011)
provisions represent opportunities for foreign HEIs (Altbach, 2015b). For instance, the availability of teaching and research academics.

**Due Diligence, Planning and Monitoring**

Closely linked to environmental issues is due diligence, which is established as the process of ascertaining and understanding information about the investment (Braun, 2005; Puranam et al., 2006). Given the rapidly changing local market environments, it is essential to carry out comprehensive due diligence, which will consult numerous sources of information (Lane, 2011). Moreover, a key contributor to success is adequate planning and continual monitoring (Knight, 2015b; McBurnie, 2015). Therefore, the process of due diligence should continue beyond the initial planning stages. Also, it is essential that HEIs learn from the experience of establishing an IBC that could impact the way in which the home campus operates as well as providing a framework for future investments (Farrugia and Lane, 2013; Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014).

Some barriers prevent organisations from carrying out sufficient due diligence. The most prominent are incorrect collection and use of information. Firstly, inaccurate information results in the failure of IBCs, with the main issue being derived from the overestimation of student demand/enrolment and an understanding of the desired qualifications and degrees that are important in the local market (i.e. employers and student interests) (Lane, 2011). This also supports the need for a conservative approach when forecasting financial viability.
The impact of this suggestion can be further investigated to identify the impact of poor forecasts.

Regulations and Quality Assurance

Every country’s regulatory landscape is different and requires separate planning (Shams and Huisman, 2011). An example of an open country is the UAE, whose government allows HEIs to set up in the seven Emirates without the need for partners as well as providing numerous incentives (Mahani and Molki, 2011). Furthermore, some countries are unable to regulate HEIs that enter the country, and in some cases, even if regulations are in place, they do not apply to foreign providers (Altbach and Knight, 2007). In general, there is the need to not only understand the local regulations but the compatibility with the HEI (Knight, 2015c) and whether it can operate successfully (Bennell and Pearce, 2003).

Another consideration is related to the awarding institution. In cases where two HEIs are involved, who offers and how many degrees are offered need to be considered. In most cases, dual degrees are awarded (i.e. one from the Foreign HEI and one from the local HEI) but a key consideration is if whether the workload reflects the effort required to achieve the two degrees (Knight, 2015a). As a result, students feel disadvantaged at other campuses that offer the same programme but only a single degree. Therefore, this demonstrates a need to have consistency across campuses. In addition to the type of degree, who will recognise the qualifications awarded should also be contemplated (Altbach and Knight, 2007). This is crucial as this can impact the HEI/IBC that will be chosen.
Education Hubs

To help develop suitable environments, educational hubs are created. There are currently several education hubs, which are located in places such as Hong Kong, the UAE, Singapore and Malaysia (Becker, 2010; Ho Mok et al., 2008; Mahani and Molki, 2011; Robertson, 2010a). There are three broad types of education hubs (Knight, 2015a), which include, 1) student hubs, 2) education and training and 3) knowledge and innovation. Education hubs have grown in popularity as more countries place emphasis on developing their HE system (Gondwe, 2011). An example of a developing education hub is Hong Kong, which actively attracts foreign HEIs to complement their current HE system (Becker, 2010).

In most cases, governments that have education hubs offer numerous benefits that include tax incentives and repatriation of finances (Mahani and Molki, 2011; Robertson, 2010a). However, it has been suggested that despite the “benefits of being local”, some students prefer studying abroad at the home campus rather than at an IBC (Altbach, 2011). Furthermore, educational hubs have been criticised for setting unrealistic targets and overestimating the supply for future students (Gribble and McBurnie, 2015). Ultimately, the rising number of education hubs increase the number of opportunities to establish IBCs and allows HCs to develop their HE markets. However, the research on education hub remains somewhat theoretical, with a specific need to understand how the benefits of an education hub impact the operation of an IBC.
IBC Partnerships

An approach to establishing IBCs is through partnerships, which have been exhibited in Australian, North American and British universities and is the main form of TNE for the UK (Adam, 2001; Heffernan and Poole, 2004). However, there is a suggestion that HEIs are not fully vetting potential partners or the information that they receive (Lane, 2011).

Partnerships are sometimes formed based on agreed financial returns, which applies to externally funded IBCs, where financial targets are likely to be embedded into partnership agreements (Kinser and Lane, 2014). If IBCs are unable to meet their enrolment goals and generate sufficient return, partners may pressurise the HEI to increase enrolments (Schoepp, 2015). However, it is essential for IBCs to maintain quality and not reduce enrolment criteria as a means of increasing the number of students. Therefore, a partner must understand the need for a long-term commitment and the inherent risks.

The above section presents the key issue of finance as a contributor to failure. However, there are several benefits to choosing a partner, which includes shared/ reduced risk, decreasing transaction costs and the ability to share resources and competencies (Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014). Additionally, for the previously identified hedge strategy, the use of a local partner can remove some of the uncertainties in the host country (Wilkins et al., 2011). Furthermore, in some cases, government funding is predicated on forming a partnership. To reduce the drawbacks and to leverage the advantages of having a partner, it is essential to retain academic control (Kinser and Lane, 2014; McBurnie, 2015; Schoepp, 2015) and to ensure any agreement put in place is congruent with the HEI’s mission (Verbik, 2015). Again, literature presents a
predominately theoretical understanding of partnerships, which needs to be further supplemented with empirical research.

**Home and Local Staff**

The use of home and local staff is acknowledged to provide both advantages and disadvantages.

It is important to use home staff, as a means of knowledge management and to ensure consistent and high-quality education across campuses (Ranjan *et al.*, 2012). Furthermore, the use of home staff ensures that the identity and image are embedded in the IBC, which may form one of the main reasons for students to choose an IBC over a local HEI (Kinser and Lane, 2014). However, the use of home staff comes with the associated high expense (e.g. travel and potential higher salaries) (Ennew and Fujia, 2009; Gill, 2009; Shams and Huisman, 2016). Furthermore, there are numerous barriers for home staff, which mainly revolve around uprooting of families (Altbach, 2015).

Local staff can be recruited from local HEIs, but in certain countries, this may not be possible as the country may lack the skill base (i.e. developing countries) (Altbach, 2015a; McBurnie and Ziguras, 2009). The use of local staff is also beneficial as they have a better understanding of the local context, but some believe that the primary use of local staff can adversely impact quality (Ziguras, 2008).

Home staff have been identified as being better suited for IBCs, but local staff appear to be more committed to internationalisation and the local region (Kinser and Lane, 2014). Hence, arguably, a good mix of local and home staff is
advisable (McBurnie, 2015; Tham and Kam, 2008) and in some cases, governments might stipulate the required staff composition of IBCs (Becker, 2009; Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014). There are numerous benefits of having a mixed staff, which include the opportunity for knowledge and exchange of ideas (Knight, 2015c). However, using a mixture of home and local staff has associated problems, and it is fundamental to manage conflicts carefully (Knight, 2015c). The most appropriate composition staff that results in the success of an IBC still needs to be identified.

**Student Satisfaction and Choice Criteria**

Although student choice criteria have been addressed previously in the TNE section, there are specific issues to consider as to why students would choose IBCs. Wilkins and Huisman (2011a) suggest examining “push” and “pull” factors (see figure 14), which respectively refer to why students would choose to leave their home country and what attracts them to other countries (e.g. desire to study overseas. Generally, IBCs offer low-cost alternatives for those who want to study at a foreign HEI, particularly when tuition fee at the home campus is high (Wilkins and Huisman, 2011b).

It is important to acknowledge that traditional choice criteria also apply such as reputation and ranking, especially as reports on such matters are becoming widely available (Knight, 2015a; McBurnie and Ziguras, 2007). Furthermore, accreditations can be used as a selling point and as a bi-product can impact the HEI’s ranking (Altbach and Knight, 2007; Knight, 2015b).
Consistently achieving high student satisfaction can offer IBCs a competitive advantage, which can result in loyalty and positive word of mouth (Arambewela and Hall, 2009). One facet that contributes to satisfaction and can provide a competitive advantage are the social elements (e.g. recreational services) of an IBC (Wilkins and Balakrishnan, 2015). However, an over focus on profits has contributed to these social element/ additional services being neglected and requiring improvement (Ahmad, 2015; Wilkins et al., 2012). However, Wilkins et al. (2012) suggest that the flaws identified at IBCs were not
different to those being identified at the relative home campus, thus suggesting that satisfaction does not differ whether they attend the home campus or the IBC. Nonetheless, it is important to ensure that there are adequate recreational facilities at the IBC. Therefore, the importance of facilities need to be understood and how they contribute to the positive evaluation of an IBC.

IBC Success and Failure Factors

A number of areas have been addressed above that could contribute to the success or failure of an IBC. However, before discussing how these can be translated into success factors for IBCs, the focus will pivot to the discussion of what a success factor is.

Critical Success Factors (CSF) are suggested to be the factors or a few things that must go well for an organisation to be successful (Boynton and Zmud, 1984; Bullen and Rockhart, 1981; Munro and Wheeler, 1980). Subsequently, these factors can be used as a means of monitoring corporate activities (Ferguson and Dickinson, 1982) and provide decision makers with direction and areas to focus on (Bullen and Rockhart, 1981). However, there are three critiques of CSF, which include 1) it is difficult to apply without being a skilled analyst 2) it’s over dependence on management could make the factors biased 3) it is susceptible to human error e.g. based on beliefs or short term memory (Boynton and Zmud, 1984). Nonetheless, CSF has been used by HEIs, both as a means of identifying factors and addressing challenges (Alhlak et al., 2012; Islam et al., 2015; Mazzarol et al., 2001; McPherson and Baptista Nunes, 2006; Paramasivam and Muthusamy, 2012).
With the general literature regarding CSF addressed, the attention turns to existing potential success and failure factors of IBCs. An early paper by Mazzarol (1998) conducted research into the CSF for marketing international education through factor analysis, four factors were identified, which include promotion and recruitment, people and culture, image and resources and coalition and forward integration (further detail of each is listed in Table 12).

**Table 12: Success factors as identified by Mazzarol (1998)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Recruitment</td>
<td>Use of private recruitment agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size of overseas advertising and promotion budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possession of offshore recruitment offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of government information offices overseas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size of international student enrolments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image and Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People and Culture</td>
<td>Level of innovation within the institutions culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of customer orientation within culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective use of information technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality and expertise of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of technical superiority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition and Forward Integration</td>
<td>Possession of offshore teaching programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted From: Mazzarol, 1998)

In addition, two success measures were identified, which were market success and an independent variable (see Table 13). Although the factors and measures can be applied to IBCs, the paper focuses generically on the marketing
of international education, rather than the success or failure of IBCs. Therefore, this demonstrates that similar research has been conducted previously, but up to date research on IBCs is still required.

### Table 13: Success measures as identified by Mazzarol (1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Success</td>
<td>Growth in overseas student enrolments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial benefits from international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand for places regularly exceed supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The outlook for the next 3 to 6 years is for growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td>Without overseas students fees the institution would experience financial difficulties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted From: Mazzarol, 1998)

Addressing IBCs specifically, the literature has highlighted a few examples of success and failures of IBCs, which are highlighted in Table 14. The factors that can contribute to the success of IBCs are related to funding and good enrolment. Furthermore, the need for HEI’s to conduct comprehensive market research and adequate planning has been stressed (Becker, 2009; Rumbley and Altbach, 2007). Conversely, several factors that lead to the failure of IBCs were identified, which include poor market research, over exaggerated enrolment forecasts, changes in the environment and poor financial performance (Altbach, 2011; Morgan, 2010b). Thus, HEIs need to focus on the potential success factors and reduce the risk of failure, which can result in unsuccessful investments. This aspect makes up a key component of this research.
Table 14: IBC Successes and Failures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEI</th>
<th>Success and Failure Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>George Mason University</strong></td>
<td><strong>Situation</strong>&lt;br&gt;This university resulted in a failure due to low enrolment rates. This resulted in the enrolled student being offered a place at the Virginia campus. In addition, when the campus closed multiple HEIs attempted to attract some of the enrolled students too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Failure Factors</strong>&lt;br&gt;- The university failed to meet the recruitment target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India University of Pune</strong></td>
<td><strong>Situation</strong>&lt;br&gt;The university invested in a campus in the emirates of Ras Al Khaimah due to looser regulations. This campus eventually failed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Failure Factors</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Unable to attain sufficient enrolment numbers&lt;br&gt;- The emirate was less populated and did not offer the same lifestyle as the main ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Wollongong</strong></td>
<td><strong>Situation</strong>&lt;br&gt;This university was established in the UAE shortly after the failure of Michigan State university. The branch was started in a rented building and operated with no outside funding and was fully dependent on its own revenue received from tuition. It now has a student body of 2,500.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Success Factors</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Successfully increased enrolments&lt;br&gt;- Required no outside funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Herriot-Watt University</strong></td>
<td><strong>Situation</strong>&lt;br&gt;This is one of the fastest growing universities in the UAE, achieving a student enrolment number of 500 within three years of opening. It is now developing a larger campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Success Factors/ Measures</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Attracted a high number of enrolments&lt;br&gt;- The student body increased rapidly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masdar Institute of Science and Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This university is a post-graduate only campus in the UAE and currently has 92 students enrolled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Offered an attractive package to its students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Affiliation with MIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Becker, 2009; Mahani and Molki, 2011)

**2.4.6 Conclusion**

The TNE section is the final part of the literature review before the discussion on the conceptual model. Many areas within TNE have been identified and addressed, but application of the theories to IBCs are less apparent. Yet, they underline the key considerations that apply to HEIs (such as branding, selection criteria and quality), which may apply to IBCs. Following this, relevant literature related to IBCs has been addressed, which develops on some of the areas identified in the TNE section (such as partnerships, education hub and environmental monitoring). In addition, the types of IBCs and the benefits and drawbacks have also been discussed.

There are three issues in the current literature. Firstly, the theories are discussed in isolation with few theories looking at what makes IBCs successful holistically. Secondly, many studies are based on a review of literature rather than on primary data. Finally, there is limited discussion on how success can be measured but like discussions in the FDI section, they can be implied by converting the benefits and drawbacks.
2.5 Chapter Review

This section amalgamates and addresssees the main gaps in the literature and an extensive conceptual model is presented.

2.5.1 Key Factors for Research

From the literature, four possible success and failure factors of FDI in TNE can be deduced. This links the relevant issues within TNE with FDI theory, which creates potential factors and sub-factors. Thus, the potential groups comprise of ownership advantage, internalisation and location advantage. Furthermore, the additional aspect of relationships is added, as IBC can include joint ventures (Becker, 2009) and to reflect the potential relationship between the HEI and entities within the host countries (i.e. government and competitors). Each of these factors has been assessed in turn.

Ownership advantage is essential as it identifies the assets that can be utilised to compete in offshore environments (Bevan and Estrin, 2004; Kimura, 1989; Shan and Song, 1997). For this research, ownership advantage is relabelled as HEI advantage. The sub factors include knowledge, resource and organisational assets as seen in Table 15. These areas within the HEI advantage represent factors that can result in the success of IBCs. Furthermore, it is essential to identify a match between the elements within the HEI advantage and the host country’s environment.
### Table 15: HEI Advantage Sub-factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Knowledge Assets   | • Familiarity with the local market which includes understanding the selection criteria of the local students  
|                    | • Familiarity with the culture of the host country, which will include learning styles.                                                        |
| Resources Assets   | • Substantial financial resources will be required to establish an IBC  
|                    | • Home staff willing to travel, which allows for higher levels of control                                                                      |
| Organisational Assets | • Branding can impact enrolments and perceptions of the HEI  
|                     | • Accreditations can indicate quality and enhance the student’s employability                                                                    |

Locational advantages refer to the benefits of investing in an HC (Bevan and Estrin, 2004). For the purpose of this research, this is renamed as host country advantages. The sub factors include financial incentives, proximity and potential target market, knowledge base and regulations (as seen in Table 16). This demonstrates the TNE issues that relate to the relevant FDI location criteria. However, in this case, comparative advantage has been removed as it mainly affects products (i.e. the manufacturing of tangible goods) (Waldkirch, 2010).
Table 16: Host Country Sub-factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>• Governments are offering financial incentives such as tax breaks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Education hubs can be used to establish IBC, which allows HEI to operate independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity and Potential Target Market</td>
<td>• The number of available students can impact success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The quality of the students also need to be identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research is needed to understand student’s choice criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The demand in neighbouring countries or the region could be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Base</td>
<td>• Availability of academics in the host country is important as there are several benefits of recruiting local staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td>• These will be set by governments and HEIs will need to understand and operate within them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internalisation advantage refers to the benefits of the HEI choosing to invest abroad rather than outsourcing courses using a licensing or franchise approach (Bevan and Estrin, 2004). However, this factor does not have a significant number of implications for TNE (as shown in Table 17). The limited issues associated with this factor are because HEIs provide a service and internalisation mainly benefit product orientated industries, but there is still a need to reduce the risk by exercising sufficient control.
Table 17: Internalisation Sub-factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Control    | • The use of IBC reduces quality issues, due to the increased level of control.  
• Academic staff will have increased stability as a result of greater control. |

The final issue is relationships, which is not included in the “OLI” theory. However, it is inevitable that when HEIs enter new countries, new relationships between entities in the environment will be formed. The main relationship item identified is the potential for joint ventures (as detailed in Table 18). These reflect the final issues that may dictate the success or failure of an IBC. To further illustrate these matters, a conceptual framework has been created (see Figure 15). This identifies the main groups and sub groups of contributing factors and how they are linked based on the discussion of the literature.

Table 18: Relationship Sub-factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Joint Ventures   | • Governments may require foreign HEIs to partner with a local institution.  
• The ideal partner needs to be selected to reduce opportunism.  
• Academic control needs to be retained. |
Figure 15: Success and Failure Factors
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Figure 15 presents the key factors identified in the literature; thus far they are underdeveloped and require further investigation. Therefore, the empirical research carried out in this thesis will identify whether these factors and sub-factors contribute to the success or failure of an IBC.

The final consideration is the measure of success or failure. For this research, the benefits and drawbacks of TNE and FDI have been transformed into measures. For instance, the benefits represent the desired results of the investment and would be an indicator of success. The measures have been separated into two with measures for the HEI and the HC being presented (as seen in Figure 16). However, it can be difficult to measure the success of IBCs as intangible soft aspects can be overlooked, such as the human aspects and the impact on the local community (Knight, 2015b). Therefore, there is a need to identify additional measures.
Figure 16: Success and Failure Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host Country</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>- Economic Growth</td>
<td>- Drive out local competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Financial Growth</td>
<td>- Environmental Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improved Technology</td>
<td>- Brain Drain effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Upgraded Skills</td>
<td>- Disruption to educational standards and structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improved Management Skills</td>
<td>- Possible potential of low quality education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEI</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>- Successful entry into foreign higher education markets</td>
<td>- Leak excessive information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased Revenue</td>
<td>- Wasted Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Better serve students</td>
<td>- Lack of enrolment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased Brand Awareness</td>
<td>- Damage to brand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.2 Literature Review Conclusion

The literature details three key areas for this research in an attempt to determine the current issues that need to be considered. The first section focuses on IB, which shows that organisations are globalising and this is the result of increased competition and rapid changes in the environment (Theodosiou and Leonidou, 2003).
The key areas within IB include competitive and comparative advantage, developing economies/markets, globalisation, FDI (Peng, 2004) and culture (Zou et al., 1997). These areas greatly affect HE as HEIs focus on globalisation as a new source of revenue as a result of dwindling government funds. This requires HEIs to develop a competitive advantage (Joseph and Joseph, 2000) and exploit new opportunities such as HE markets in developing countries. Additionally, an inherent factor of concern when investing abroad is culture (Zou et al., 1997), which affects HE as it relates to students’ learning styles. Finally, FDI is rising in importance for TNE as the number of IBCs increase (Gondwe, 2011). Thus, identifying which factors result in the success or failure of these investments is important.

Several criteria need to be considered to enable this success, which is underpinned by the “OLI” theory developed by Dunning (1973; 2001). This theory examines ownership advantages, internalisation, location advantage and the additional relationship factor. By considering these factors, both the investor and host country may identify the potential benefits from an investment. However, these elements do not address the specific investment criteria for establishing an IBC. Success is also dependent on issues related to HE and TNE in general.

The increasing number of people in HE (Adam, 2001; Jones, 2001; UNESCO, 2011) and TNE (Böhm et al., 2004) represent an opportunity for HEIs to invest abroad for new sources of revenue and to enhance their international reputation. Furthermore, the issues identified within TNE and specifically IBCs includes factors such as branding, programme delivery, quality and technology.

Finally, a conceptual framework that merges the three bodies of literature and postulates the potential four factors and nine sub-factors that will contribute
to the success of an IBC is presented. Furthermore, appropriate measures to
gauge the success of an IBC have also been identified. With the contributing
factors and measures identified, the next sequential step is to research these
areas. Thus, the next chapter details the methodology for this research.
3. Methodology

3.1 Introduction

With a conceptual framework being created as a result of critically analysing the extant literature, the focus pivots to the methodology for this thesis. This chapter provides the rationale for the use of a three-stage mixed methods approach. The first section will cover the choice of research philosophy, this is followed by stating the research aims and objectives. Finally, the three individual stages are addressed clearly detailing what each one entails.

3.2 Research Aims

The aim of this research is to identify the success and failure factors of foreign direct investment (FDI) in transnational education (TNE). The following research questions have been designated as a result of the literature review, and they are as follows:

1. Which factors contribute to the success or failure of foreign direct investment in transnational education?

2. What are the appropriate measures of success and failure in foreign direct investment in transnational education?

3. Identify a framework for the successful establishment and operation of an international branch campus (IBC).
The following sections detail the appropriate methodology to address these research questions.

3.3 Research Paradigms

Before detailing the methodology, relevant research paradigms will be addressed, along with the justification as to why the chosen paradigm is selected, as it dictates how the research will be conducted (Morgan and Smircich, 1980). Also, it has been argued that research paradigms are “based on ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions” (Guba and Lincoln, 1994, p. 107). However, before discussing these two areas, they must both be defined. Simply, ontology refers to the nature of reality and epistemology relates to the nature of the knowledge (Allison and Pomeroy, 2000). Furthermore, the authors identify that the latter refers to how a researcher will set out to determine what they need to know, which is often constrained by ontological and methodological issues. Finally, the four research paradigms (Allison and Pomeroy, 2000; Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Racher and Robinson, 2003) that have been recognised (and as seen in Table 19) are discussed below.
Table 19: Research Paradigm Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Post- Positivism</th>
<th>Critical Theory</th>
<th>Constructivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Aim</td>
<td>Explanation, Prediction and Control.</td>
<td>Explanation, Prediction and Control.</td>
<td>Critique and Transformation, Restitution and Emancipation</td>
<td>Understanding the subjective meaning of the individual in its various constructions and reconstructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontology</td>
<td>Naive Realism - There is a reality that we are able to apprehend: aims to determine what is there.</td>
<td>Critical Realism - there is a reality but it is only imperfectly apprehendable and therefore predictable in terms of probability.</td>
<td>Historical realism- virtual reality shaped by social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender values; crystallised over time.</td>
<td>Relativism- reality is multiple and will be constructed differently by people, depending on the meaning they make of their world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>Dualist/ Objectivist - findings are true verified hypotheses are established as facts of law</td>
<td>Modified Dualist/ Objectivist; critical traditional/ community; findings probably true.</td>
<td>Subjective value, mediating findings which account for cultural and historical insights</td>
<td>Transactional/ subjectivist. Finding are read as significant when individuals’ accounts of their reality converge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Experimental/ Manipulative; Verification of Hypotheses, Chiefly quantitative methods.</td>
<td>Modified experimental/ manipulative; falsification of hypotheses, may include qualitative methods.</td>
<td>Methods as seen as involving dialogue with participants as sources of information.</td>
<td>Hermeneutic: information fed back to participants for confirmation of correct interpretations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Pretest, posttest, intervention group and control group.</td>
<td>Pretest, posttest intervention group and control group.</td>
<td>Ethnographic, interviews, and biographies.</td>
<td>Groups interviews and focus groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from: Allison and Pomeroy, 2000, p.94)
3.3.1 Positivism

The first and the most common research paradigms to be discussed is positivism. The ontological theory behind this paradigm is that knowledge reflects reality and is context free (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Suggesting that “the world” is objective, quantifiable and measurable; thus the focus is on identifying what already exists and aims to verify “fact”. Furthermore, this paradigm primarily consists of quantitative research, which usually comprises of experimentation and observation. (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Hence, the aim of this research paradigm is the explanation and the discovery of one truth (Lather, 1986).

A range of issues has contributed to the rejection of this paradigm, which reduces its applicability to the research being conducted in this thesis. Firstly, a flaw associated with this paradigm is the assumption that individuals are passive and controlled, thus neglecting to incorporate that information can be viewed differently in varying contexts, i.e. in a subjective manner (Dash, 2005). Also, from a methodological viewpoint, the bulk of this research is primarily qualitative. Therefore, there are few measures which are quantifiable. Furthermore, descriptive information is needed on the factors that result in success and failure, which can be subjective as they are interpreted differently by individuals. In contrast, the positivist paradigm is better suited for validating information and testing links, which may be derived from quantitative research. A final consideration is that there is limited information on what causes the success or failure of FDI in TNE. Thus, the focus of this research is knowledge-building rather than verification.
3.3.2 Critical Theory

The second paradigm to be discussed is critical theory, which is difficult to define for three reasons. Firstly, there are several critical theories; secondly, it is continually evolving and thirdly, it avoids specificity as there is room for disagreement (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2002). Nonetheless, this paradigm has two key features, which includes researchers using their information to critique cultural and social issues and the acceptance of certain assumptions (Ponterotto, 2005). Furthermore, critical theory examines how research can impact a society (Allison and Pomeroy, 2000), with the aim of raising oppressed groups to a true conscious level (Guba, 1990) and making them more informed. Also, in contrast to positivism, this paradigm predominantly uses qualitative research (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Finally, from an ontological viewpoint, this paradigm recognises “reality” as a series of structures that are formed as a result of the external environment (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Thus, this paradigm follows the idea that reality is based on a socio-historical context.

This paradigm is not appropriate for the purpose of this research as it does not aim to alter the perceptions of certain groups and raise their profile and focuses on theory building.

3.3.3 Constructivism

Constructivism (also referred to as interpretivism) research is subjective rather than objective and therefore, varies depending on how individuals interpret reality (Allison and Pomeroy, 2000). Hence, from an ontological standpoint, this paradigm differs from one person to another as it focuses on “reality” in the
context of the individual (Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Ponterotto, 2005). Furthermore, this paradigm is a direct contrast to positivism due to the diverse viewpoint of reality and the predominant use of qualitative research (Ponterotto, 2005). Thus, the nature of this knowledge is to gain a consensus in information, which is subjected to continual change (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Furthermore, findings are created as the research progresses with the intention of developing a more informed and sophisticated knowledge base, which requires an increased amount of participation on the part of the researcher (Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Ponterotto, 2005). Ponterotto (2005) further suggests that this encourages researchers to explore deeper into individual's experiences, which may need coercing for them to be recalled.

This paradigm can be adopted for this thesis as it focuses on achieving a consensus of information (Guba and Lincoln, 1994), which suits the aim of identifying the success and failure factors. However, this research does require verification as well as identifying new theories and hence, it requires some quantitative elements.

3.3.4 Post-Positivism

The final paradigm to address is post-positivism, which has also been viewed as a critical version of realism. Hence, it is alternatively known as critical realism (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). This paradigm suggests that “reality” needs to be subjected to some scrutiny to resemble the actual “reality” and the complexities of human life (Lather, 1986). Thus, the information identified has to match both the existing knowledge as well as those of critical communities, such as professional peers (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). This is further supported, as it
has been argued that a “true reality” is difficult to identify (Ponterotto, 2005; Racher and Robinson, 2003).

The post-positivism paradigm questions traditional positivism by suggesting what is likely to occur, rather than a definitive (Allison and Pomeroy, 2000), i.e. the correct guess, rather than a definitive truth (Lather, 1986). Hence, the nature of this knowledge differs from positivism as it does not verify the truth but instead a possible truth (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Despite the differences of positivism and post-positivism, there are several similarities. These include both paradigms being focused on explaining and identifying causal effects (Ponterotto, 2005) and the predominant use of quantitative methods (Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Ponterotto, 2005). Despite this, qualitative research methods can also be used (Racher and Robinson, 2003) as techniques, such as case studies and interviewing have previously been adopted (Healy and Perry, 2000), with case studies being identified as the most appropriate when adopting this paradigm.

This paradigm is suitable for the research to be conducted in this thesis as it allows for both quantitative and qualitative research (Denzin et al., 2006). It has also been recognised as being the most appropriate for qualitative research, in particular, the use case studies (Healy and Perry, 2000). Furthermore, authors identify that this paradigm allows for both the discovery and verification of theories. Thus emphasising the applicability of this paradigm to this research, as the qualitative research elements (Studies 1 and 2) allow for the development of theory (i.e. what are the causes that result in success or failure), which is then followed by quantitative research (Study 3) to verify the information from the initial qualitative elements.
3.4. Justification of Proposed Methodology

Leading on from the identified paradigms, this section details the justification for the methods used in this methodology and examines issues such as validity, reliability, ethics and research plan.

3.4.1 Justification of Mixed Methods

There are three recognised approaches to research and these are quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodology (Migiro and Magangi, 2011, p. 375). The research conducted in this thesis mainly consists of qualitative research (expert surveys and case studies) and the final element is a quantitative study. Thus, a mixed method approach is adopted, with an emphasis on qualitative techniques. The remainder of this section details the justification for adopting qualitative and mixed methodologies.

Qualitative research is based on understanding meaning and interpretations rather than statistics (Barnes, 1992; Hoepfl, 1997). A variety of studies in HE has adopted a qualitative approach (such as Chapleo, 2008). Thus, given the nature of the research, interviews and smaller samples are appropriate. Also, qualitative research tends to adopt either a constructivist or post-positivism paradigm with most writers adopting a rich and in-depth informal writing style (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Furthermore, the authors suggest that the benefits of qualitative research include collecting in-depth information, gaining an informed understanding of complex situations and cross-case analysis i.e. between respondents or groups. This is vital for this research as exploring the
success and failure of FDI in TNE is complex and requires rich information to gain a better understanding.

However, alongside the benefits, there is a range of weaknesses. The main weakness of qualitative research is its inability to be generalised to the overall population (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Furthermore, it has been argued that qualitative research struggles for legitimacy unlike quantitative research (Allison and Pomeroy, 2000). Additionally, qualitative research is time-consuming concerning data collection and analysis (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Thus, to reduce these areas of weaknesses, quantitative elements are included to increase the validity of the findings.

The purpose of a mixed methodology is to utilise the strengths and reduce the weaknesses of both qualitative and quantitative research (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Migiro and Magangi, 2011). Furthermore, the authors recognise that by adopting a mixed method approach, non-numeric meaning can be applied to numeric data and vice versa. In essence, it allows for a complete understanding of research findings (Migiro and Magangi, 2011). For the purpose of the research to be conducted for this thesis, quantitative information has been used to identify the importance of the qualitative elements. However, Patton (2005) suggests that multiple data sources should be used to test consistency rather than achieve the same results. Furthermore, there are several advantages to adopting a mixed methodology, which, according to Migiro and Magangi (2011), include:
• Alternative methods that can be used depending on the purpose of each study.

• It allows for triangulation, which enables the researcher to verify if the findings are suggesting what they are meant to.

• Aids in explaining quantitative findings using qualitative methods.

• Develops qualitative findings, which subsequently are tested.

• Creates complete knowledge, which is necessary for theory building

However, when adopting a mixed method approach; it is important to mix the two methods appropriately.

As identified, there is a range of benefits associated with adopting a mixed method. Despite this, there are a series of drawbacks that include this approach being more time-consuming, costly and difficult to conduct without a team (Greene, 2008; Johnson and Onwuegbuguie, 2004). Furthermore, Migiro and Magangi (2011) identify two additional issues: mixing paradigms and implementation.

The problem of paradigm mixing is derived from the suggestion that only one paradigm should be used along with the associated methodological issues. The key argument is that quantitative research typically takes a positivist paradigm and as a result explores the “one truth”. In contrast, qualitative research takes an interpretivist or collectivist paradigm, which suggest that the truth is dependent on the context and is continually varying (Sale et al., 2002). Thus, they represent alternative ends of the continuum. However, adopting the post-positivism paradigm reduces the impact of this weakness as it has already been
suggested that this paradigm utilises both methods (Healy and Perry, 2000). This views the truth as imperfect and seeks to emulate the “real world”. Thus, by using this paradigm, no “mixing” of paradigms occur. The second issue, which is implementation, includes the weaknesses of having to learn both research methods and on a similar note, makes this approach more time-consuming and complex to implement.

Another issue to consider are the approaches within a mixed methodology, which comprises of four designs: triangulation, embedded, explanatory and exploratory (Creswell et al., 2011). The authors highlight the issues of each approach, which are detailed below:

The exploratory approach is the most applicable for this research, given the emphasis on qualitative research and the focus on theory building; subsequently, the data can be validated quantitatively (Creswell et al., 2011). The authors also elude to triangulation, the embedded approach and explanatory approach being primarily used to explain quantitative results. As there is very little quantitative data available, qualitative data collection is required to identify which factors contribute to the success and failure, as well as the relevant measures. This information can be sequentially used in the quantitative surveys, and allow the information to be tested in a wider population. Thus, the research flows as indicated in Figure 17, and each element has been discussed further in later sections.
A final consideration are the steps involved in the mixed method approach, which is detailed in Table 20. Thus, the justification for using this approach is based on these steps.

Table 20: Mixed Methodology Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed Methodology Approach</th>
<th>Implications for This Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify research question, determine whether mixed method is appropriate to address the research questions.</td>
<td>- The mixed method approach is suitable as it allows for the exploration of success and failure factors, which can then be tested in a wider scope. - Adopting only one method will not allow for a complete understanding of the research questions as: - Qualitative will indicate what the potential factors are and why, but not whether they apply to all types of FDI in TNE, and - Quantitative will indicate which factors are crucial but not why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe that you can best answer the research question using a mixed methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe that a mixed method approach is the best method for the amount and type of evidence that is required.</td>
<td>- The qualitative elements will allow for the development of new theory as well as verifying issues rasied in the literature review. The data gathered in the expert interviews and case studies will provide the in-depth information that is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Methodology Approach</td>
<td>Implications for This Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The quantitative element allows for the testing of the potential success and failure factors and measures. This gives the findings some external validity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select a specific mixed method approach (which consist of either triangulation, embedded, exploratory and explanatory)</td>
<td>- The exploratory method represents the most appropriate method as it uses both elements to arrive at an overall interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a detailed purpose statement for the mixed methodology study</td>
<td>- Both the purpose and research question have already been identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop research question for both quantitative and qualitative elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse the data from both elements</td>
<td>- The first element is the qualitative aspect, which will contribute to identifying the appropriate success and failure factors and measures. Firstly, the expert interviews will be analysed, which will then feed in to the case studies. This will be analysed and will aid in designing the semi-structured questionnaires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validate the study</td>
<td>- Quantitative methods will be used to test the qualitative aspects. The information from the previous stage will aid in designing the survey. This will allow for the identified factors and measures to be further scrutinised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write the research report, which can be started before or during the research.</td>
<td>- The findings will be written up as the research is conducted as each element requires analysis before proceeding to the following stage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted From: Migiro and Magangi, 2011, p.3760)
3.4.2 Validity and Reliability Concerns

This section addresses the potential validity and reliability issues that affect this research. This section addresses three areas: construct validity, external validity (Onwuegbuzie and Johnson, 2006) and reliability.

Construct Validity

Construct validity refers to, “acceptance of a set of operations as an adequate definition of whatever is to be measured” (Conroy and Stichter, 2006, p. 143). In essence are the factors measuring what they intend to. In this case, as there have been no established factors that equate to the success or failure of FDI in TNE, a model needs to be developed. To articulate the appropriate factors to measure success and failure factors, the key constructs need to be identified, which refers to collating all the relevant information (Clark and Watson, 1995). Moreover, to ensure that the information collected is reputable, only well-recognised journals, conferences or authors are considered (all of which are demonstrated in the reference list).

To measure the items within a pool of items, Carpenter and Reilly (2006) suggest five methods of testing construct validity and these include 1) expert judges, 2) reliability statistics, 3) convergent reliability, 4) testing discriminant validity and 5) nomological network. Due to the emphasis on qualitative research, expert judges are used to gauge the importance of the constructs and verify the information collected from the pool of information. The experts are picked based on their knowledge of FDI in TNE. The purpose of using experts is to validate the potential success and failure factors identified in the literature review framework,
as well as to identify any new factors that were not made evident in the literature review chapter.

The final stage of testing the relationships is carried out using case studies and quantitative surveys. The case studies identify the prevalence of the success and failure factors in previous IBCs. This highlights the relevance of each identified construct in a “real life” situation while determining whether there are any causal relationships. The quantitative survey provides further external validity for these findings.

**External Validity**

External validity refers to the “ability to extend the research findings to other individuals with different or similar characteristics, behaviors, setting, and across time.... without external validity, the findings are exceedingly restricted” (Conroy and Stichter, 2006, p. 145–146). Basically, this refers to the extent to which the results can be generalised in the context of another population. Furthermore, it has been suggested that there are three threats to external validity (Cottrell and McKenzie, 2011; Royse, 2008; Wang *et al.*, 2011), which are addressed below.

Firstly, the interactive effect of testing and multiple-treatment interactions is considered, but this does not have a large impact on the proposed research for this thesis; as no testing is conducted on the target population. Thus, this reduces the possibility of respondents having increased awareness of the research area, above what they already know.
Secondly, selection bias is acknowledged, as the respondents are selected based on specific criteria rather than randomly. For example, for the expert surveys, knowledge of FDI in TNE is used, and the experience of either successful or failed IBCs investments dictates the sample for the case studies. This selection bias is crucial to address the research problem, as clear information is required. Therefore, applying random sampling is not practical. Moreover, the results of this research cannot be generalised to the success and failure factors of FDI in other industries. However, the results are intended to be generalised to the TNE population.

The final threat to external validity is the reactive effects of the arrangement, which refer to the conditions prevailing during the research e.g. the effect of using recording instruments, such as anxiety may cause the respondent to screen information. This raises issues, particularly, in the case study element of this research, as it is likely to involve a recording element to aid in transcribing and analysis. Thus, approaches are taken to advise the respondent of the recording in advance (which also fulfils ethical requirements). Although this may not reduce the effect of this with some respondents, the goal is to allow them to prepare for the situation and become less anxious as a result.

Reliability

With validity detailing the extent to which the findings are accurate; this section details the reliability issues for this research. It has been suggested that reliability identifies whether the results can be replicated in a similar situation (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982; Montello and Sutton, 2006). Furthermore, it has
been argued that research with low reliability is meaningless, as the results are likely to have occurred by chance (Montello and Sutton, 2006). Thus, to enhance the reliability of the research, five aspects have been highlighted (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982, p. 37) and these include:

1. Researcher’s status position.
2. Informant choices.
3. Social situations and conditions.
4. Analytic constructs and premises.
5. Methods of data collection and analysis.

The researcher’s status position examines the relationship between the researcher and the respondents, which dictates the flow of information. This issue is inherent in all qualitative research as it is difficult to collect identical information (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982) and thus, the results collected are dependent on the researcher. To reduce the effect of this, a consistent approach (Engel and Schutt, 2016) that is simple to follow (Walker, 2011) is adopted. This involves designing a set of guidelines for the expert survey and case studies, which in turn can be used by other researchers to replicate the study.

Following on from the researcher’s position, the informants’ choice refers to the people who are selected as participants, which is linked to the previous issue, as social associations can influence who is selected (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982). For the research to be conducted for this thesis, there is a selection bias due to the need for participants to have knowledge of FDI in TNE. This is
further emphasised during the case studies, as the participants need to have either a failed or successful experience of establishing a campus abroad. Thus, to increase reliability, information on the participants are detailed. This includes occupation, years of working in the higher education sector, association with regulatory bodies and the nature of their experience of FDI in TNE. This allows for a similar sample to be used if the study is to be replicated.

The third reliability consideration is the social situations, which suggest that participants act differently depending on the surroundings. For instance, a respondent may not voice opinions in a large group but would be more open in a one-to-one interaction. Thus, to increase reliability, the expert interviews are conducted using a Delphi technique, which reduces barriers to the respondents communicating by negating the effect of dominant participants (Riggs, 1983). Furthermore, the use of online techniques adds to the convenience of the respondent and provide an ideal situation to participate in. This also applies to the use of the online quantitative surveys. The case studies are based on a one-to-one interview, which was arranged at the convenience of the participant. However, given the geographical placement of the potential participants, the difference in time zones need to be factored in. Nonetheless, a one-to-one interview is best suited as it allows the participant to speak freely, especially on areas that may be more sensitive i.e. why an investment failed.

The final factor relates to the method of collecting and analysing data. Providing detailed information on this process increases the reliability of the research. Therefore, each stage is detailed and includes the method of collection, which includes:
• Collection medium (in this case, online surveys and one-to-one interviews).

• Method of recording.

• Use of any stimulus material.

• Location and situation.

After the data collection, the method of data analysis was also detailed, which includes what was used to analyse the data (i.e. the use of HyperResearch and Statistical Package for Social Science) and the output that is required.

In addition to these areas, which measure external reliability, there are also a set of internal reliability measures (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982). These include: multiple researchers, participant-researchers, peer examination and mechanically recorded data. The multiple researchers and peer examination refer to the addition of other researchers, which in this case is not relevant. However, the participant researcher technique and the recorded data is factored into this research. This is conducted by reviewing the data collected during the expert interviews and case studies with the participants, to ensure that the correct meaning is interpreted. Furthermore, the interviews for case studies is recorded to allow future analysis and transcribing. This ensures that all the relevant issues are covered.

A specific method for improving the reliability of quantitative research is the use of statistical testing (Elmes et al., 2011; Engel and Schutt, 2016; Onwuegbuzie and Johnson, 2006; Walker, 2011). This form of testing is difficult to implement with the qualitative elements of the research as they cannot be
measured. However, it is possible to apply these tests to the quantitative elements of the semi-structured and the expert surveys. Therefore, these tests are considered to identify if there are any applicable elements, which will benefit the research to be conducted for this thesis.

There are four types of statistical tests, which include 1) test-retest reliability, 2) parallel forms, 3) split half reliability and 4) coefficient alpha, which can be further classed as external (test 1 and 2) and internal reliability (tests 3 and 4). Despite these tests increasing reliability, it has been argued that the technique of ensuring external reliability contain flaws; in particular, the test-retest method, as the results of the retest tests may be the outcome of heightened awareness due to the first exposure to the test (Golafshani, 2003). Thus, the internal reliability tests are more appropriate. Furthermore, given the small sample (which is discussed later), the coefficient alpha reliability test is more applicable and is the most commonly used method of internal reliability (Christensen et al., 2014).

3.4.3 Research Plan

This research consists of six phases which include the three stages of data collection (as seen in Figure 18). Firstly, secondary research was undertaken to examine the current literature on FDI in TNE to identify potential success and failure factors. As a result, an initial framework was developed. Secondly, the three studies are conducted, which starts with expert interviews. This is carried out to validate the findings of the previous stage as well as revealing other
unidentified factors, which are crucial for the construct validity of this research (Carpenter and Reilly, 2006).

Following the expert interviews, the second study, which comprises a case study is implemented. The aim of this study is to identify whether the previously established success and failure factors (in study 1) are prevalent in real life cases, as well as identifying any overlooked factors. This involves analysing both successful and failed IBCs.

The final study involves quantitative surveys, which focus on identifying whether the factors apply to a wider population. Upon completion of the studies, the results are presented and discussed in relation to the defined research questions. This is followed by the final section, which concludes the findings and identifies the implication, the limitations and the potential for further research.
Figure 18: Research Plan Flow

- **Phase 1**: Secondary Research
  - Literature Review
    - Identify Relevant Success and Failure Factors and Measures
  - Study 1 Expert Interviews
    - Experts in TNE
    - Clarify and Identify New Success and Failure Factors and Measures
  - Study 2 Case Studies
    - Members of HEI who have experienced Successful and Failed FDI in TNE
    - Identify the prevalence of Success and Failure Factors and Measures
  - Study 3 Quantitative Surveys
    - HEI involved in FDI in TNE
    - Identify whether the Success and Failure Factors and Measures Apply in a broader context

- **Phase 2**: Primary Research (Exploratory and Confirmation)
  - Phase 2 (Exploratory)
  - Phase 2 (Confirmation)

- **Phase 3**: Primary Research (Exploratory)
  - Phase 3 (Exploratory)

- **Phase 4**: Primary Research (Confirmation)
  - Phase 4 (Confirmation)

- **Phase 5**: Presentation and Discussion of the Three Studies

- **Phase 6**: Conclusion, Limitations and Further Research

**Purpose**:
- **Research Method**: Analysis, Sample

**Study 1**
- Case Studies
- Expert Interviews

**Study 2**
- Case Studies

**Study 3**
- Quantitative Surveys

**Presentation of the Three Studies**

**Discussion of Findings in relation to Research Question**

**Conclusion and Implications**
3.4.4 Ethical Considerations

With the overview of the research discussed, a fundamental issue to address are the ethical considerations (Hesse-Biber, 2010; Leech and Onwuegbuzie, 2010), as it relates to how participants are treated (Creswell, 2009; Saks and Allsop, 2007; Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2009). Furthermore, the authors identify that it is the obligation of the researcher to protect and ensure the well-being of the participants. In addition, Creswell (2009) suggests that ethics should be considered at five stages and these include:

1. The Research Problem.
2. The Purpose and the Question.
3. Data Collection.
4. Data Analysis and Interpretation.
5. Writing and Disseminating Research.

The first two issues involve considering the purpose of the research, by demonstrating how they can benefit the people beyond the researcher’s well-being (Creswell, 2009). As a result, it is crucial to detail the purpose of the research to participants. Hence, they remain informed that the aim is to identify the success and failure factors of FDI in TNE.

A crucial element of the data collection is to ensure that the participants are not harmed. Thus, informed consent is needed (Creswell, 2009; Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2009). Furthermore, Creswell (2009) identified a series of issues that
require attention, which is detailed in Table 21. This demonstrates the different methods of ensuring that the data collection stage is conducted ethically.

**Table 21: Ethical Data Collection Practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Issue</th>
<th>Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The identification of the researcher and the institution will be detailed to the participant, along with the relevant contact information if any issues arise.</td>
<td>This will be achieved by providing the respondent with a detailed card as well as relevant identification to prove who they are. In addition, the participant will be notified of who will view the raw data and the final research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose and benefits of the research will be detailed</td>
<td>This will be detailed in the beginning of the research as well as the recruitment stage. Furthermore, this will provide the participant the opportunity to withdraw if need be. This will also include detailing the use of any recording devices such as voice recorders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any potential risk and the guarantee of confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level and type of involvement required as well as the assurance that the participant may withdraw.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The correct authorisation needs to be collected and the correct technique of dealing with sensitive information needs to be adopted.</td>
<td>This is a large issue during the case study, as the information divulged as to why an investment was successful may be sensitive. In a similar manner, the failure of an investment may contain sensitive information, which should not be expressed to others. Thus, upon receiving authorisation the participants will be reassured of confidentiality and to ensure that data is interpreted correctly, the results of the interview will be reviewed with the participant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the event a specific location is required to conduct the research; every care will be taken to ensure that the environment is undisturbed. This will be achieved by ensuring that the location remains in the same conditions at the end of the research process. Furthermore, the participants will be given the option to select a time most suitable for them; so that disturbance to their routines are kept to a minimum.

Following the ethical consideration for the data collection stage, the data analysis and interpretation are deliberated. Four key aspects that need to be considered during these two stages (Creswell, 2009) and these are detailed in Table 22. The key ethical issues at this juncture include protecting the identity of the participant, especially in the case where confidentiality has been agreed upon. Thus, participants are not referred to by their names. Instead, identifiers have been applied. Furthermore, how long the data is going to be stored, along with the ownership of it is detailed to the participants during the recruitment process as well as at the beginning of the interview process. Finally, to ensure the correct interpretation of the data, the results of each interview process have been reviewed by the participant.

Table 22: Ethical Data Analysis and Interpretation Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Issue</th>
<th>Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Identity Protection</td>
<td>To ensure participants are kept anonymous they will be referred to by an identification number. For instance, the participants in the expert interviews will be identified as S1, S1: R1, S1: R2 etc,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Issue</td>
<td>Implication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Information Storage</td>
<td>The recommended time to keep the data is 5-10 years, so for this project the data (which includes transcripts, notes and recording) will be stored on an external hard drive for a duration of five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct Interpretation of Data</td>
<td>This will be done by reviewing the data gathered with the participant which is a key aspect of establishing internal reliability (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of The Data</td>
<td>The participant will be made aware that the information will be property of the researcher but the participants will be granted access to their inputs if requested. This will be detailed during the recruitment and at the beginning of the interviews. Furthermore, the participant will be assured that the information will not be used for any other reason other than the purpose of this research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final area of consideration is the writing and dissemination of the research. This addresses the five areas recognised by Creswell (2009), which are detailed in Table 23. The main consideration when deriving the results is to ensure that the analysis reflects the results that were ascertained. Therefore, the results should not include any bias or falsification that may mislead the reader. Furthermore, the research techniques are detailed, which allows the reader to judge whether the study itself is credible. Finally, acknowledgement is given to those that have made significant contributions to this research.
Table 23: Ethical Writing and Research Dissemination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Issue</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that Information is not Misleading or Biased</td>
<td>This will be ensured by analysing the data as it appears. The data will not be falsified to meet the needs of the target audience. Furthermore, the anonymity of the research will reduce the bias of the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>All colleagues that are considered to have contributed a substantial amount of information will be recognised in the research and credit will be given accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility of Research Techniques</td>
<td>It has been suggested that the specifics of the research be detailed during the write up to allow the reader to form their own opinions on the reliability of the study. Therefore, all elements of each study will be presented in this research (Engel and Schutt, 2005; LeCompte and Goetz, 1982; Walker, 2011).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Research Studies

This section details the specific aspects of the three studies to be undertaken in this research, which are: expert interviews, case studies and quantitative surveys. This section includes issues such as definition, purpose, justification, limitation, description of the study, data analysis and implications.
3.5.1 Study 1: Expert Interviews using Delphi Technique

Purpose of Expert Interviews

Expert interviews consist of interviewing relevant figures based on their knowledge of the subject area (Imms and Ereaut, 2002; Schroiff, 2012), which in this case consist of experts in the field of TNE. Furthermore, it has been argued that the purpose of expert interviews is to ensure that no information is missing (Schroiff, 2012). Thus, this study utilises expert interviews to verify the knowledge established from the literature and identifies any factors that have not been addressed.

There are three methods of adopting expert interviews (Flick, 2009) and these include exploratory research, systematising research and theory generating research. This research uses expert interviews in both a systematising and exploratory manner. Firstly, the study verifies information from the literature review, and secondly, the exploratory element addresses any areas that have been omitted and yet are fundamental to this research. This is likely to occur as literature tends to be dated and experts have a practical and current knowledge base of TNE.

The expert interviews are conducted using an Expert Delphi Technique (EDT). This provides further information on factors that influence FDIs within TNE, in addition to verifying the data previously collected during the secondary research. However, before addressing the issues with adopting an EDT, it needs to be defined; thus:
“Delphi may be characterized as a method for structuring a group communication process so that the process is effective in allowing a group of individuals, as a whole, to deal with a complex problem. To accomplish this “structured communication” there is provided: some feedback of individual contributions of information and knowledge; some assessment of the group judgment or view; some opportunity for individuals to revise views; and some degree of anonymity for the individual responses.” (Okoli and Pawlowski, 2004, p. 16)

Furthermore, the EDT usually begins with a broad question, which is then refined based on the responses of the experts. Thus, the aim is to achieve a consensus on the topic at hand, which, in this case, refers to FDI in TNE (Gerald and Cluskey, 2008; Powell, 2003).

**Justification for the use of Expert Delphi Technique**

The use of EDT for the expert interviews enables researchers to gain in-depth information while maintaining a high level of flexibility (Flick, 2009; Gerald and Cluskey, 2008; Saylor *et al.*, 2015). In addition, it has been suggested that expert interviews are valuable as a complementary method of research for designing the instruments for later stages of research, which can be used for triangulation (Flick, 2009) and experts may have up to date knowledge based on experience (Weinreich *et al.*, 2015), which is not currently in the literature. Both these elements are crucial for verifying the findings from the literature review while incorporating new ideas. As a result, it ensures that the key elements are included in the subsequent studies of the research.

With the justification of using expert interviews discussed, the reason for adopting an EDT is addressed. The EDT comprises of various benefits that overcome a range of issues associated with other group interview techniques,
which include not requiring face-to-face interactions, reducing the impact of dominant personalities and combining views of respondents spread out geographically (Powell, 2003; Riggs, 1983). Thus, demonstrating that by adopting an EDT, the research for this thesis benefits from less screened information by reducing issues of group dynamics and reaching a larger sample due to the reduced barriers to access.

In addition to reducing issues associated with group interviews, other benefits include the method being both cost effective and a versatile research approach (Gerald and Cluskey, 2008; Powell, 2003). The versatility of the EDT is derived from the ability to incorporate the responses of the entire group before proceeding to the next set of questions, which is a key benefit over traditional face-to-face interviews. This allows for specific points to be elaborated on, as well as ensuring that all individuals are asked the same questions, which increases consistency. This contrasts with traditional interviews, where questions may be adapted over time as themes arise. However, there is the need to have a consistent group that is willing to participate until the end because this approach requires a greater time commitment, i.e. there are a series of iterations (Gerald and Cluskey, 2008; Powell, 2003).

Limitations of Expert Delphi Technique

There are various limitations of the Expert Delphi Technique (EDT), which stems from this research being qualitative, such as it being time-consuming, lack of structure and little quantifiable data (Mariampolski, 2001). However, this is the
nature of this type of research and it is necessary to achieve the desired results of this study.

There are several limitations of EDT, which need to be considered. For instance, the need to identify the right expert as well as having access to be able to interview them (Flick, 2009). Selecting the right interviewees is crucial as it dictates the information that will be collected, which must be both reliable, relevant and “information rich” (Patton, 1990). Furthermore, inaccurate information at this stage will damage the subsequent stages as they are based on this study and the literature review. As for the ability to interview, the experts have certain constraints, such as increased time demands, requisite for a higher level of expertise from the interviewer, higher demand for confidentiality, issues of refusing to answer sensitive information, consent issues for recording and the dilution of results (Fitzsimmons and Fitzsimmons, 2001; Flick, 2009; Kezar and Maxey, 2016; Powell, 2003).

To address the various issues, the following has been implemented. Firstly, by adopting an online method for EDT, the participant can respond at their convenience, which reduces the time demand of this study for them. However, a time limit is applied to remain within the research constraints. Secondly, the respondents are addressed in a professional manner, which is achieved by piloting the questions before they are dispatched. Thirdly, in addition to adopting a professional manner, other issues, such as confidentiality, refusal to answer and use of recording equipment are considered. Hence, the respondents are given complete confidentiality; this is fulfilled by not divulging individual responses and identities to other participants. However, it has been argued that this can reduce the accountability of the views expressed (Powell, 2003). Finally,
there are no recording instruments, as the responses are collected using an online medium.

In addition to the limitations, there are a series of factors that can lead to the failure of EDT (Flick, 2009) and overcoming these issues is essential. Hence, Table 24 details these potential failures and the possible methods to address them. Furthermore, the previously mentioned issues of maintaining a group and reducing dropouts need to be factored in. This is achieved by analysing and posting questions in a timely manner to reduce the overall time needed while keeping the respondent’s mind on the topic.

Table 24: Expert Survey Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert Survey Issue</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| During the study, it becomes apparent that the respondent is not an expert in TNE. | - This will be overcome by detailing the description of an expert, which will be marked off to ensure they can be categorised as an expert.  
- Furthermore, the individuals will be given an overview of the research; this will give them an idea of the research, and giving them the opportunity to judge whether they can address issues within TNE.  
- In addition, snowball sampling will also be utilised so the judgement of the respondent can also be used. |
<p>| The individual referring to specific matters related to them rather than the topic generally. | - The EDT will allow individuals to answer each question freely. This is essential for qualitative research.                                                                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert Survey Issue</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The individual may refer to themselves (privately) rather than their knowledge of the area.</td>
<td>- Given that the EDT poses questions based on responses it makes it possible to dictate the direction of the interviews, whilst incorporating new ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The possibility of a ‘rhetoric interview’, which involves individuals lecturing on the topic in general; rather than addressing the relevant topic</td>
<td>(Adapted From: Flick, 2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Expert Interviews**

**Sample Selection**

The first problem to address is sampling, which consists of two elements; the sampling scheme and size (Migiro and Magangi, 2011). They respectively refer to the strategy taken to select the unit and the number of units that are needed. Thus, all sampling sections in each of the studies address both areas.

The size of the sample for using EDT is dependent on the problem (Powell, 2003). Research suggests that a desirable size for EDT is 20 (Day and Bobeva, 2005; Hsu and Sandford, 2007; Skulmoski *et al.*, 2007); thus this is the target for this thesis. This provides a good balance between time and cost for conducting this study. However, a higher number of experts are recruited to factor in the potential for dropouts, which in education research can range from 29% (Frankena *et al.*, 2016) to 70% (Maston, 2011). Furthermore, it has been suggested that in the case of consensus research, there is little research as to whether more respondents will increase reliability or validity (Boje and
Murnighan, 1982; Brockhoff, 1975; Powell, 2003). Instead, the focus should be on the quality of the expert.

As previously identified, the quality of the experts is crucial as they need to be “information rich” (Patton, 1990). Thus, it is essential to determine the criteria that define an expert (Flick, 2009; Powell, 2003), which include:

- Competent people in a subject area
  - This includes individuals who have worked in TNE or are academics in the subject area.

- Has practical experience as well as a theoretical knowledge
  - This includes individuals who are aware of TNE but also work in the industry and therefore, have a practical view of the subject, which are also important to the findings.

- Are often “professionals” within a specific organisation
  - From the literature review, key bodies include UNCTAD and the OBHE.

In addition to meeting these criteria, a wide range of experts are recruited, as it has been argued that having a diverse group, which has several perspectives on a problem, is beneficial (Powell, 2003). Furthermore, to aid in identifying participants, it has been suggested that the literature can be a key indicator of relevant experts (Davis and Wagner, 2003; Weinreich, 2010), which includes regularly cited authors, key bodies and association in TNE.
In addition to identifying the criteria that define an expert, it has been suggested that this only represents a minor aspect. Instead, it has been argued that recruiting experts to be in the sample is another equally difficult issue (Flick, 2009; Gerald and Cluskey, 2008; Powell, 2003). Thus, generating motivation to be part of the sample needs to be considered. Therefore, experts may be enticed to participate, in exchange for the results of the study as an incentive. However, this assumes that participants will be interested in the results.

With the specifics of the sample being detailed, the method of sampling for this study needs to be discussed. The EDT utilises a non-random sampling method for selection, due to specific knowledge being required. This stage utilises theory based sampling, which means that groups or individuals are purposefully selected because they will aid in developing a theory (Migiro and Magangi, 2011; Patton, 1990). This is further supported by the argument that the respondents themselves are not important; instead, their ability to provide knowledge on the area is far more crucial (Flick, 2009). On a final note, the snowball sampling technique has been adopted wherever possible to identify additional experts, as it has been suggested that participants are often selected based on referrals (Kolb, 2008).

**Planning the Expert Delphi Technique**

This section focuses on the issues that need to be addressed before the interview can begin, which consists of recruitment and interview design. It has been argued that the former is crucial as it can adversely affect the validity of the research if the wrong respondents are selected (Mariampolski, 2001). Thus, it is
essential to follow the criteria mentioned in the above sampling section to identify experts.

The first consideration is the recruitment of experts, which involves contacting relevant bodies, associations and HEIs that are considered to have experts in TNE, but more specifically, IBCs. The key agencies and associations that have been identified, which are used as a starting point, are as follows: UNCTAD, the Observatory of Borderless Higher Education and the British Council. Following the identification of experts within these organisations, they were contacted through emails, which details every aspect of the research. An additional consideration is the effect of gatekeepers that may restrict access to the right experts. Thus it is crucial to gain the support of gatekeepers, as they can reduce the time needed by researchers to recruit respondents.

The details of the research are given to the respondent, which include several aspects (as seen in Appendix 1). Firstly, the aim and objectives of the research are presented, along with the role that the expert plays in achieving them. Secondly, the method of conducting EDT is detailed; this allows the respondent to identify whether they can participate in the research. Furthermore, the number of rounds are highlighted, as this requires a longer time commitment than one-off interviews. Thirdly, the respondent is informed that communications are to be conducted through an electronic medium. In addition, the respondent is assured confidentiality, which includes informing the participant how the data is used and who can access it. The issues addressed above relate primarily to informing the participants, which should increase the transparency of the research to be conducted.
The second aspect, interview design, is critical as the information collected is dependent on this. Moreover, the expert surveys comprise of several stages of questioning, and each round requires planning. To achieve this, each round of questions is tested; which has been argued to be beneficial to reduce any ambiguity that a question may have (Powell, 2003). Thus, testing is conducted by piloting the questions to gauge how the questions are interpreted, rather than their ability to answer the question. This should clarify whether the questions result in the right data being collected.

Managing the Expert Delphi Technique

Following the planning of the interviews, the next consideration is how to manage the EDT. This study comprises sequential rounds of questioning and it has been suggested that the number of rounds is dependent on the aim of the project, but typically there are three stages (Powell, 2003). This section addresses the stages of the EDT.

The first round often comprises of questions based on the general topic, which allows the respondent to illustrate as many potential factors as possible, which can later be further explored (Gerald and Cluskey, 2008; Powell, 2003). For this study, this identifies the potential success and failure factors of FDI in TNE. The proceeding stages of questions are based on the responses of the previous round (as seen in Figure 19).
Following the initial question, each subsequent iteration will build upon and elaborate on the responses from the previous stage, with a focus on where opinions converge. However, to ensure that the expert interviews stay on topic, a general aim for each round of questions has been determined (as seen in Figure 20). As a result, there is likely to be a maximum of four rounds, which may be excessive, as it has been argued that the number of rounds is dependent on the balancing cost, time and respondent fatigue (Powell, 2003). Therefore, wherever possible, the rounds have been reduced, provided it does not compromise the data that is to be collected.
Figure 20: Rounds of Questions for The Expert Interviews

- **Round 1:** Open Question on the Success and Failure Factors of FDI in TNE
- **Round 2:** Open and Closed Questions to identify Factors and Measures
- **Round 3:** Open and Closed Questions to verify Factors and Measures
- **Round 4:** Open and Closed Questions to address additional issues, if needed.

The final consideration is how the interviews are conducted. The emails are first distributed to introduce the researcher and the topic being researched, which also includes specifying the respondent’s rights (i.e. anonymity, right to refuse an answer and the use of the data) and requesting consent to use the data collected. This is followed by the initial open question on the topic. Furthermore, respondents are given a time limit of five days to respond, following which, seven days are spent analysing the responses before the next question is posted. The rounds continue this process until the final stage, where any issues that require additional elaboration are addressed. Finally, after the analysis of all responses, all participants are sent a review, which allows for verification and highlights any issue that may need amendments.

**Data Analysis of Expert Interviews**

With the relevant matters associated with managing the EDT addressed, this section focuses on how the data is analysed. The techniques for analysing
the data collected include: content analysis, ethnography, grounded theory, phenomenology and historical research (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005). The purpose of each method is detailed in Table 25.

**Table 25: Qualitative Research Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Method</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography</td>
<td>Focus on the culture of a group from an ‘insiders’ point of view. In this method, the researcher as instrument is used (Polit and Beck, 2004; Silverman, 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounded Theory</td>
<td>The aim of this method is to identify the theoretical perceptions grounded in the data. This approach uses constant comparisons and compares data obtained earlier for analysis and comparison (Polit and Beck, 2004). Additionally, the aim of the research is to explore new dimensions of theory (Streubert and Carpenter, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenology</td>
<td>This aims to identify the meaning or understand phenomena experienced by people. Thus, researchers are open to meaning attributed to them by people who have experienced it (Polit and Beck, 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Research</td>
<td>This involves identifying the facts and relationships about past events (Polit and Beck, 2004).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content analysis is usually adopted to identify themes in unstructured questionnaires and is mainly used to analyse written, verbal or visual communications, which usually consists of categorising the related data into themes or categories for the purpose of developing models (Elo and Kyngäs, 2008). For this study, it has been used to verify the model developed in the literature review. However, this method has been criticised for being simplistic.
and unable to provide statistical analysis (Elo and Kyngäs, 2008; Polit and Beck, 2004). Nonetheless, the inductive approach to this method (grounded theory) is adopted for this study, as it is an accepted method to be used alongside the EDT (Powell, 2003).

There are two methods of conducting content analysis, which are inductive or deductive (Elo and Kyngäs, 2008). Furthermore, the authors suggest that the inductive approach is best suited for theory development, whereas deductive is for theory testing. Thus, this research uses an inductive approach to analyse the data, which is also known as the grounded theory (Zhang and Wildemuth, 2009). This comprises of five stages (Elo and Kyngäs, 2008; Taylor-Powell and Renner, 2003), which are detailed in Figure 21. The main benefit of this approach is the ability to summarise a large amount of data into smaller categories (Silverman, 2006). However, the author does recognise that the predetermined categories negate to factor in issues outside of them. Thus, it is important to ensure that the data is categorised properly and factors in problems that are related to each category.
Cognitive mapping is the process of presenting the relationships between elements in a given context and illustrates the links between attributes that have been identified, which improves the understanding of a complex phenomenon (Montazemi and Conrath, 1986). In most cases, identified nodes and linkages tend to be subjective and is based on the perceptions of the interviewer (Tegarden and Sheetz, 2003). The use of mapping tools has been widely
employed in numerous contexts, which include economics, marketing and more pertinently, education (Davies, 2011; Tegarden and Sheetz, 2003).

Cognitive mapping contains elements of content analysis and procedural mapping (Tegarden and Sheetz, 2003) and it is essential to define the purpose of the model to be developed to avoid the model from growing too much (Montazemi and Conrath, 1986). There are three methods of mapping (Davies, 2011; Siau and Tan, 2005), which include causal mapping, semantic mapping and concept mapping. Semantic mapping is used for this analysis as the only causal link is related to success. Thus, a central factor is identified along with contributing sub-factors, which highlight linkages. However, Davies (2011) suggests that the limitations of the links are simplistic as it does not reflect complex linkages between nodes, which is overcome by using concept mapping.

To complete this analysis successfully, a range of factors need to be considered (Taylor-Powell and Renner, 2003), which the authors suggest include 1) checking the data, 2) adding the ID numbers, 3) preparing data for analysis, 4) making copies and 5) identifying the source of information. These can also be implemented in the case studies, as they relate to qualitative data. Finally, there are two issues to avoid when analysing the data with this approach (Taylor-Powell and Renner, 2003). Firstly, generalisations need to be avoided which can be achieved through the identification of codes for each respondent in isolation. Secondly, the quotes need to be selected carefully, which can be accomplished by identifying the purpose of each quote and what it adds to the analysis (i.e. in what way does it highlight a success or failure factor).
Justification for the use of Electronic Software

It has been suggested that the use of computer software in the analysis is beneficial for researchers as it increases speed, consistency and rigour (Jones, 2007b; Weitzman, 1999). Also, Weitzman (1999) recognised the several uses of computer software, which includes editing, coding, storage, content analysis, data display, conclusion drawing and verification, theory building, visual mapping and report writing. The various uses identified benefits the analysis of the data collected in this study. Data from the EDT is analysed using HyperRESEARCH, a key tool for analysing qualitative data (Gibbs, 2014; Woods et al., 2016).

Implications of Expert Interviews for the General Findings and Study 2

Once analysed, the data collected is used to identify the success and failure factors, success measures and the framework, which can be compared to the conceptual framework to determine the key similarities and differences. The data contributes to the case studies by establishing a foundation to create a research instrument and provide insight into additional categories for the analysis if applicable. The aim is to verify whether literature and the EDT present factors and measures that are also apparent in actual IBCs.
3.5.2 Study 2: Case Studies

With the first study being addressed, the details of the Case Study (CS) has been highlighted in this section. This includes the method of using the data collected from the previous study, as well as discussing the issues related to the previous headings.

Purpose of the Case Studies

The aim of the CSs is to test themes developed as a result of the literature review and the EDT. These are conducted to identify the success and failure factors of FDIs in TNE based on actual operational and closed IBCs. Similar to the EDT, a qualitative method is adopted to gain in-depth knowledge of a particular behaviour and why it occurs (Gravetter and Forzano, 2015; Noor, 2008), which in this case, is the success or failure of previous FDI in TNE. Moreover, a quantitative approach does not provide the depth of knowledge that is required at this stage.

The qualitative method that is conducted in this study is mini case research using interviews, which Bonoma (1985, p. 199) indicates that

“Case research, as the term is used here, refers to the qualitative and field-based construction of case studies. It is guided by a process model of discovery which leads to (1) a set of theoretical generalizations from the clinical observations, (2) clinical "constraint testing" of these generalizations, and eventually (3) a clinically validated theory of some marketing phenomenon.”

Furthermore, Yin (2006; 2011) suggested that there are three criteria for using CSs, which include the type of research question, the emphasis needed to examine the phenomena, and evaluations. Thus, the rationale for using case
research for this study is due to the specific aim of understanding a particular phenomenon (i.e. what makes IBC successful) in TNE.

There are three types of CSs, which are explanatory, exploratory and descriptive. Furthermore, a decision of whether to use a single or multiple case approach needs to be decided (Yin, 1994). This research adopts an exploratory approach as there is limited literature that suggests which factors lead to the success or failure of FDI in TNE. Additionally, a multiple CS approach is used as this method is more robust (Yin, 1994), and this research requires the examination of both successful and failed investment.

Overall, the case research method suits this study as it allows for the identification of factors that impact the success or failure of FDIs in TNE, which provides an opportunity to compare a variety of situations from both successful and failed IBCs in “real” life situations.

**Justification for the use of Case Studies**

It has been suggested that CSs are the most appropriate method when adopting the post-positivism paradigm (Healy and Perry, 2000). Additionally, the use of the CS approach can be further justified, as other researchers on TNE adopts this method (Feast and Bretag, 2005). However, viewpoints can be subjective and will vary based on the sample. Nonetheless, CSs are best suited for situations that require a “how” or “why” question (Yin, 2009), which suits the purpose of this study, as the aim is to understand why IBCs have succeeded or failed. Furthermore, there are four benefits of the knowledge collected from CSs (Merriam and Tisdell, 2015), which are as follows:
- More concrete owing to it being based on the respondents’ experience; thus making a more vivid, tangible and sensory perception.

- More contextual as the responses are based on the context i.e. based on the context of success and failures.

- More developed by the readers’ interpretation as readers incorporate their understanding that leads to generalisations when new data is added.

- Based more on the reference population.

Other advantages of CSs include exploring alternative meanings and interpretations, the ability to archive information for future research, changing practices and being more persuasive and accessible (Blaxter et al., 2010). Furthermore, it has been argued that CSs are ideal for theory building (Barratt et al., 2011; Dooley, 2002) for a variety of reasons that include the ability to incorporate quantitative elements and view the phenomena from multiple perspectives. Additionally, the possibility of theory building increases as the case study progresses. Moreover, it has been argued that data collected from CSs are sharper, and can be used as a basis for statistical analysis (George and Bennett, 2005). Thus, it represents this study’s contribution to the final stage of data collection, as the results are tested statistically.

For this research, CSs are beneficial as it collects in-depth information on IBCs based on the respondent’s experience (which emulates a “practical” situation rather than a theoretical one), which aids in identifying the success and failure factors that can then be tested statistically.
Limitations of the Case Studies

There are several disadvantages of using a case research method. This includes the increased difficulty of analysing complex cases derived from the researcher identifying everything as relevant (Blaxter et al., 2010). Besides, CSs can be considered as a last resort to testing the worthiness of a topic as a research area, which may be due to the research procedures being less credible (Yin, 2009). However, for this research, it is used to verify information that can be utilised in the next study.

There is a range of limitations that directly impact this study that needs to be addressed, which include the sensitive nature of the information, language barriers and the ability to identify the right respondents.

Firstly, a fundamental barrier for this study is the sensitive nature of the information. For instance, respondents are less willing to discuss a failed investment. Therefore, it is essential to ensure confidentiality (which protects the respondents), detail the purpose of the research and clarify how the data is used.

Secondly, the language barriers may impact the ability to communicate with those interviewed. This barrier is inevitable as HEIs and relevant TNE bodies are spread across a wide geographic area. Thus, to overcome this, the interviews are conducted with respondents who speak English. This is justified based on the assumption that most respondents from IBCs can speak English, given the high percentage of IBCs that originate from Western countries. However, in the event of a language issue, a translator is used.

The final issue is the ability to identify the correct respondents within the HEIs who can provide quality information on both successful and failed
investments. The primary sampling criteria for this study is the need for respondents to have previously had an active role in investing in an IBC. Therefore, criteria need to be created, such as their experience of FDI and whether they were involved with a successful or failed investment. Furthermore, to aid in finding the correct respondent, experts from the previous stages are asked if they can recommend or detail any relevant people for this sample. This section has raised a variety of limitations that needs to be addressed, and these are detailed in Table 26.

Table 26: Case Study Limitations Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitation</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complexity during Analysis</td>
<td>The use of computer software will aid in analysing the data, which as established benefits researchers by reducing the time needed. Furthermore, with regards to the relevant data being selected the codes will be scrutinised to identify the importance of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Issues</td>
<td>To identify the context issues, the questions will be targeted to gain the responses needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>The procedures will be fully documented, and the questions will set out to answer the questions rather than validate information that the researcher has. This will reduce any researcher bias in the questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>English speaking respondents will be targeted; however, if needed a translator will be called upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>The respondents will be based on Becker’s (2009) and C-Bert’s (2015) list of successful and failed branch campuses. In addition, where possible respondents will be asked to recommend respondents that would be willing to participate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Selection

Following the previous section highlighting both the benefits and constraints of using CSs, the focus now turns to sampling. Furthermore, with the main sampling theory being detailed in the previous study, this section details the scheme and size of the sample for this study only.

A fundamental sampling issue for this study is derived from the small number of failed investments. It has been recognised that there is a total of 277 IBCs (C-BERT, 2015; Becker, 2009; OBHE, 2011). From these campuses, 26 (20 at the time interviews were carried out) have closed (C-BERT, 2015; OBHE, 2011), which represent failed investments; the remainder of the campuses are assumed to be successful or at the very least, remain in operation. Thus, there are a minute number of failed investments in comparison to the successful ones, which is an issue in the event respondents from the failed investments reject to participate. Consequentially, the results only illustrate success and failure factors from the viewpoint of successful investments. Hence, the failure elements may not accurately reflect a “real” life situation. Therefore, incentives are provided for their participation, which is going to be the results of this study initially, followed by the overall ones.

Regardless of the availability of respondents, there is the suggestion that a comprehensive background of the case should be compiled before interviews begin, which normally derives from secondary sources (Darke et al., 1998). It is advisable to utilise multiple sources when constructing case studies, which can include interviews, observations and archival sources (Barratt et al., 2011; Baxter and Jack, 2008; Patton, 1990). The use of multiple sources allows for triangulation and increases the reliability of the data (Hyer et al., 1999; Voss et
However, an issue that may arise is the collection of an overwhelming amount of data, which requires a means of systematically organising the data and objectively assessing the information concerning its ability to address the research questions (Baxter and Jack, 2008; Darke et al., 1998). While a concentrated effort is made to identify the respondents (especially in the case of failed campuses), in the event, this is not possible; only secondary sources have been used to construct a case study of a campus.

The sample size of the qualitative research is not fixed as the number of participants required is typically established as the research progresses (Marshall, 1996). However, Patton (1990) suggests that any of the purposeful techniques for sampling can be used in this instance. Furthermore, cases are chosen that either predicts similar results or contrary results (Yin, 1994). Pertinent to this research, the use of polar extreme-types is employed in cases that have sharply contrasting characteristics (i.e. success and failure) (Miles and Huberman, 1984; Pettigrew, 1990). Additionally, theoretical saturation determines the sample size, but there are suggestions that the upper limit of 12 is suitable due to the cost and anything more than 15 makes the research unwieldy (Miles and Huberman, 1984; Perry, 1998). Therefore, an initial sample size of n = 10 is used as a guideline, which includes five successes and failures. Furthermore, selecting the right amount of cases allows themes to develop and ensures that a range of information can be collected while balancing the cost and not collecting excessive amounts of data. Finally, the sampling method for this study is quota sampling, and convenience sampling as a fair representation of both successful and failed investments need to be included, and not all campuses are willing to participate, given the sensitive nature of the research.
Furthermore, four criteria have been identified, which detail the appropriate number of CSs to conduct and when to cease interviewing (Dooley, 2002). These include exhaustion of sources, saturation of categories, an emergence of irregularities and overextensions. Therefore, these criteria are considered before additional interviews are conducted to evaluate the impact that the results will have.

**Planning the Case Studies**

There are several stages to consider when conducting CS research (Dooley, 2002; Noor, 2008). Furthermore, Noor (2008) suggests a potential sequential process when conducting CSs (as seen in Figure 22). This section details the preliminary stages, with the remaining stages being detailed in the following two sections.
The first stage of this process is to formulate a theory, which is achieved by extensively analysing literature along with consulting professionals and experts in the area (Noor, 2008). For this study, the literature review and study 1 achieves this.

As indicated, it is expected that failed campuses are not likely to participate. Thus, a means of identifying suitable failed campuses is required. In 2014 (the time when the interviews took place), 20 IBCs were no longer in operation and had closed. From these, a search was conducted on each of the institutions to assess the availability, volume and usability (i.e. language of the available sources). Consequently, five HEIs were identified as having enough
information to form an initial background for the foundation of a CS. However, to conform to anonymity, these have not been identified. The IBCs were then selected based on their willingness to participate in an interview and to ensure a good variation of host and home countries.

Along with formulating a theory, cases need to be selected. This has been addressed in the sampling section of this study. Thus, the recruitment issue is the focal point to be discussed. The respondents are recruited using emails to allow for different time zones, which provide them with greater convenience. The email outlines the aims of the research, ethical consent and the specifics of how the interviews will be conducted (see Appendix 2). If the respondent agrees, a mutual time is agreed upon, and necessary equipment is collected.

The final stage of design is the piloting of the questions, which is achieved by testing the questions with the academic staff at the University of Plymouth. This is done for convenience and to ensure that the potential samples are not aware of the questions, which could bias their answers (Golafshani, 2003). The aim of the test is to identify whether the questions depict the correct meaning or whether they can be interpreted in an alternative manner. This is achieved by testing the questions with three academic members of the staff.

Managing the Case Studies

This section discusses the following stage of the process detailed in Figure 22, which is the fieldwork and analysis stage. It has been suggested that each case should be examined on their own (Dooley, 2002). Therefore, each case is treated in isolation. Furthermore, the case studies are carried out using
interviews, which allows the respondents to elaborate on their answers. The following paragraphs detail the interviewing process as seen in Figure 23 (and see Appendix 2 for the interview guide).

**Figure 23: Case Study Interview Flow**

The interviews begin with the introduction of the researcher, the aim of the research and gaining ethical consent (including the consent to record). Sequentially, the open questions are asked, for which the respondents are given the opportunity to elaborate on their answer and discuss the factors that contributed to the success or failure of the IBC. Once all the questions have been addressed, the interview is concluded. This includes allowing the respondent to identify any other key areas not already addressed, which can reveal other
potential success and failure factors. Following this, the notes, along with the interview, is read back to the respondent and ultimately a copy of the analysis is sent to ensure that the correct meaning has been taken from the responses.

**Data Analysis of Case Studies**

Before the data can be analysed, each interview needs to be transcribed. Although the interviews are already partially analysed to allow respondents to verify the findings, the transcripts and coding are used for the cross-case analysis.

Two methods have been suggested for analysing case study data: structural and reflective analysis (Constable, 2016; Dooley, 2002). Firstly, structural analysis is designed to analyse data with the purpose of identifying themes and is similar to grounded theory. Secondly, reflective analysis is dependent on the judgement of the researcher, rather than the development of categories and is associated with phenomenology. Thus, for this research, structural analysis is conducted, which adopts the inductive content analysis method detailed in Figure 21. Furthermore, there are three analysing techniques: comparing empirically based patterns with predicted one(s), explanation building and time series data (Yin, 1994). The latter is the most appropriate as Yin (1994) highlights that this technique is suited for identifying, the potential causes of a particular outcome. Therefore, this approach aids in identifying the factors that result in a successful or failed investment.

The cases are analysed individually, which is essential and should precede the cross-case analysis (Perry, 1998). The author further suggests that
the individual CS analysis is more descriptive. Thus, it consists of identifying codes within the data and categorising them. Therefore, the aim is to determine the themes in each case, which can then be used for comparison in the cross-case analysis (see Figure 24), which allows for triangulation and strengthens the findings (Dooley, 2002).

**Figure 24: Cross Case Analysis Flow**

![Cross Case Analysis Flow Diagram](image)

**Implications of the Case Studies for the General Findings and Study 3**

The aim of this study is to establish whether the identified success and failure factors from the expert surveys and literature are present in real life situations. Through analysing each case, a range of themes can be developed. Furthermore, the unique perspective of each respondent provides a broad view of the research, which enables the identification of practical success and failure factors of FDI in TNE. This can then be tested in the next study. The factors
defined in this study are used to develop the research instrument in the semi-structured questionnaires, which tests the factors in a wider population and provides additional external validity.

3.5.3 Study 3: Quantitative Survey

This section details the final study, which utilises a semi-structured questionnaire. Similar to the previous studies, the purpose, justification, limitations and description of the survey are discussed.

Purpose of the Quantitative Survey

The final study is the Quantitative Survey (QS), which is used to add statistical validity to the research. The QS is used to address how important the identified success and failure factors are to HEIs when considering FDIs in a wider population. The information collected from Study 1 and 2 of this research is used to develop the research instrument.

QSs Furthermore, it has been recognised that QS is used in exploratory research and usually aim to elicit a specific response using a guided list of questions (Schensul et al., 1999). Hence, it can be used to identify the importance of the factors that influence the outcome of FDI in TNE.

Justification for the use of Online Quantitative Surveys

With the purpose of using QS addressed, this section discusses the rationale behind adopting an online survey. Firstly, the advantages of the
questionnaires include standardised responses, being quick and easy and the use of larger samples (Sale et al., 2002). Secondly, there are several advantages associated with using web surveys, which include lower costs, more design options and less data entry time (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Fan and Yan, 2010). Additionally, and important for this study, is that this technique allows access to unique populations (Wright, 2005). Given that IBCs are geographically dispersed, this is a key advantage. In contrast, the drawbacks of web survey include low response rates and bias against those who are not computer literate (Couper, 2000; Fricker and Schonlau, 2002), which can impact the quality (Crawford et al., 2001).

**Limitations of Semi Structured Quantitative Surveys**

Along with the benefits of this approach for this study, there are also a series of limitations. It has been suggested that the main limitation of QS is the ability of the interviewer to bias the questions (Bless et al., 2006; Walsh, 2003). The bias is introduced if the researcher seeks to verify his/her opinion or incorporates additional information when administering the questionnaire. However, this study uses the internet to conduct the survey and therefore, the possibility of bias is reduced. In this case, the key concern is to ensure that the questions themselves are not biased. This can be achieved by pre-testing the questionnaires to ensure that this does not occur. Furthermore, despite online surveys having several advantages and reducing bias; response rates can be low (Bryman and Bell, 2015; McGivern, 2009).
Sample Selection

Following the benefits and constraints being addressed, this section discusses the sampling considerations for this study. The QS is conducted online as the sample is likely to be spread out geographically. As established, there are 277 IBCs, but more importantly, there are 205 unique HEIs (C-BERT, 2015), which highlights the small population size and is likely to result in a small sample. Two facets are considered regarding the sample size, which is the population size and the statistical test to be employed. In the case of the latter, descriptive statistics and frequencies do not require a minimum size.

The sample can be established based on the population size, confidence level and the margin of error. It is advisable to use a 95% confidence level with a 5% margin of error, which equates to 134 (65% of the population; a response rate of 1:1.5). However, this may be unattainable given the research suggests that the average response rate is approximately 36% (around 1:3) (Sheehan, 2001). However, response rates can be impacted by many aspects (i.e. incentives and follow-up calls), which can increase the response rate to between 40–70% but at the same time, long descriptive surveys can reduce this number down by 10–25% (Sauermann and Roach, 2013). Notwithstanding, an average between the desired and average response rate is 50.2% (approximately 1:2 or n = 103).

The sampling method used is judgemental sampling as the respondents need to fulfil certain criteria i.e. having experienced an FDI in TNE. The judgemental element determines whether the experience that the respondent has had is sufficient to be included in the sample. Furthermore, it is possible that these investments are likely to involve several people in one HEI. Therefore, a maximum of two participants are included from each institution, to avoid over-
representation of any one HEI. Finally, given that there is a relatively small sample, snowball sampling is used to access further respondents if required.

Planning the Quantitative Surveys

The first issue to consider is the design of the QS, which is based on the previous two studies. Thus, the questionnaires include the success and failure factors that would affect the outcome of FDI in TNE from both a theoretical and a practical viewpoint. This section addresses the scales and the design of the web survey.

There are many arguments surrounding scale development, namely the number of points to be used and the inclusion or omission of a mid-point. The former has a greater impact on the survey design. Traditionally, scales utilised are either five or seven points (Dawes, 2008), which suggest that it is standard practice to utilise a mid-point. Furthermore, Garland (1991) suggests that despite considering the implications of adopting either approach, ultimately the use of a mid-point is based on the preference of the researcher.

The appropriate number of scale points is a key area of dispute within the literature (Dawes, 2008; Pearse, 2011), with scale points ranging from two to twenty-one. Given the need to understand the respondent’s attitude to the various success factors, a minimum of five points needs to be used, as this will measure both the direction and intensity of the response (Alwin, 1997). However, at five points, the level of intensity is restricted, given the limited number of responses (e.g. in a scale on agreement, this could consist of agree and strongly agree). Although it can be argued that fewer points are simpler and less time-consuming,
after transposing, similar results can be yielded (Colman et al., 1997). Moreover, Matell and Jaoby (1972) argue that the reduction of scale points is not needed regardless of the time required to complete a survey.

There are many supporting arguments for the use of more scale points. Firstly, Matell and Jacoby (1972) identify that the use of seven points reduces the number of uncertain responses, and as the number of scale points increase, reliability improves (Alwin, 1997) and better illustrates an accurate subjective response (Finstad, 2010). Finstad (2010) and Sauro (2010) both identify that when exposed to five-point and seven-point scales, respondents are more likely to interpolate the former thus suggesting that it is increasingly difficult to decide on the level of agreement when only five points are used. Thus, a seven-point scale is used as this is common practice and allows for a greater understanding of intensity without overburdening the respondent with too many scale points. For the success factors, the scale points are “unimportant”, “somewhat important”, “important”, “very important”, “extremely important” and “critical”. For the failure factors and measures, the scale points vary from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” (as seen in Appendix 3).

Another aspect of scale development is symmetry/balance. A balanced scale has an equal number of positive and negative positions and usually has a neutral point (Burns and Bush, 2012). In contrast, an unbalanced scale tends to favour one side of the scale and does not have a natural mid-point (Burns and Bush, 2012; Webb, 2002). Furthermore, there is the suggestion that the use of unbalanced scales can yield more valid and reliable results, especially when there are fewer “negative” positions (Friedman et al., 1981; Lubian, 2010; Saris and Gallhofer, 2007). Additionally, the data is less likely to be skewed when the
results are expected to be predominantly on one side of the scale (Dawes, 2008). As it is likely that the respondents will agree to several of the statements in the survey, seven points favouring the positive side will provide a better idea of the intensity of the agreement.

There are a series of issues related to using unbalanced scales, which include forcing the respondent to agree with certain statements (Johns, 2010; Joshi et al., 2015; Saris and Gallhofer, 2007). Furthermore, the use of unbalanced scales can make analysis difficult as the intervals between spaces are not necessarily equal like balanced scales (Feinberg et al., 2012). However, other researchers suggest that in tests that do not require normality, similar results can be yielded from unbalanced scales (Norman, 2010).

The drawbacks of the use of unbalanced scales can be addressed provided that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that respondents will agree or disagree with all of the statements (Friedman and Amoo, 1999). In this research, the scale items are based on the results of the EDT and the CSs by using the factors and sub-factors which are apparent in both. Therefore, the purpose of the survey is to understand the importance of each of the sub-factors about each other. A single “negative” and six “positive” positions are used, and this allows for better precision on the positive side of the scale. The “negative” position identifies that a sub-factor is unimportant and the level of unimportance is not prudent. The use of unbalanced scales only applies to the factors; balanced scales are employed for the measures as there is less consensus between the two previous stages.

As identified, a substantial issue related to web surveys is the low response rate (Reynolds et al., 2007). The two most important methods to
improve response rate is to consider the design (i.e. layout, length and formatting) and delivery (i.e. delivery modes, invitation method, pre-notification, reminder and incentives) (Ganassali, 2008).

Concerning design, four areas are considered length, wording, interactivity and response format. Firstly, it has been suggested that the ideal question length is between 15 to 30 questions (Fan and Yan, 2010). Additionally, the use of a single page (scrolling) versus multiple pages need to be considered. Research suggests that neither impacts completion rate (Manfreda et al., 2002; Peytchev et al., 2006) but multiple pages do increase completion time (Peytchev et al., 2006). Secondly, short sentences (of no more than 20 words) increases understanding (Molenaar, 1982). Thirdly, interactivity relates to the personalisation of the survey based on the respondents’ responses; increasing interactivity impacts response rate (Conrad et al., 2005). Finally, the ways in which the respondent can answer a question can impact the quality of responses; this includes providing larger text boxes (Smith, 1995) and the use of radio buttons over drop down boxes (Heerwegh and Loosveldt, 2002).

Building on the areas above, the design of the survey has 16 questions (all of which have 20 or fewer words), which falls within the optimal number of questions (see Appendix 3). The questions comprise of five questions related to the factors, one question to address failures, one question that addresses measures (all of the previous questions comprise of one scale and one open-ended question) and two demographic questions. Additionally, the use of unbalanced scales in web surveys negates the issue of biasing responses (Liu and Cho, 2016).
When considering interactivity, very little is possible in the survey, but a routeing option for additional questions is created in case a respondent chooses to select an extreme. For instance, if a respondent selects critical or unimportant, an additional dialogue pops up seeking further information about their choice. Finally, to address the response format, paragraph style text boxes are used to encourage respondents to write more when appropriate and radio boxes are used to reduce the difficulty when answering questions.

To ensure that the questionnaires are implemented effectively, they have been pre-tested. Like the previous studies, the questionnaire has been tested with the academic staff at the University of Plymouth. The aim of this test is to ensure that the questions are interpreted properly, and as it is conducted online, it has been verified that the questionnaire functions properly. Again, the responses during the test are not important as the goal is to ensure that the questionnaire can collect the intended information.

The second issue is recruitment. The QS is meant for specific individuals who have experience of FDI in TNE. The respondents are contacted via email to invite them to complete the questionnaire, but there are several issues to consider during the recruitment process. It has been suggested that access to certain individuals require permission (Burgess and Husband, 2006), which applies in this case as the information provided may be sensitive to the HEI. Thus, issues of confidentiality need to be considered. Therefore, during the recruitment, several aspects are detailed, such as assurance of confidentiality, aim of the research and how the data will be used as well as who will have access to it. Once the respondent agrees, they can activate the link to the survey. Moreover, a key issue that impacts delivery and response rate is the frequency of contact
(Fox et al., 2006; Manfreda et al., 2008). Therefore, reminders are sent two days after the initial invitation, as this has been identified to be the most efficient (Crawford et al., 2001).

**Managing the Quantitative Surveys**

Having discussed the questionnaire design and recruitment issues above, this section details issues during the implementation process. This incorporates the process detailed in Figure 25. Furthermore, the need for managing is less during this study as the interaction between the researcher, and the respondent is reduced in comparison to the previous two studies.

**Figure 25: Quantitative Survey Flow**

1. Design Questionnaire
2. Test Questionnaire
3. Recruit Respondents
4. Send Link to Respondent
5. Respondent Completes Questionnaire
6. Collect All Responses and Analyse
7. Send Reminders
8. Rectify Errors
The recruitment email and the beginning of the questionnaire will remind the respondent of their anonymity, the aim of the research and use of the data. The respondent is asked to confirm that they understand their rights and the use of the data before they can proceed. Moreover, the questionnaire is checked every three days to ensure that it still functions correctly and allows respondents to complete it. Additionally, two reminders are sent to respondents to encourage the completion of the questionnaires, for those who have not activated their links. This is achieved through follow-up emails or phone calls wherever possible.

Other issues to consider is the dropout rate, which can be overcome by providing the researcher's contact information that can assist in addressing any issues that may arise. Moreover, if a problem is identified in the questionnaire, all respondents are informed of the error, and they are given the option to retake the survey. For those who are yet to complete the questionnaire, they are informed when the link is reactivated.

**Data Analysis of the Quantitative Surveys**

The survey contains both open and closed ended questions. Therefore, there is a need for both quantitative and qualitative analysis. Moreover, the qualitative data is used to support the quantitative findings as shown in Figure 26.
The closed-ended questions are analysed first, after being inputted into SPSS. As previously mentioned (see Section 2.5.6), computer software has a variety of benefits for research. Thus, SPSS is a suitable software for analysing the quantitative elements of this study (Jones, 2007b) as it includes a broad range of statistical tools, which exceed the needs of this research.

The closed-ended questions of this study require statistical analysis and only basic statistical tools are utilised, given the low sample size and the absence of a dependent variable, which would allow for bivariate and multivariate analysis (Pallant, 2013). The statistical tests used will include frequency and descriptive statistics. The frequency and descriptive statistics are used to describe the data, i.e. how many respondents ranked a particular aspect as being crucial to the success or the failure of an IBC.
After the analysis of the quantitative aspects, the qualitative data is analysed in a similar manner to the previous two studies. Thus, they have been coded, and categories have been developed. The data collected clarifies the quantitative elements and provides more in-depth knowledge than purely statistical information. Following this, the findings of both the qualitative and the quantitative elements are documented and discussed in relation to the research questions.

**Implications of Quantitative Surveys for the General Findings**

The aim of this study is to identify whether factors from the previous two studies are prevalent in a wider population. Furthermore, the use of QS allowed for the testing of success and failure factors in gauging the importance of each factor and the items within them. As a result, the most crucial factors that contribute to the success of an IBC can be established.

**3.6 Conclusion**

This chapter addresses the methodological approach to address the research questions that have been set out, based on the findings of the previous chapter (Chapter 2). The use of a post-positivist mixed methodology approach has been discussed. Following this, the validity and reliability concerns have been acknowledged, and means of overcoming the main issues have been addressed. Finally, the approach taken for the three stages of research have been examined by focusing on the justification, planning, managing and analysis of each element.
With the research approach considered, the following chapters (Chapters 4, 5 and 6) present the results of the analysis.
4. Data Analysis—Expert Delphi Technique (EDT)

4.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to present the key themes that have been identified as a result of the EDT. This chapter comprises of three section. Firstly, the success and failure factors will be considered. Secondly, the appropriate measures of success and failure will be addressed. The final section will focus on a discussion of the findings and the implications for the second stage of data collection.

4.2 Expert Delphi Techniques

Nineteen experts participated in the first stage of the expert survey, followed by eleven in both the second and the final/third stage. As previously mentioned in the methodology, the respondents are a range of researchers and professionals currently working in transnational education (TNE).

The sample in the first stage is made up of respondents from the UK (5), USA (6), China (2), India (2), Australia (2), Slovenia (1) and the UAE (1). Additionally, the experts are fundamentally made up of two groups. Group 1 consists of respondents who are actively researching or currently holding a position in an international office (in some cases both) within a Higher education institution (HEI) (14), and Group 2 includes personnel from government bodies (5). The second stage saw a dropout rate of approximately 52%. However, the distribution of the sample remains geographically dispersed (UK [4], USA [3], Slovenia [1], UAE [1] and Australia [1]), but the remainder of the sample consist
of respondents from Group 1 only. The final stage saw a dropout rate of a further 10%. In addition, the geographic split is more refined (UK [4], USA [4], Slovenia [1] and Australia [1]).

The EDT consists of three iterations that are aimed at addressing the research questions. The first iteration focuses on the factors that contribute to the success or the failure of an international branch campus (IBC), from which five key factors were identified. Following this, the second stage verifies the findings of the first stage by asking the experts about the five factors. In addition, potential measures of success and failure were also established. Finally, the respondents are presented with each of the factors and the various measures for verification purposes.

4.3 Success and Failure Factors

This section details the success and failure factors that have identified as a result of the expert survey. Overall, there are five factors: Resources, Course, Relationships, Host Country and HEI. Furthermore, the success factors are illustrated through a series of cognitive maps that demonstrate the relationship between the sub-factors and the overlying factor. Additionally, the failure factors contribute to the development of the success factors, as the majority of the respondents suggest that the issues that equate to the failure of a campus are directly opposite to those that make one successful.
4.4 Success Factors

The five factors identified are Resources, Course, Host Country, Partnerships and HEI. Each of these factors will be explained individually and includes an examination of the areas that contribute to them. As stated, each factor is created through three iterations. The relevant transcripts for each stage can be found in the appendix (see Appendix 4, 5 and 6). The most complex factor (HEI) will be used to illustrate the process of factor creation; the remaining four factors will be discussed holistically, but the full analysis can be found in Appendix 7.

4.4.1 HEI Factor

This factor relates to the essential issues within the HEI (i.e. the home campus) that need to be addressed, which would ultimately contribute to the success of an IBC. Furthermore, this factor is the most extensive of the five factors identified, and there is a high number of areas to be considered. The remainder of this section details the various sub-factors and their development through the three stages of the expert survey.

Stage 1: Expert HEI Responses

The first stage of the expert survey identified five sub-factors that contribute to the HEI factor (as seen in Figure 27). Furthermore, these sub-factors are the preliminary areas that are believed to contribute to the success of an IBC. The remainder of this section provides details about the factor and how they contribute to the success of an IBC.
Figure 27: Stage 1 HEI Factor
Environmental Monitoring

This sub-factor relates to the need to monitor and understand the forces that can impact the IBC. Furthermore, the majority of respondents identified that having an extensive understanding of the environment in the host country is crucial. The responses below demonstrate the overall opinion with regards to understanding the environment. Moreover, the response by (S1: R2) illustrates a sequential effect of scanning the environment (i.e. the ability to position correctly in the host country). Additionally, the need to monitor the environment extends beyond the planning and the development of an IBC; continual monitoring is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S1:R16)</th>
<th>‘Success can be determined by several aspects but it is crucial to get a sound understanding of the local market i.e. availability and demand for certain subjects.’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S1:R2)</td>
<td>‘The institution would also need to be in a position where it can quickly respond to market demands.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The importance of analysing the market is further emphasised when the respondents are asked about the factors that contribute to the failure of an IBC. Most respondents indicate that the lack of understanding due to insufficient analysis is an unsurpassable factor that can lead to failure. Furthermore, these responses highlight two other issues that contribute to the failure of an IBC, poor planning and overly focussing on financial returns. In contrast, proper planning and a long-term academic approach are mentioned as areas that contribute to the success of an IBC. These will be examined individually in the next section.
Strategic planning is identified as an area that contributes to the success of an IBC as demonstrated by the responses below. Despite the importance of strategic planning being highlighted, it is used generically. Thus, what constitutes as good planning is yet to be understood. Nonetheless, substantial planning is necessary to contribute to the success of an IBC, based on the environment. Furthermore, it can be postulated that planning mainly applies to the initial development of the campus.

One element of strategic planning is the need to establish clear objectives and aims as they provide direction for the IBC. However, the mission element needs to be further clarified as it is unclear whether a new mission is established for the IBC or the existing one is used from the HEI. Despite the response by (S1: R13) alluding to establishing a new mission, it remains to be understood whether this is true in all cases. Nonetheless, it is crucial to devise an explicit mission, with complementary realistic objectives that contribute to achieving it.
As previously mentioned, clear objectives need to be set; the majority of respondents highlighted two key areas when devising objectives. Firstly, the IBC needs to take an academic focus above a financial one. This issue is also apparent in the Course and Relationship factor. However, this has mainly referred to the impact of partners that are focused on financial gain rather than academic development. In this case, the academic focus is linked to the HEI that is establishing an IBC. Thus, it is important for HEI’s to look beyond the potential financial gain. However, this is not to suggest that finance cannot be an objective.

Following on from the previous point, a coinciding issue suggested by the respondents is the need to adopt a long-term approach. This suggests that those HEIs that intend on focusing on a short-term financial gain are likely to fail. Furthermore, a long-term focus complements an academic focus as it will take time to build academic accolades.
This sub-factor identified some key areas to be considered. However, like other sub-factors, they remain generic in nature; thus, further development is needed. There are three main issues within this sub-factor. Firstly, although the importance of environmental monitoring is suggested, what this entails needs to be clarified. However, at this point, basic assumptions can be made as to what can be included, such as market demand and competition, which are also areas within the Course and Host Country factors. Secondly, the origin of the mission needs to be clarified. Finally, the notion of taking an academic focus is stressed, but again, what this consists of remains vague.

Integration

This sub-factor relates to the need to integrate the IBC with the HEI, but what this involves is yet to be explicitly mentioned. The importance of integration is stressed when respondents are asked what factors would contribute to the failure of a campus (shown below in responses by (S1: R4) and (S1: R17)). As previously mentioned, what integration includes is still unclear. However, the potential integration issue can be linked to the use of the HEI administration and the teaching staff. This will need to be further investigated during the case studies.

| (S1:R3) | ‘Close integration of branch campus into parent institution’ |
| (S1:R4) | ‘8. Weak links with home operation e.g no opportunity to do final year in home country of uni.’ |
| (S1:R17) | ‘The lack of integration between the home campus and bc can also cause issues.’ |
Support

This sub-factor relates to gaining support from HEIs to facilitate the success of an IBC. Furthermore, issues with support are identified in both the success and the failure responses. The success responses stress the importance of getting support from the entire HEI rather than just the management. Thus, it reduces the barriers towards sharing resources, such as academic staff as indicated by (S1:R10). Therefore, methods of encouraging support need to be factored in when establishing and running an IBC. However, like the other sub-factors, the term support is not clear; thus, what support relates to needs to be identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S1:R7)</th>
<th>'support of whole university community not just the executive'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S1:R10)</td>
<td>'Lack of buy in from academic staff at the home institution'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marketing Activities

This sub-factor refers to the necessary marketing which is required to contribute to the success of an IBC. Similar to the previous sub-factor (support), this issue is identified in both the success (S1: R2) and the failure (S1: R4) responses. Furthermore, this sub-factor relates to effectively promoting and marketing the HEI as well as the course to the target market within the host country. However, this sub-factor needs to be further developed as the appropriate methods or channels of marketing needs to be established. Additionally, the suitable method may be difficult to identify as it may be subject to the host country.
A final consideration mentioned in the above response is the focus on marketing the brand of the HEI to the local student market. This area of branding is the next and the final sub-factor identified under the HEI factor.

**Reputation and Branding**

This factor relates to the impact of the HEI's brand on success. Furthermore, the literature suggests that branding is one of the key influencers when choosing an HEI (Beneke, 2011; Mitra, 2010; Robertson, 2010a); this would also apply to IBCs.

The responses related to branding identifies the need for an HEI to have a good brand. Moreover, the majority of the replies mentions the need for a good local (to the host country) brand, and this is supported by the further observation of the response by (S1: R10) and (S1: R8). Both identify the need to develop an HEI's brand within the host country rather than a generic international brand which can be applied. However, the need for a good existing brand in the HEI's home country is not mentioned as often. Therefore, the importance of each needs to be established. This will be an area for further consideration in the case study section, as this will examine the impact of actual HEI brands on success and failure. Nonetheless, branding is suggested to be an area that contributes to the success of an IBC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S1:R9)</th>
<th>‘quality label (brand) of the provider’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S1:R10)</td>
<td>‘Developing brand and reputation in key overseas markets are important motivations’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S1:R8)</td>
<td>‘Establishing a solid local reputation (international recognition does not always translate into local reputation).’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stage 1 HEI Factor Conclusion**

The first stage of the EDT identifies five sub-factors which are based on both success and failure responses. Numerous issues have been determined, but an overarching finding is the ambiguity of the sub-factors that require further clarification. The second stage of the EDT elicits responses directly about the HEI; that would contribute to success and will be addressed in the next section.

**Stage 2: Expert HEI Responses**

The second stage both clarified the previous sub-factors and identified additional considerations. Furthermore, this factor still consists of five sub-factors, but only two remain the same: *marketing activities*, and *reputation and branding* (as seen in Figure 28). The previously identified environmental monitoring, support and integration are now elements within the new competencies sub-factor. Also, the two new areas of relationship and campus are added, which demonstrates a link between all the factors and suggests that no one factor should be considered in isolation. The remainder of this section details each of the identified sub-factors.
Figure 28: Stage 2 HEI Factor
Relationship with the Local Environment

This sub-factor is related to the areas within the *Relationship* factor. Furthermore, the respondents from the second round indicate that it is essential for an HEI to establish relationships with entities in the host country. Moreover, this demonstrates that the factors are interlinked; thus, all factors have an impact on one another. The *Relationship* factor highlights the relevant stakeholders that need to be considered. Within this factor, the focus switches to developing and understanding those relationships. In addition, the importance of establishing a relationship with the host country government and local employers are stressed further.

| (S2:R9) | ‘To establish the best possible relations with the local environment (Government, academia, economy/employers, culture, community etc.)’ |
| (S2:R8) | ‘...cooperation and collaboration with stakeholders, including home campus and local employers’ |

Marketing Activities

This sub-factor is carried forward from the previous stage rather than respondents mentioning it, as the *Course* factor identifies the importance of marketing a course to the right market. Furthermore, similar to the previous sub-factor, marketing in this factor refers to the ability to market rather than what should be marketed. Therefore, the HEI should have suitable marketing staff and competencies. Additionally, effective ways of marketing an IBC should be established. Hence, the next stage of data collection (case studies) will identify how successful and failed campuses have marketed their IBC.
Competencies

This sub-factor has been created as a result of the responses from the second round and incorporates previously identified areas, which are Strategic Planning, Environmental Monitoring, Aim and Objectives and Integration. First, the importance of Strategic Planning has been reiterated. The responses below illustrate the importance of understanding a potential market and analysing whether there exists a potential to establish an IBC. Furthermore, this is linked to the market demand sub-factor within the Course and the Host Country factor. Thus, environmental scanning has become an element of strategic planning rather than the other way around, which is identified in the first round.

| (S2:R8) | ‘the ability to analyse the potential of countries and plan long term’ |
| (S2:R4) | ’the ability to analyse the market and assess whether there is potential to develop abroad, long term planning that is focused on academics rather financial returns,...’ |

Similar to the first round, Aims and Objectives remain an element of Strategic Planning. Moreover, the respondents restated the need to adopt a long-term academic focus over a financial one, which is important when considering financial objectives, as it can take several years before gaining a return on investment. Additionally, the importance of investing in learning is mentioned, but knowing how this is achieved requires clarification (i.e. investment in learning could be increasing training for academic staff or more physical resources).
Another area within the Competencies sub-factor is experience within TNE. This is only mentioned by one respondent, but the importance of having experience within TNE provides obvious advantages. Furthermore, experience can either be naturally developed (i.e. learning by doing) or as the respondent suggests, externally recruited. Furthermore, the benefits of having members of staff with relevant experience in TNE include a reduction in risks and time. However, the impact of having these members of staff will need to be identified in the case studies.

The final area within Competencies is Strong Management, which primarily relates to the interaction between the IBC and the home campus. Some of the areas that are previously mentioned in the first round are restated. Furthermore, the focus is on establishing a commitment to the IBC and integrating all campuses. Both elements ensure that IBCs are treated as part of the HEI, rather than an add-on to existing offers.
Methods of integrating campuses include improving the level of communication and the use of home faculty. The latter is a sub-factor within the Resource factor; again, this demonstrates the links between the factors. However, to be able to facilitate the use of home faculty at the IBC, there needs to be a commitment from the HEI to invest staff in IBCs.

**Reputation and Branding**

This sub-factor is mentioned in both the previous and the second round. This is due to the focus on the competencies of the HEI, which addresses the successful planning and running of an IBC. Nonetheless, respondents highlighted the importance of branding, which as previously mentioned, can impact student selection when choosing an HEI.
Attractive Campus

The final sub-factor is related to the campus, which is also addressed in the Resource factor. The importance of having a campus in the host country, which benefits the students and enhances their learning is stressed. Additionally, the campus sub-factor in the Resource factor highlights several issues that need to be considered when building an IBC. In the case of this factor, the focus switches to the ability of the HEI to determine which of those facilities needs to be built. Moreover, this is often based on student demand and other (local and IBC) campuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S2:R1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘...good accessible location, attractive and functional campus, adequate investment in learning and student accommodation, refectories, sports facilities etc, adequate scale to invest in these things - difficult if only have 200 or 400 students...’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 2: HEI Factor Conclusion

As a result of the second round, the previously identified sub-factors have been further clarified and verified. Therefore, the next round will aim to further verify the sub-factors, as certain items are re-categorised. Additionally, this factor is given a higher importance, as the other factors are often linked to the aims and the missions of the HEI and thus will be augmented based on the HEI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S2:R5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘...success or failure of any branch campus (or any higher education institution) should be tied to its mission. I'm hesitant to respond to the following as, depending on the situation, they all could either contribute or not contribute to the failure of an IBC.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 3: Expert HEI Responses

The final stage of the expert survey involves showing the respondents the factors identified in stage two. From this, respondents are asked whether the factor addressed the key HEI considerations and if any changes are required. Similar to the other factors, a small number of minor changes are needed (as seen in Figure 29). However, these serve to primarily rename sub-categories and establish additional links. The remainder of this section will discuss these changes and other additional issues identified.

One minor change is made to the Competencies sub-factor. Given that the term competencies can be used in a variety of ways, it has been renamed Managerial Competencies to reduce confusion.

| (S3:R4) | ‘Rather than "competencies", I would use the notion of "Institutional or managerial capacity" (competencies would refer better to the competencies to be acquired by graduates.’ |
Figure 29: Final HEI Factor

HEI

- Relationships with The Local Environment
- Collaboration with Local Employers
- Marketing Activities
- Competences
- Reputation and Branding
- Attractive Campus
- Good Location
- Planning and Strategic Thinking
- Experience in TNE
- Strong Management
- Aims and Objectives
- Environmental Monitoring
- Commitment to Program
- Integration
- Academic Focus
- Investment in Learning
- Long Termism
- Focus beyond Financial Return
- Support
- Integrated Faculty
- Ethics
Another issue is the relationship between the experience in TNE and commitment, which identifies a potential sequential effect. The respondents suggest that having an experience in HEI is likely to result in higher levels of commitment to the investment as they have a better understanding of the process of establishing an IBC. Thus, they will be aware of the resources and time commitments needed. Therefore, an additional link is drawn to demonstrate this relationship.

| (S3:R9) | ‘Experience in TNE activities is very important. A management which understands the issues involved in operating outside of their own country is more likely to understand the needs of a branch campus than a management which has not such experience. This has to be linked then to commitment, if you understand what it is you are getting into you are more likely to be fully committed.’ |

Stage 3 HEI Factor Conclusion

Two minor changes are needed to account for the responses from the third stage of the expert surveys. These include reducing the ambiguity when using the term ‘Competencies’ and to reflect the relationship between experience in TNE and commitment. Furthermore, the respondents agreed with the sub-factors identified in the HEI factor (which are defined in Table 27). Similar to the other factors, the case studies will further determine which sub-factors impact the success and failure of an IBC.
### Table 27: HEI Sub-factor Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with the Local Environment</strong></td>
<td>This category refers to the relationships that need to be established between the HEI and the entities within the host country that are related to the <em>Relationship</em> factor. Again, a key element of this is the relationships with local employers, which as previously discussed, impacts elements of the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing Activities</strong></td>
<td>The key issues to consider are the marketing of the HEI and the course to the appropriate target market through appropriate channels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competencies</strong></td>
<td>This category is split into three areas: planning and strategic thinking, experience in TNE and strong management. First, the planning and strategic thinking is linked to the environmental monitoring that is required, such as analysing the potential host country (which incorporates areas in the <em>Host Country</em> factor), which allows the HEI to prepare effectively for market entry. Following environmental monitoring, aim and objectives can be devised; this then dictates how the other factors are augmented. Another element of the competency category is strong management, which facilitates the successful running of the IBC through commitment and integration. The final aspect is experience in TNE, which reflects the need for management to have knowledge and experience of working in this context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reputations and Branding</strong></td>
<td>The key issues in this category relates to the reputation of the HEI which can influence student decision. This also forms one of the areas of measuring success, i.e. enhancing the reputation and the recognition of the HEI globally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attractive Campus</strong></td>
<td>This category is linked to resource factors and relates to developing an attractive campus, which will accommodate academic and non-academic facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2 Resource Factor

The Resource factor contains four sub-factors. Initially, two sub-factors are identified, which are facilities and teaching staff (see Appendix 7), which evolved into four sub-factors, which are Finance, Administration, Campus and Faculty (as seen in Figure 30). The third stage of the expert survey confirmed many of the areas within the model with only a few amendments being required.

In addition to the sub-factors, the context is emphasised as each HEI will need different resources depending on the situation. This is an opinion identified in the second and the third stage. Therefore, the model presents a holistic view of the necessary potential resources. Furthermore, this also applies to the other factor models. As a result, the sub-factors for each of the factors may not be present or even needed in all the situations.

| (S2:R2) | ‘This is hard to say in general. It all depends on the purpose of the branch campus (and the home institution)’ |
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Figure 30: Final Resource Factor
Campus

Originally named *Facilities*, this sub-factor addresses five areas that could be considered when developing a campus.

In the first stage, the importance of facilities is identified. There is little agreement at this juncture about the essential facilities. Therefore, greater clarity is needed as to what facilities need to be considered. In general, facilities relate to the physical elements of a campus.

| (S1:R2) | ‘... It is important to create the relevant provisions such as building good facilities and finding good teachers, especially if local teachers will be used.’ |
| (S1:R4) | Size - scale needed to provide adequate library and social facilities.’ |

The second stage addresses three broad areas, which are academic facilities, non-academic facilities, and location.

Academic facilities refer to buildings for educational purposes, which include classrooms (adequate rooms and equipment for delivering lectures for students to use) and libraries (building, textbooks and online resources). Furthermore, a link is apparent between academic facilities and the *Course* factor as the correct provisions need to be in place to deliver programmes correctly. In contrast, non-academic facilities are buildings for leisure activities. Although the exact configuration of a campus can be dependent on the needs and the demands of the student market, this can often be dictated by available finances and spatial restrictions.
The final consideration within the campus sub-factor is location. This is a minor area that is mentioned and refers to the selection of an appropriate site for the IBC. Furthermore, appropriate transportation may be needed as this will ease the travel issues when travelling between transportation hubs and the IBC (e.g. airports and train stations). Moreover, there is also a range of educational hubs being developed that will dictate where the campus will be located, usually determined by the local government.

The responses from the third stage verified the aspects within the campus sub-factor, with only one minor amendment needed. Originally, Technology and Online Resources is incorporated into the library resources as it is seen to be an element of the library. However, it is separated as respondents indicate that this element is crucial as technology can be further divided into computers, printers,
internet sites or other aspects related to technology that are not directly related to library resources.

| (S3:R1)  | ‘Would suggest to see Technology and online resources not as a subcategory of library but a separate main category under campus.’ |

**Faculty**

This is originally labelled as *Teaching Staff*. This sub-factor includes three items which could be considered when recruiting.

The first stage demonstrated the importance of teaching and research. The former focused on the use of either home staff and/or local recruitment, with an emphasis on maintaining a high quality, the need to understand the local culture, and the recruitment market and its effect on teaching and learning. Furthermore, poor recruitment is suggested to be an area that contributed to a failure of an IBC. The *Research* item refers to the encouragement of the staff to conduct research at the IBC, which as previously identified, provides a source of competitive advantages for HEIs (Curran, 2000).

| (S1:R3) | ‘Close integration of branch campus into parent institution, Willingness to invest high quality 'parent' personnel in branch campus, Cultural competence / local understanding’ |
| (S1:R4) | ‘3. Recruitment of high quality faculty. 4. Faculty that are encouraged and supported to engage in research and scholarly activities.’ |
| (S1:R7) | ‘1. Poor staff recruitment - not quality faculty’ |
| (S1:R7) | ‘Involvement of local staff in programme and research developments.’ |
The second stage emphasised the need for a correct composition of the staff. The main findings are related to quality issues associated with recruiting home and local staff. Again, the focus is on ensuring consistency across campuses and where the local staff is recruited, to make sure that they are fully vetted, which can be achieved by using the same recruitment criteria that are applied at the home campus. As a result, the use of home faculty is separated and shown as a separate item. Furthermore, given the potential impact on the quality of the course, a linkage between this item and the Course factor is established.

| (S2:R2)   | ‘..one may argue that home institution staff should teach at the branch campus (to secure a high level of quality teaching), but this may go a the cost of a genuine embeddedness in the branch campus’ context.’ |
| (S2:R6)   | ‘Problems will be growing if the staff (academic and administrative) from abroad is employed without appropriate knowledge and skills requested by the "native environment". ‘ |

No amendments are needed in the final stage, but when the respondents are presented with the Resource factor, an additional consideration related to home staff is highlighted. Namely, this revolves around the need to ensure that adequate incentives are available to the home staff to encourage them to go to the IBC, and this should look beyond financial incentives and consider the quality of life.

| (S3:R4)   | ‘Ability to recruit quality teaching staff is essential, and this depends upon the quality of expatriate life in the host city and reputation of the uni and campus as much as it depends on salary level.’ |
Finance

The Finance sub-factor is stressed once the respondents are directly asked about the necessary resources. There are six items that reflect potential sources and uses.

The second stage highlights three items: Start-up Capital, Government Assistance and Financial Aid. The need for sufficient funds to establish a campus is stressed by several respondents, but few of its sources are mentioned other than governmental assistance. The availability of this assistance can help spread the financial risk of opening an IBC, which can increase the attractiveness of certain countries. However, these benefits can have prerequisites from the local government, which can include enrolment targets and the need for a partner (Wang, 2003). Furthermore, over-reliance on external funding can result in failure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S2:R9)</th>
<th>‘Good academics and low student / teacher ratio, good physical infrastructure, availability of student aid to ensure student diversity in terms of socio-economic background (needs-blind admission), and of course abundant financial resources to support the previously mentioned factors.’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S2:R3)</td>
<td>‘Strong government assistance can be a great strength, as it will help the institution to spread the costs, also enable the institution to have a more expanded campus/facilities, and spread the burden and risk. However, the government may make certain requirements to the institution that must be met, i.e. the institution must attract a certain number of research associates.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S2:R10)</td>
<td>‘The key is having a sustainable financial model. Many campuses fail because they rely on start-up funding from a government and burn through that cash until it runs out.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final item of financial aid is one means of how financial resources can be used; others include facilities. Financial aid can be provided in several ways
to enable an IBC to attract a wider range of students, for example, scholarships. This item suggests that finances need to be available for more than physical buildings; intangible services (student support, electronic library, etc..) will also have to be considered. Furthermore, the level of financial aid needed should be based on research and an understanding of student characteristics (i.e. socioeconomic) within the host country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S2:R9)</th>
<th>‘availability of student aid to ensure student diversity in terms of socio-economic background (needs-blind admission)’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S2:R3)</td>
<td>‘fees must be priced according to demand, and not priced too high as this will mean disadvantaged students cannot take up studies, however, subsidised fees for those students could mitigate that.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third stage requires the incorporation of additional items that reflect other sources of finance, which include tuition fees, external bodies and research funding. As established, there are two elements of this sub-factor: sources and usage. In the case of the former, this can be further divided into ‘Pre-opening’ and ‘Post-opening’. First, government funds, external bodies (which, similar to government funds, cannot be relied upon) and home campus funds can be used throughout the investment. In contrast, tuition fees and research funding can only be collected once the campus is in operation. Moreover, a key consideration when attracting research funding is related to research faculty mentioned in the Faculty sub-factor. Hence, high-quality research needs to be conducted to attract appropriate funding.
Administration

This sub-factor is mentioned broadly by the respondents in the second stage and refers to the administrative staff at the home campus and the IBC. Respondents stressed the importance of having appropriate administrative support as a key resource that would contribute to the success of an IBC. However, very little is mentioned about what specific administrative factors contribute to success. As a result, HEIs will need to ensure that appropriate levels of knowledgeable administrative staff are available to aid the running of an IBC. However, this area is underdeveloped as the specific issues related to what administrative support entails is not evident. Thus, this area will need to be further researched in the later stages of this study.

Finally, there is a link between administration and integration with the home campus. The latter refers to integration issues that are related to the HEI
factor that contributes to the success of an IBC. Again, this demonstrates another close link between the relevant resources and the HEI.

**Resource Factor Conclusion**

Four sub-factors are identified which relate to potential resources that would contribute to the success of an IBC. Each of the final sub-factors is confirmed in the third stage, with only a few amendments being required. Furthermore, the importance of context is re-iterated. Thus, the sub-factors offer a comprehensive list of what should contribute to the success of an IBC (defined in Table 28), and not all will be applicable in all situations. The information collected on resources will now be used in the next stage of the research to identify which sub-factors impact the successes and the failures of IBC.

**Table 28: Resource Sub-factor Definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>This category relates to the monetary resources that impact the success or failure of an IBC. This has been further divided into government assistance, tuition fees, financial aid (having sufficient finances to support student tuition), start-up capital and research funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>The essential elements of this category are providing appropriate academic and non-academic facilities that increase the attractiveness of the branch campus. The non-academic facilities include sports complex and accommodation and the academic facilities include library and classroom resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>The key areas this category addresses are the support staff which facilitate the running of the branch campus. In order for this to occur, the staff from both the home and the branch campus need to be integrated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This category addresses three key areas: teaching, research and home faculty. First, the research aspect refers to the interests of the faculty, which can influence the decision to teach at the branch campus. This has an impact on the use of home faculty. Secondly, the teaching ability of the faculty is dependent on understanding how students from different cultures learn and access appropriate resources, i.e. I.T. equipment, textbooks and audio/visual equipment.

### 4.4.3 Course Factor

The Course factor is related to the relevant considerations when choosing which courses to run at the IBC, as well as how the course will be delivered. This section details the key areas that lead to success within this factor. Furthermore, similar to other factors, some of the sub-factors are identified to be too broad, and the relevance of each one is dependent on the context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>This category addresses three key areas: teaching, research and home faculty. First, the research aspect refers to the interests of the faculty, which can influence the decision to teach at the branch campus. This has an impact on the use of home faculty. Secondly, the teaching ability of the faculty is dependent on understanding how students from different cultures learn and access appropriate resources, i.e. I.T. equipment, textbooks and audio/visual equipment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(S3:R7) ‘Yes, there are some key factors presented but they remain generic and the individual campus will need prioritise these factors dependent on there situation.’

(S3:R1) ‘...I struggle with a model offers key considerations, given my view that it is all dependent on contextual and situational conditions. E.g. course marketing is not a NECESSARY consideration to contribute to the success, but it CAN be. Also, whether the course content should be adapted to the local context/employers is dependent on needs/wishes of stakeholders involved.’

The Course factor contains six sub-factors and has the highest number of linkage to the other factors. Originally, there are seven (see Figure 31 and Appendix 7); of these, five are retained throughout (although some are relabelled) and two become items within the five sub-factors. This includes Standardisation.
but Adapted becoming an element of Faculty and Competition falling under Market Demand.

**Figure 31: Stage 1 Course Factor**

Further sub-factors are added and later verified in stages two and three (see Figure 32). These are included as they are deemed to be essential items within this factor when respondents are directly asked about issues related to the course. Each of the sub-factors and the key developments is addressed below.
Figure 32: Final Course Factor
Faculty

In the first stage, this sub-factor is labelled Teaching Staff, which is strongly related to Faculty in the Resource factor. Thus, it will only be addressed briefly in this section. Within the Course factor, Teaching Staff refers to the ability to deliver the course content and ensure that the same high standards are applied at the IBC; rather than the recruitment of staff.

| (S1:R2) | ‘Next, it is important to create the relevant provisions such as building good facilities and finding good teachers, especially if local teachers will be used.’ |
| (S1:R7) | ‘Involvement of local staff in programme and research developments’ |
| (S1:R3) | ‘Willingness to invest high quality ‘parent’ personnel in branch campus’ |

The second stage reallocates Teaching Staff under the new sub-factor of Faculty. Given the close connection to the corresponding sub-factor in the Resource factor, some principles are the same, especially the one concerning quality. The greatest emphasis is on the ability of the staff to deliver the course content. The Teaching item has the most elements within it, which relate to the adequate provisions and consideration for local needs. The need for standardisation or adaption is further addressed in the Course Content sub-factor. These changes reflect the final stage of this sub-factor as respondents did not comment on the sub-factor or the elements within it in the third iteration.
Course Content

In the first stage, this sub-factor is not apparent, but one of its principal components are identified, which revolves around standardisation and adaption. In essence, the importance of a standardised course with local adaption is stressed. The former ensures that high quality is consistent across campuses, and the latter focuses on meeting the needs of the local market. Moreover, it has been suggested that a failure to adapt can result in the failure of an IBC. However, these adjustments need to be catered to without compromising on the quality and should focus on the learning requirements of the students.

The second stage results in the creation of the final Course Content sub-factor as a number of items are identified that relate to considerations when creating a course. The previous sub-factor Standardisation but Adapted is still a concurring issue to consider when designing the content of the course. However, this has been broken down into Adaption to Local Context and Degree Equivalent to Home Campus to illustrate potential areas that require adapting and those that should be standardised.
One of the elements that seem most important is finding a balance between the expectations of the home campus for maintaining a comparable course and the need to adapt the course to make it locally relevant.

...adapting the courses to factor in cultural or country differences...

Courses/programs need to be designed to respond to identified student demand in that location.

4. A curriculum that is suitable for the needs of local employers/ to enable students to secure employment.

The need for adaption is stressed as the course needs to appeal to local employers, which demonstrates the need to not only understand the student market but the local employers as well. The second area of standardisation is altered as it is too generic and addresses respondents referring to the need to deliver a course that is equivalent to the home campus. Hence, the course content needs to target the needs of the local employers while maintaining a high-quality level of teaching, thus making it appeal to local employers, which is another key issue within the Course Content sub-factor.

The last two areas are Links with Local Industry and the Ability to Study at the Home Campus. First, the need to establish a link with the industry (organisations within the local market) is identified at this stage, also linking items

| (S2:R5) | ‘One of the elements that seem most important is finding a balance between the expectations of the home campus for maintaining a comparable course and the need to adapt the course to make it locally relevant.’ |
| (S2:R8) | ‘...adapting the courses to factor in cultural or country differences...’ |
| (S2:R9) | ‘Courses/programs need to be designed to respond to identified student demand in that location.’ |
| (S2:R1) | ‘4. A curriculum that is suitable for the needs of local employers/ to enable students to secure employment.’ |
| (S2:R1) | ‘1. Acceptance by all stakeholders that the branch campus degree is equivalent to the home campus qualification ... 3. Learning resources and materials for lectures and assessments that include home campus prepared materials and locally prepared materials’ |
| (S2:R3) | ‘...the course should be identical to what is being delivered in the host country so that employers will be confident of the degree’s standard/relevance.’ |
within the *Relationship* factor. Within this factor, the focus is on how local organisations can be used to develop appropriate course content. Secondly, although a minor area, the option to study at the home campus may add value to the course, especially against local competitors.

(S2:R4) ‘...ability to study at the home campus...’

No amendments are identified in the final stage; the only consideration is the linkage between course content and quality. As established, a standardised approach can be a means of ensuring high quality across campuses.

**Quality**

Quality issues are identified in the first stage, but for the most part, remains generic with no specific quality issues being identified, although the need to ensure that the quality standards are upheld at the IBC is mentioned, the inability to monitor and apply quality control would result in failure.

| (S1:R6) | ‘Suitable controls in place to assure quality of provision and quality of student experience’ |
|         | ‘Not applying the same rigor in quality assurance as in the home country.’ |

(S1:R4) ‘2. Quality assurance procedures to ensure same standards as home campus.’

(S1:R16) ‘There is also the need for apply the same levels of quality to the branch that is similar to that in the home campus.’

(S1:R3) ‘Lack of quality control and integration with parent’
An area linked to quality is *Entry Requirements*, which relates to the quality of the students who are admitted and adopting similar entry criteria as the home campus. Thus, signifying the importance of not just recruiting students to ensure adequate numbers, but also based on their capabilities, which will require further in-depth research into the student market. Furthermore, the focus on quality students over quantity is aligned with having an academic focus (as identified in the *HEI* factor).

| (S1:R4) | ‘Entry requirements for students not dropped (i.e. same as home campus)’ |
| (S1:R2) | ‘Good quality student are often a preference than a greater quantity of lesser quality students.’ |
| (S1:R12) | ‘...a careful analysis of local market including competitors and potential students in terms of quality and quantity; ‘ |
| (S1:R17) | ‘A good understanding of the local demand and availability of quality local students.’ |

An area related to the *Entry Requirements* is partner interference, which needs to be controlled, especially over academic issues. The main problem arises if a partner pushes to increase enrolment numbers as a means of improving profits and places little importance on the quality of students. A detrimental effect of this is increased failure rates that can impact the reputation of the HEI.
The second stage labels the primary sub-factor as *Quality*, and three broad items are identified which divide quality consideration into course, faculty and student-related. The faculty and the student issues have been addressed previously in the *Resource* factor and the *Entry Requirements* sub-factor respectively. The main course items are related to the need for equivalent quality standards to be present at the IBC, which, as established, can be achieved through the use of the home staff. An additional way of ensuring equivalency is to use similar assessment standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S1:R8)</th>
<th>‘This includes the existence of a firewall to prevent the investor/partner from interfering with academic and admissions decisions.’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S1:R17)</td>
<td>‘Partnerships and relationships with organisation or government within the new country can also result in failure especially when the incorrect measures are taken when forming those relationships i.e. establishing clear boundaries with potential partners in terms of quality, admissions and teaching.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final stage identifies the importance of accreditations. This is essential as failing to do this could result in the course not meeting the requirements within the host country, thus reducing credibility, which will sequentially impact the ability of graduates from that campus to secure employment. Furthermore, accreditations are mentioned in the second stage of the expert surveys within the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S2:R8)</th>
<th>‘…applying the same level of quality assurance to the branch campus..’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S2:R9)</td>
<td>‘Combination of being locally relevant while having global quality standards.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S2:R1)</td>
<td>‘5. Fair and rigorous assessment systems with home campus efficiently assessing equivalency across campuses’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship factor, as relationships with accreditation agencies are a potentially key external relationship to develop, which would contribute to the success of an IBC.

| (S3:R6) | ‘... One issue is the acceptability of the credential students receive. One major US university too late discovered that a US degree offered in the UAE was not ‘accredited’ by the UAE authorities (which was known) and that without an accredited degree, graduates could not get certain types of jobs (a point missed by the US university)’ |
| (S3:R9) | ‘For programmes which are professionally orientated professional accreditation is crucial and should cover accreditation by local institutions and boards and at the home country.’ |

An additional finding of the final stage is the potential barriers and problems that may become apparent when considering standardisation and adaption. The main consideration is the need to ensure global equivalency while maintaining locally contextual relevance. Regardless, the focus should be on providing high-quality education.

| (S3:R1) | ‘This comment also points at potential tensions in the model: e.g. adaptation to the local contexts may put serious pressure on degree equivalence and the same adaptation may be at odds with reliance on home faculty.’ |
| (S3:R3) | ‘In terms of adapting the course content to suit the local context, I think it's fine as long as the particular units taught are still identical to that delivered in UK.’ |
| (S3:R7) | ‘However, adjusting the content for the local context is key. By no means should the quality suffer though.’ |
| (S3:R9) | ‘You refer to assessment standards being similar. They should be the same although the assessment methods can be different. There should be a link between quality and equivalence and controls put in place to ensure these two elements are maintained.’ |
Market Demand

This sub-factor is identified in the first stage and is linked to the *Host Country* factor, and refers to the demand for the actual course that is being provided, rather than the available number of students in general. The criteria could include volume, quality, real need and demand from neighbouring countries. Furthermore, the importance of this sub-factor is stressed further as the inability to meet the needs of the market could result in the failure of an IBC. This further emphasises the need to not only look at demand regarding numbers but to gain a good understanding of what the local student market wants. Therefore, market research is going to be essential when understanding the market demand beyond statistical information.

| (S1:R8) | ‘2) offering programs that don't meet local demand, resulting in enrollment problems’ |

The second stage identifies two issues, which include the classification of competition and the further understanding of market demand. Furthermore, no additional changes were required in the third stage.

Competition was originally established as a separate sub-factor and relates to direct competition to a course (i.e. other HEIs or IBCs that offer the same course). Furthermore, this sub-factor also falls under the *Host Country* factor but refers to a more holistic view of competition. The second stage shows a linkage between student demand and competition, as demand would be affected by the number of competitors. Therefore, competition forms part of the *Market Demand* sub-factor.
The second development is similar to the findings of the *Course Content* sub-factor, in that, market demand can also be influenced by the local industry, which may require certain skill sets. Thus further strengthening the need to work with the local industry when designing courses.

| (S2:R3) | ‘It must be in demand, it must be a course that is sensitive to local political/cultural landscape,’ |
| (S2:R7) | ‘Relevance to student needs and labor market demands’ |

**Student Tuition**

The *Tuition* sub-factor is initially identified as a minor area through the examination of what would cause an IBC to fail. From the responses, it is apparent that charging the incorrect tuition fee could have an adverse impact on enrolment. Therefore, it is valuable to understand what the local market can afford.

| (S1:R4) | ‘5. Tuition fees priced too high’ |
| (S1:R8) | ‘3) charging tuition above what the local market can handle’ |

The second stage further emphasises the need to charge the correct tuition fee but also to consider competitors’ pricing. In cases where academically capable students apply but affordability is an issue; the importance of providing financial aid is mentioned. Again, this further demonstrates the interconnectivity
between the factors, as this is related to available financial resources. The changes in the second stage were not furthered in the final stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S2:R4)</th>
<th>‘competitively priced against other branches or local universities’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S2:R3)</td>
<td>‘it must be priced fairly and have subsidies for disadvantaged students in order to avoid elitism/class divisions’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course Marketing**

Marketing is only mentioned in the second stage and focuses on the need to market the HEI and the courses it provides. In this case, course marketing refers directly to the marketing of the course. Furthermore, similar to the *Marketing* sub-factor identified within the *HEI* factor, the term ‘marketing’ is used generically, and no specific methods are suggested. Thus, this remains a broad area.

| (S2:R3) | ‘The course should be marketed effectively to the target market, using relevant channels.’ |

**Course Factor Conclusion**

A total of six sub-factors are identified which are the key considerations related to the course. Some alterations are made over the three iterations with the key focus being on the quality and the need to balance the levels of standardisation and adaption. Each of the sub-factors (defined in Table 29) are confirmed in the third stage and represent aspects of a course that should be
acknowledged. The case studies will identify which of these areas are important in the practice.

Table 29: Course Sub-factor Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>This addresses the staff element of the course, which is linked to the resources that a college/university may have. The three factors within this category are research, teaching and the use of home faculty. Research impacts staffing issues as it is both an indicator of success i.e. the number of publications, and whether home faculty can be used due to their research interests. The teaching element refers to how the teaching staff can deliver the course effectively, which utilises a range of resources as well as understanding the learning culture within the host country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Content</td>
<td>As the name suggests, this refers to elements within the course itself. The key aspect is that the course has to be delivered to a similar standard as the home campus while being adapted to the local context. Furthermore, establishing a course which is similar to the ones run at the home campus impacts the quality. The next key element is the link with the local industry. This impacts the course in two ways. First, links with the local industry provides a good resource for developing the course content, i.e. guest speakers and work placements. Second, this relationship with the local industry aids in designing a course which appeals to the employers with the intention of increasing graduate employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Marketing</td>
<td>This involves marketing the course through appropriate channels to the target audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>This is another key area for consideration and is often influenced by the regulatory bodies and education authorities within the host country. The three factors within quality are listed above. As you can see, the quality of the course is impacted primarily on three issues: having a degree that is equivalent to those of the home campus, establishing the same levels of assessment standards and accreditations which may be impacted by the local education authority. The quality of the student can be determined by the entry requirement, i.e. pre-requisites and proficiency in relevant languages. Finally, the quality of faculty can be determined by recruitment standards and use of the home faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Factor</td>
<td>Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Tuition</td>
<td>This addresses the issues of establishing the correct price based on the situation i.e., looking at the demand and competitor offerings. Furthermore, there is a link to financial aid, which once again is linked to the resources of the college/university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Demand</td>
<td>The final factors addresses the demand for the course in the country, which is dependent on the host country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.4 Host Country Factor

The Host Country factor relates to issues that need to be considered when selecting an appropriate country to establish an IBC. Several issues need to be considered to increase the chances of success and reduce failure. This factor includes three sub-factors (as seen in Figure 33), which allow HEIs to assess the viability of operating in the host country and in turn impact its attractiveness.

Although three sub-factors are identified in the first stage, Barriers to Entry is added in the second stage and took the place of Competition as a sub-factor. Subsequently, the new sub-factor better encompasses the potential areas that represent barriers. Competition is seen as part of these obstacles. The final stage of the expert surveys verified all of the areas identified, with only one adjustment being required. Moreover, this factor is regarded as being the most comprehensive and developed of all.

(S3:R1) ‘Yes, I think this model is the most developed model of the ones you present. I would agree with most of the elements in this model.’

(S3:R2) ‘This is quite comprehensive, and all very important as far as I can tell.’
Figure 33: Final Host Country Factor
Government

The first stage highlighted the importance of the government regarding both support and regulations, which include stability, a friendly environment and ability to host foreign HEIs. Although some items are identified, they remain generic and require further clarification in the second stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S1:R9)</th>
<th>‘open and rather friendly (or at least not uninterested) political environment (e.g. Ministry responsible for HE)’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S1:R7)</td>
<td>‘stable regulatory regime’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S1:R2)</td>
<td>‘Next, the institution would need to check the political landscape i.e. the government’s higher education policies to see if there are any stumbling blocks like government registration/auditing, requirements etc’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S1:R7)</td>
<td>‘Regulatory regime not in place to accommodation foreign HE providers.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second stage clarifies aspects of the government that are important, and these are assistance and regulations.

The importance of governmental support is further emphasised; particular emphasis is given to the assistance that can be provided. The prominent area identified is financial aid, which can assist the development and the running of an IBC. The benefits of this approach include reduced risk, but over-reliance on this funding can result in failure (Lane and Kinser, 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S2:R1)</th>
<th>‘4. Contribution of host country to set-up or operating costs, as done by Abu Dhabi for NYU and Paris Sorbonne’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S2:R8)</td>
<td>‘...a supportive government (tax levies)…’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regulations are the second area identified with the key focus being the need to understand and encounter favourable regulations that allow the IBC to operate in the host country. Furthermore, these regulations form potential barriers to entry and can also determine whether a host country is selected. Five regulatory items are identified, which include 1) repatriation of money, 2) achieving local accreditation, 3) impact of the education authorities of the host countries, 4) censorship, and 5) demand for high assessment standards (usually equivalent to the home campus).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S2:R4)</th>
<th>‘...regulations that allow the branch to function whilst not being overly restrictive,...’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Limited entry barriers except in the area of quality assurance where the host country should be highly demanding (at least standards equivalent to those enforced in country of origin of university that sets up branch campus’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S2:R7)</td>
<td>‘Welcoming attitudes, supportive laws and regulations’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S2:R1)</td>
<td>‘1. Ability to move finance in and out of the country  2. Institution and qualifications locally accredited and recognised’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S2:R3)</td>
<td>‘The institution must not concede its values because the government doesn’t like it, as this may harm the brand. For example, the Yale-NUS partnership in Singapore has caused some controversy due to Yale teachers being concerned about lack of free speech in Singapore and how that may affect student’s rights.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third stage verifies the five regulations addressed above but also highlights the need to include immigration and visa issues given the need for home faculty and international students at the IBC. Therefore, the ease with which either students or staff can get a visa is likely to impact the viability of an IBC.
Other observations are made concerning government assistance and accreditation. First, government support can include other areas beyond finance, which includes information and guidance about how to operate in the host country. Second, accreditations may not be an issue in all countries. This highlights two considerations, and like most of the other factors, they may need adaption based on the context and the need for a comprehensive understanding of the host country.

‘You refer to government assistance. This may come in two forms, financial support during set up or simply providing assistance to navigate through the regulatory regime. The latter is extremely important and interacts with the low barriers to entry factor. Local accreditation may not be a factor. There are still countries where this is not a requirement. However, where it is it is obviously crucial, no accreditation no campus. When undertaking an evaluation of where to establish a campus financial assistance from the local government, while helpful should not be a key element. Evidence that the other factors to be consider are positive is much more important.’

Market Demand

This sub-factor also falls under the Course factor, but the main difference is that in this case, the focus is on looking holistically at the country. The first stage highlights the need to identify the potential demand in the country, with a strong suggestion that poor forecasting based on an insufficient understanding of the market is likely to lead to failure.
There are two further considerations when researching the market, and these are related to the quality of students and the demand for a specific course, both of which are addressed in the Course factor. Furthermore, the assessment of potential students should also extend to neighbouring countries, which can be a motive to locate in certain regions, for example, establishing an IBC in Asia to access India and China.

The second stage identifies two further areas that would make up this sub-factor, competition and size of the market both in the local and the neighbouring market.

Originally, competition is recognised as a unique sub-factor, but because of the second stage of responses, a prevalent larger theme of Barriers to Entry is identified, which explained a greater number of forces in the host country that would impact the IBC. In the first stage, the main focus is on understanding and
anticipating the competitors in the local market. Furthermore, there is a need to monitor the competitive environment over time as the dynamics of the market change.

| (S1:R3) | ‘Hostility of local government and/or local competitor institutions’ |
| (S1:R12) | ‘...a lack of understanding of the overall local environment including.....competing universities.’ |
| (S1:R15) | ‘These need to be supported and championed at government level as well as by the institutions themselves, particularly as competition increases, local (cheaper) provision catches up, and market share reduces.’ |

In the second stage, competition is adjusted to represent an element in both Market Demand and Barrier to Entry. Focusing on the former, similar to the Course factor, competition is recognised to have an effect on market demand, especially as local HEIs became more competitive, or more IBCs are established. Furthermore, as previously stated understanding competitors can facilitate the identification of the correct tuition fee.

In addition to changes related to the competition, further emphasis is placed on the need to not only understand the local market but the potential in the neighbouring ones. Therefore, when carrying out due diligence, it is beneficial to look beyond the local market when assessing the viability of a potential host country.
The only consideration related to the market demand in the final stage is the potential to target smaller niche markets. When considering the market demand, it is usually favourable to invest in countries with high levels of demand. Nevertheless, it is suggested that targeting smaller specific niches may also present viable investment opportunities that will also have several benefits and drawbacks. Although a focused approach allows for a better concentration of resources that better meets the need for a narrowly defined market, which can allow smaller HEIs to gain a foothold (McDaniel et al., 2011). However, positioning to target a specific niche may negate further opportunities to branch out later. For example, an IBC that focuses on agriculture may then find it difficult to expand into business.

...perhaps a smaller, niche market size can also be desirable to a high potential market size. Niche partnerships mean students recognise the partnership as delivering in a specific area, thus making an easily recognisable brand name for the institution.'
barriers to entry and incorporate five items: the government, regulations, culture, stability of the environment and competition. To this point, three of the areas have been addressed. Thus, the focus will be on environment and culture.

Although culture is not identified previously in the context of the Host Country factor, it is addressed in the Resource factor concerning teaching. Culture, in this respect, refers to wider areas. It looks at the host country as a whole and relates to the compatibility between the HEI and the host country. However, the impact of culture on the success of an IBC needs to be identified, which will be ascertained during the case studies. Additionally, the response below reiterates the need to acknowledge the bespoke nature of each individual IBC.

I have to repeat myself: on the basis of my (research) experiences it is a matter of developing campuses that are fit for purpose, balancing the requirements from all stakeholders and trying to deal with Host Country culture and regulations.

The second area to be addressed is the need for a stable environment within the host country. There are several benefits of stability, which include the increased willingness of the host country’s governments to invest in new IBCs. Although, the need to have a stable environment is stressed, what the environment consists of needs to be identified. However, competition has been alluded to be a key element.
‘The host country would firstly need to be politically and economically stable, then other factors such as the level of competition for similar courses (which include over BC and local universities), ...’

‘3. Stable country politically, economically and socially ... 5. Extent of competition - e.g. in UAE with 39 branch campuses it is a very competitive environment, difficult to create a USP and stand out, and hence several institutions have failed’

The main development in the third stage is the renaming of the sub-factor to its final label Barriers to Entry, which is the result of the responses and provides a broader classification of the items within it. Other than the change in the label, further insight is provided into barriers and niche markets.

Respondents identified that high barriers to entry could be advantageous as they can discourage competitors from entering the country, and as a result provide a first-mover advantage. However, this is not without its risks; hence, to fully benefit from these opportunities, it will be crucial to have a comprehensive understanding of the barriers in place, and seek guidance where possible (Wilkins et al., 2011).

‘Although I generally agree with what you say in the introduction on this page, it could be argued that entry into a "high barrier" country may provide a university a first-mover advantage.’

Host Country Factor Conclusion

A total of three sub-factors has been identified, which relates to the areas that should be assessed when considering the viability of a host country. However, an HEI should principally be focused on whether it can operate efficiently. Some alterations are made over the three iterations, but these revolve
around the classification of items. Each of the sub-factors (defined in Table 30) are confirmed in the third stage. The case studies will identify which of these areas are important in practice.

Table 30: Host Country Sub-factor Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>This category relates to the impact that the host country governments have on the operation of a branch campus, which can influences which host country to select. The two key issues are governmental assistance and regulations. The government can provide assistance through either tax incentives or providing additional finance. Furthermore, the government also greatly impacts the regulations within the host country, which the IBC would need to abide by, for example, setting benchmarks for quality standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to Entry</td>
<td>The category is divided into five areas: government, competition, regulations, culture and stability. One of the key aspects is the impact of regulations on the operations of the IBC. The host countries regulations relate to issues, such as the repatriation of finances (i.e. moving money back to the home campus), quality (accreditation and assessment standards) and censorship (which can influence the willingness of home faculty to relocate to the branch campus). In addition to regulations, the environment needs to be stable, which examines issues, such as politics and economics. All of these relate to areas that can influence the success of an IBC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Demand</td>
<td>There are three main considerations in this category that impact the market demand in the host country. The competition and the potential market of both local and neighbouring countries indicate the level of demand in the host country, which influences other areas, such as selecting the correct courses to run in the host country and the number of potential enrolments. Again, this impacts the selection of the host country and influences the success of an IBC. However, further consideration is also needed to understand the opportunities within niche markets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.5 Relationship Factor

This factor addresses the key relationships that contribute to a successful campus. The final Relationship factor has two sub-factors (as seen in Figure 34), which reflects a broad list of potential relationships. However, this does not suggest that all of them are needed for an IBC to be successful. Again, this supports the suggestion that each IBC is unique and should be adjusted to suit the context.

This is the only factor that has been renamed due to its development across the three stages. The initial name assigned to this factor was partnerships. It is changed to remove the need for a partnership. Instead, a good relationship between the entities is essential. Fundamentally, a relationship is necessary with entities within the IBC and the host country, but there do not necessarily need to be partnerships.

Initially, four sub-factors are identified, but these are reduced to two; and the broader labels are given to encompass a large number of relationships that could be considered. However, the formation of the factor created some ambiguity amongst the respondents, which require further definitions in relation to the labels used (e.g., the lack of clarity regarding what constituted a fixed and variable external relationship is highlighted). However, they still agreed that the elements within the factor are relevant in determining the success or failure of an IBC. Therefore, the issue is the presentation of the information, rather than the sub-factors containing an error.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S3:R4)</th>
<th>‘Yes, these factors are adequate to describe. But it would be useful to clarify the concept of &quot;fixed&quot; and &quot;variable&quot; relationships’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S3:R7)</td>
<td>‘Again Yes, but better description of what 'Internal' and 'External' are, is required. I believe that educational partners could also be better defined - does this refer to publishers, other HEI, college, schools? One further thought is how are these relationships going to be formed and maintained?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response by (S3: R7) suggests two other matters that need to be addressed. First, certain elements (in this case educational partners) are not adequately defined, and to a certain extent, remain brief. The reason is to reflect contextualisation, whereby the specific partners would vary depending on the situation. Second, the Respondent also mentions the need to consider how the various relationships are formed and maintained. This is essential, as simply identifying key relationships is insufficient. Hence, this is an area that needs to be established in the following study, which will determine how relationships are formed based on a real investment.
Figure 34: Final Relationship Factor
Internal relationships refer to those relationships that are formed within the HEI. The four original items identified in the first stage only focused on external bodies. Thus, the importance of internal relationships is not mentioned until the second stage, when respondents are asked specifically about relationships. The two key areas mentioned are related to the students and the home campus, both of which are referred to in other factors. Despite identifying these areas, what is not apparent from the second stage are the benefits and whether this is a definitive list.

(S2:R8) ‘The key relationships would be with the students, local government and education authorities, industry and local partners.’

(S2:R1) ‘With home campus staff, local employers, local government, accreditation agencies, quality assurance bodies at home and locally’

In the third stage, the items within internal relationships are further clarified. The importance of including both current students and alumni is mentioned. The link with existing students allows for feedback on the course, and the benefits of the alumni are a means of developing relationships with local organisations, which is related to the Course Content element of the course. Also, the importance of relationships with the staff is suggested, and this includes administrative and academic faculty.
'An extremely important relationship has been missed that with alumni, both with alumni who graduated from the home campus and alumni who graduate from the branch campus. Of course the relationship is not a simple binary one, alumni have an important role in developing relationships with for example industry and professional institutions.'

'Makes sense, but I missed a key stakeholder (staff) in the picture. Why are students mentioned, but not staff? How important would you value the input of administrators?'

**External**

In the first stage, four areas are identified, which include Government, Industry, Local HEI and Local partners. The majority of these have been previously addressed in other factors, but the difference is the focus on the beneficial entities to establish relationships with. However, neither are their benefits established nor is it mentioned whether any one of them takes precedence over the others.

'Partnership with a local university and formulation of a blended curriculum that bring international elements together with local aspects.'

'involvement of local industry, government organisations and collaboration with local HE'

In addition to identifying potential relationships, other responses are related to the issues of forming them. Respondents suggest that the correct selection of a partner is a key contributor to success. This is further apparent when responses to what would cause a failure is analysed, with the main issue being inappropriate partners that are overly controlling or have a high influence.
A fundamental means of ensuring a mutually beneficial relationship is to ensure that the interests of each party are satisfied, and expectations are clearly established early on. Moreover, the majority of these partnerships are established as joint ventures, which are suggested to have high levels of failure if the correct precautions are not considered (Barringer and Harrison, 2000; Geringer and Hebert, 1989; Ireland et al., 2002). Thus, as part of these negotiations, academic control should be retained by the HEI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S1:R14)</th>
<th>‘Understanding by each partner of the interests of their collaborating institution and a structure in which each partner's interests are satisfied.’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S1:R15)</td>
<td>‘foregrounding of academic imperatives above business cases may not be persuasive to investment, but it is the feature that will appeal to the building of partnerships, on which all aspects of internationalisation, at home and abroad, are best supported.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S1:R8)</td>
<td>‘Having effective governance procedures, particularly if there is a private investor involved. This includes the existence of a firewall to prevent the investor/partner from interfering with academic and admissions decisions.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second stage, the external sub-factor is divided into two areas: Fixed and Variable. Fixed relationships refer to those relationships that are advisory or inevitable, and exist in most host countries, such as the local government and regulatory bodies. In contrast, Variable relationships relate to those relationships that are not mandatory (in most cases) but beneficial to establish and are
dependent on the context, for instance, educational partners, local industry and private partners. The Fixed relationships identified are with governments and regulatory bodies, with the latter being further divided into accreditation agencies and quality assurance bodies. Both areas have been previously identified in the Course and Host Country factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S2:R1)</th>
<th>‘With home campus staff, local employers, local government, accreditation agencies, quality assurance bodies at home and locally’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S2:R8)</td>
<td>‘The key relationships would be with the students, local government and education authorities, industry and local partners.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘This is difficult as there are so many different partnerships and it really depends on the local culture. But, having a relationship with the local government or a different local stakeholder can be important for navigating the local political, social, and regulatory environments.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the reclassification of this factor into two sub-factors, further developments are mentioned in relation to how relationships should be established. In general, similar comments made in the first stage are also apparent, but additional areas of consideration revolve around the need for partners to learn from each other and understand the long-term nature of the investment.

| (S2:R3) | ‘Partnerships that have a shared purpose and common goals, good communications and good relationship between the partners, strong finance model.’ |
| (S2:R8) | ‘Establishing the branch campus as a joint venture with local partner would be useful if both are committed to learning from each other. Close links with industry are also important to make sure that the programs and courses are relevant to local labor market needs.’ |
‘The university needs to have well-established partnerships with local institutions that share the long-term aspirations of the university.’

The responses from the final stage suggested one alteration, which coincides with findings in the Course factor. Given that not all countries have accreditation issues to address, the need to establish relationships with them may not be as significant. However, it is still probable that there will be other regulatory bodies in place. Therefore, regulatory bodies are both fixed and variable, as they are likely to exist in most cases, but the need for the relationship is variable.

‘Your application of fixed to government relationship is correct. However the relationship which should build between government, regulatory bodies and the campus is not restricted to regulatory requirements only and therefore there should also be a variable link.’

**Relationship Factor Conclusion**

Two sub-factors (defined in Table 31) are identified, which suggest the valuable relationships that could be established to allow for the successful operation of an IBC. Furthermore, some considerations related to the development of these relationships are identified. This factor has the most significant number of changes made to it, and respondents suggested that the sub-factors are ambiguous. Despite this, there is a general agreement that the areas identified are correct. Nonetheless, the sub-factors are verified in the final stage, with only a minor change being required. The areas within this factor will be compared with the results of the case studies to identify the key relationship considerations.
Table 31: Relationship Sub-factor Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>These are the relationships that the college/university will have direct and regular contact with, and can be seen as internal to the institution. The two main categories are students (which refers to both current and alumni) and the home campus (which includes staff, administrators, directors, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>This category is further divided into two sub-categories. The fixed category refers to entities that are consistent in all the host countries, and it is mandatory to establish relationships with them. The two key relationships are with the host government and regulatory bodies. Variable relationships refer to entities that are optional but are considered beneficial to establish; i.e., a link with the industry is not mandatory but beneficial for course design. Other relationships include a local partner which maybe compulsory in some countries, and educational partners, such as local HEI or high schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Failure Factors

Respondents are asked what potential areas would lead to the failure of an IBC. The majority of responses state the exact opposite of the success factors. For instance, one success factor mentions the need for sufficient analysis when choosing a host country. In contrast, respondents mention that insufficient analysis would result in failure. Therefore, to avoid repetition, the failure factors will not be discussed in depth. However, where relevant, failure responses are used in the previous section to re-emphasise success factors. Therefore, an assumption is made that the opposite of the success factors identified above would result in failure.
Finally, a minor statistical test is conducted to indicate the key issues that would lead to the failure of an IBC (as seen in Table 32). The respondents indicated that underestimated cost and low enrolment are the greatest contributors to failure. This is logical as an insufficient demand equates to low levels of revenue, which will ultimately force the IBC to generate a negative return and will more than likely result in the closure of the IBC. Similarly, underestimated costs would be an indicator of poor planning and will influence the level of return.

Table 32: Key failure factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Enrolment and Insufficient Demand</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underestimated Costs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow Focus on Foreign Student</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary focus on Income generation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High tuition fees</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ultimately, the factors and issues identified as failure will be tested in the next study to determine how much each element contributes to the failure of an IBC.
4.6 Measures of Success and Failure

With the success and failure factors addressed in the previous sections, the final section of this chapter will focus on the measures of success and failure that are introduced in the second stage and verified in the third stage. In essence, this section will address how success or failure can be determined. Additionally, the need to identify success measures is suggested during the first round of the expert surveys. The remainder of this section will address the development of the success and failure measures, starting with the success.

| (S2:R5) | ‘It’s a difficult question as all IBCs don’t have the same mission and I believe that measures of success or failure should be linked to the mission.’ |
| (S2:R8) | ‘Success varies depending on the branch in question, this makes it difficult to say what would constitute as a success.’ |
| (S2:R10) | ‘Evaluation of the success of a branch campus is dependent upon what the campus was intended to achieve. If the intent is clear at the outset then the measures generally flow pretty easily. The trouble is that the purpose of establishing a branch campus is not always entirely clear, and different stakeholders within the university may support the idea for different reasons - generating additional revenue, aiding human resource development in a developing country, building the reputation of the university in the region, tapping into research growth possibilities, etc.’ |

4.6.1 Measures of Success

The second stage of the expert surveys identifies many issues that could be considered as measures of success. Furthermore, once a list of measures is compiled, they could be further divided into six distinct areas: Student and Alumni, the Host Country, Relationships, Quality Measures, Finance and Reputation (as seen in Figure 35). Furthermore, it is recognised that the importance or relevance
of each measure is subject to the context, i.e. the HEI. Therefore, the success measures will be based on the aims and missions of the IBC and can be adapted based on the categories presented below.

(S1:R1) ‘It is very difficult to answer this question, if only for the fact that we need to define success. Is success e.g. measured by returns on investment, student numbers, or student satisfaction?’
Figure 35: Measures of Success for IBC Stage 1
However, the success measure contains a potential issue. In some cases, a broad category is presented rather than an exact measure. This issue was raised during the third stage of the expert survey. For instance, under the student and the alumni category, completion rate, graduate employment and attendance to graduate schools/programme can be measured easily (i.e. completion rate can be measured by the number of students that complete the course). However, HEIs may choose to distinguish this further by determining what type of pass is achieved e.g. the category of the pass. Nonetheless, exact measures need to be identified in the next stage of the research. This will indicate the key variable which HEIs can use to gauge success.

| (S3:R4) | ‘...What will be the actual quality measures? It would be useful to define concrete indicators for each measure. How will the contribution to the national economy and reduced environmental impact be measured?’ |
| (S3:R5) | ‘List looks good. How these are measured is not so clear.’ |

A final consideration as suggested by respondent (S3: R1) is the phrasing of the success measures. For instance, the word ‘strong’ is used to describe success. Therefore, the success measures are altered to be neutral terms (as seen in Figure 36). Thus, the success measures to be discussed in the remainder of this section reflect the developed model as a result of the final stage of the expert survey. The following sections will cover the six categories of success measures identified during the expert surveys.

| (S3:R1) | ‘I would phrase - from the perspective of parsimony - all the success measures in "neutral" terms, e.g. student feedback and satisfaction, environmental impact, relationship between branch and home etc. The actual "performance" can then be good/bad, low/high, etc.’ |
Figure 36: Measures of Success for IBC Stage 2
As part of the final stage, respondents are asked to rank the six measures based on priority (as seen in Table 33). The most important measures are related to the quality and finance, with the least important of them being related to the host country.

**Table 33: Priority Ranking of Success Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Measure</th>
<th>Priority - Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Measures</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student and Alumni</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student and Alumni**

The *Student and Alumni* success measure consists of five areas of consideration: completion rate, student achievement, graduate employment, admittance to graduate schools, student feedback and satisfaction. This category of measure directly relates to the performance of the current students and those that have already graduated. Furthermore, during the third stage of the expert survey, the category was ranked third; thus, this category is ranked in the middle in comparison to the other five categories.
As previously mentioned, there are two main categories within this success measure (although not separated in Figure 36); current students and alumni. The former can be measured on completion rates, student achievements and student feedback and satisfaction. Furthermore, the graduate variable includes graduate employment, type of graduate employment and admittance to graduate schools. Moreover, these variables differ with the previous ones as they relate to student achievements after leaving the HEI, while the other factors are indicators of the opinions and the accomplishments of the students at the IBC.

Due to insufficient evidence from the expert surveys, the applicability of the areas identified in the student and alumni category needs to be determined, (this is also common across the other success measure categories). Nonetheless, certain methods to measure success have been devised (as identified in Table 34). These form ‘potential’ measures, based on the author’s thoughts; thus, the next stage of the research will aim to identify the exact measures. Therefore, these will provide an initial basis, and are to a certain extent, based on common sense.
Table 34: Potential Student and Alumni Success Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Measure</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion Rate</td>
<td>- Number of students completing degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of students completing with higher level degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Average time taken to complete degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>- Extra Curricular activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Contribution to society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Employment</td>
<td>- Number of students in employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Average student salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Type of employment i.e. industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admittance to Graduate School</td>
<td>- Number of students in post graduate studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Type of graduate schools admitted to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Feedback and Satisfaction</td>
<td>- Teaching quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Programme quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, when respondents are asked in the final stage of the expert surveys whether any amendments are needed for the success measures, an additional area that is suggested is the relationship with alumni. The respondents allude that the relationship with the alumni needs to be monitored as they can potentially become advocates for the HEI, and can provide links to the industry as they will join the local workforce.

(S3:R2) ‘Endowment from alumni would be another way to measure success, i.e. how the graduates connect to the institution even after they've left as well as boosting the institution's offers.’
Host Country

The *Host Country* success categories relate to positive attributes that the IBC imparts on the local area. Furthermore, this reflects the alternate side of the success measures identified in the literature review (see Figure 16), with the other side comprising of factors related to the HEI. In this case, the other five success categories relate directly to the success of the HEI and the IBC. The two main categories identified are contributions to the national economy and environmental impacts.

The key themes identified in this success measures category are benefits to the host country as a result of the IBCs reducing their environmental impact; thus, the HEI needs to evaluate their positive contribution against the negative ones in the host country.

| (S2:R2) | ‘...contribution of the branch campus to the national economy....’ |
| (S2:R5) | ‘It may also be worth mentioning that its impact environmentally will likely become a more important factor to a more green-conscious younger generation over the coming years, so its infrastructure and environmental sustainability in terms of its buildings, energy use etc, should be something to seriously take account of.’ |
| (S2:R10) | ‘...aiding human resource development in a developing country...’ |

Similar to the other success categories, no clear measures have been established. However, Table 35 contains suggestions of possible measures. These have partly derived from the literature, which discusses the benefits of FDI in TNE for host countries. Finally, respondents termed this category of success measure as the least important. Furthermore, the final stage also resulted in the
previously identified label of ‘reduced environmental impacts’ being amended to ‘environmental impact’.

Table 35: Potential Host Country Success Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Measure</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to National Economy</td>
<td>- Number of graduate created in the workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of students attracted to the IBC from neighbouring countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact</td>
<td>- Energy Efficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships

The Relationship success measures refer to the ability of the HEI/IBC to establish relationships with both entities in the home and the host country. The three key relationships that need to be measured are between the home and the IBC, with regulatory bodies and local industry. There are several benefits of maintaining successful relationships with these three entities, i.e. better relationships with industries potentially provides additional graduate opportunities.

The three identified categories also replicate the key relationships identified in the Relationship factor, with the exception of students and local partners. The latter has already been addressed in the student and the alumni category, but local partners may also need to be assessed. Furthermore, the importance of this is dependent on the investment (i.e. depending on whether a local partner is needed).
The final stage of the expert surveys addresses three areas. First, this success measure is ranked fifth by the respondents and is therefore seemingly a low priority. Second, similar to the other success measure categories, there is no clearly identified method of measuring the success of these relationships. Nonetheless, Table 36 indicates some potential measures for partnership with the local industry, but the other two areas need to be identified in the next stage of data collection. Finally, the relationship between the home and the IBC is suggested to be an area which is overlooked when measuring success. Therefore, the next stage of data collection will identify if this is true, and if not, then what are the ways in which HEI can gauge the success of their relationship.

| (S2:R1) | ‘6. Positive relationships and collaboration between home and branch campuses .... 8. Collaboration and cooperation with local employers’ |
| (S2:R3) | ‘Countries that have strict governance may not be so receptive of subjects in humanities, for example. However, this shouldn’t stop prospective universities from exploring provision in these areas, but due diligence and sensitivity may be required. Good relationships and communications with the country’s Council for Private Education or equivalent would be a good way to gauge success for this.’ |
| (S3:R7) | ‘Success should be measured against measurable deliverables whether these be financial, growth in numbers and the like. It should also be measured against other metrics related to links with the HEI sector, industry and government.’ |

---

| (S3:R7) | ‘One are which does get overlooked is one you have picked up, that of the relationship between the home and branch. Branch activities should be seen as an essential element of what happens within the university.’ |
Table 36: Potential Relationship Success Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Measure</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership with Local Industry</td>
<td>- Number of graduate opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quality Measures

This success category relates to the quality issues at the IBC, in particular, how the programmes and courses are run. The three areas identified are the quality of the students, the course and the faculty.

A fundamental difference between the responses regarding quality is that they provide varying indications as to how they can be measured. For instance, the response by (S2: R1) can be used to gauge the quality of the course; thus, it can be employed as a method for evaluating the success of the IBC in terms of maintaining a high-quality course. The same also applies to the response by (S2: R9), which can be used to evaluate how successful the IBC is in attracting top students. Nonetheless, additional measures need to be identified that can be achieved in the next stage of data collection by identifying how various HEIs gauge the success of their courses.

(S2:R1) ‘3. Good quality assurance inspections from agencies in home and host countries’

(S2: R5) ‘Quality of academic programs ..... Quality of faculty’

(S2: R9) ‘Ability to attract top students from the region / country.’
The quality success measures identified are similar to the key areas identified in the Course factor. Thus, these measures provide a good indicator of how the course is being run. Furthermore, in the third stage of the expert survey, quality measures are prioritised first (alongside finance) and are repeatedly emphasised throughout all three iterations.

**Finance**

These success measures refer to the ability of the IBC to perform well financially. This includes generating sufficient revenues to maintain the campus while generating profits and returns on investment. Additionally, this measure is of particular importance as the IBC needs to be able to generate finances for the campus to remain in operation.

Similar to the quality measures, respondents provide methods of measuring financial performance (detailed in Table 37). To an extent, the measures identified are common means of judging financial performance of HEIs. Therefore, the next stage of data collection will assess how the IBCs financial performance is measured and what indicators are used.

| (S2:R1) | ‘4. Ability to break-even or produce profit, according to the institution’s objectives’ |
| (S2:R4) | ‘The success of a campus can be measured in several ways these include a good financial return, high enrolment figures,….’ |
| (S2:R5) | ‘…Number of local students being served Number of foreign students being attracted to the campus…’ |
| (S2:R8) | ‘Success varies depending on the branch in question, this makes it difficult to say what would constitute as a success. In general, factors |
such as high levels of enrolment, good financial returns, development of a global brand.’

Table 37: Potential Finance Success Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Measure</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>- Number of overall enrolments&lt;br&gt; - Number of local enrolments&lt;br&gt; - Number of foreign enrolments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profitability</td>
<td>- Revenue&lt;br&gt; - Profits&lt;br&gt; - Return on Investment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third stage of the expert survey indicates that finance is prioritised first (alongside quality measures), thus making it a crucial indicator of success. However, this creates a contradiction within the responses. Despite financial performance being prioritised highly, some respondents indicated that a focus on finances is not advisable when establishing an IBC. Therefore, there is a need for HEIs need to establish a balance between financial performance and providing high-quality courses. Furthermore, this assertion may reflect the rationale as to why both quality and financial success measures are prioritised first.

(S3:R8) ‘Critical of all of this when first looking at international operations is do you know why you want to operate in an international setting? If it is for financial reasons only then you should not be looking to start up a branch campus.’
Reputation

The final success measure relates to the benefits to the HEI’s reputation as a result of establishing an IBC. The three areas identified are recognition, accreditations and published research.

The two key areas that the respondents focus on are research and recognition, but achieving international and local accreditation will also contribute to building the reputation of the HEI. Furthermore, measures have been provided (detailed in Table 38), but similar to the other success measures, other additional and more clearly-defined measures need to be established in the next stage of data collection. Furthermore, the reputation success measure is ranked fourth overall, making it a mid-level priority in comparison to the other measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Measure</th>
<th>Potential Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>- Awareness of the HEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>- Number of accreditations achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published Research</td>
<td>- Amount of research produced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.6.2 Measures of Failure

With the measures of success addressed above, this section will detail the measures of failure. Similar to the failure factors, the majority of respondents indicated that failure could be measured by not meeting the success measures or applying the opposite or negative perspectives to the measures suggested by the respondents. Furthermore, given that the success measures are altered to be neutral, HEIs can use them in either a positive or a negative manner, i.e. as indicators of success or failure. Thus, the previous model can be utilised for success and failure, thus negating the need to create a failure model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Success Measure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Potential Measures</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number and type of publications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **(S2:R1)** ‘When the above are not achieved. Failure to gauge the local market accurately e.g. offering the wrong courses or setting fees too high.’
- **(S2:R2)** ‘The same as above, but then in the negative, low levels of student satisfaction, etc.’
- **(S2:R9)** ‘The reverse of all the aspects mentioned above.’
- **(S2:R10)** ‘The inverse of the above aspirations, I guess - did it cost the university resources, make no significant contribution to human capital development, damage the reputation of the university, undermine research by wasting time and resources, etc.’

There is one area which is not addressed by success measures, and that is the closure of a campus. Respondents indicated that a closure of the campus would represent a complete failure of an IBC, which suggests that success and failure can be plotted along a continuum, in which success and failure can be
measured with the closure of a campus representing one end. However, a complete success and variant between success and failure have not been established. Thus, additional research is needed to identify the levels of success or failure.

| (S2:R4) | ‘There are some clear indicators of failure with the most obvious measure of failure is the closure of the campus. Other factors are the individual elements that contribute to this i.e. low enrolment which reduces revenue.’ |
| (S2:R8) | ‘Again same as above, failure is subject to each BC. However, the closure of a campus would be the ultimate sign of failure. This could suggest a whole host of reason as to why the campus failed, which could include continuous loss making, poor enrolment, lack of partnerships in the host country, lack of commitment.’ |

4.7 Discussion of Findings

This section will focus on the findings of this chapter against the research questions and comparisons to literature. The factors will be discussed first (Research Question 1), followed by the measures (Research Question 2). The framework for IBCs will be discussed last (Research 3). The aim is to see how the findings contribute to the existing literature and illustrate how gaps have been addressed.

4.7.1 Research Question 1 – Success Factors

As illustrated in the conclusion of the literature review (see Figure 15), four factors contribute to the success or failure of an IBC. The foundation of these factors is based on the OLI eclectic theory, which is the basis for establishing the
determinants of FDI (Bevan and Estrin, 2004; Doh, 2005; Dunning, 1988; Dunning and Wymbs, 2001; Grosse and Behrman, 1992; Qiu, 2003; Sadoi, 2008). Relationships is added as an additional factor to address the importance of forming and managing relationships with partners during the investment (Calvet, 1981; Geringer and Hebert, 1989; Luo, 2007).

The results of the expert surveys show that five factors can determine the success or failure of an IBC, which includes Resources, Course, Relationships, Host Country and HEI. Furthermore, these factors can be linked to the theory of the firm as they can be considered as inputs, as they contribute towards the outputs (the success measures) (Besanko and Braeutigam, 2013). The similarities and differences can be drawn when compared to the factors identified in the literature; these will be addressed in the following sections.

**HEI Factor**

The HEI factor relates to the areas that can be used to identify whether an HEI can establish and create an IBC successfully. Furthermore, this factor consists of process and competency issues, which is important as Nonaka et al., (2000) argues that organisation need to consider how inputs can be transformed into outputs. Therefore, the sub-factors represent key insight into the areas that would contribute to utilising the inputs efficiently.

The factor contains elements of ownership advantage, as the sub-factors highlight the key activities and competencies that are desirable (as seen in Table 27 and Figure 29). These are similar to the intangible assets (Bevan and Estrin, 2004; Kimura, 1989) that can be exploited in a new market to gain a competitive
advantage over local counterparts. Given the generic description of ownership advantage, the findings of this chapter improve the understanding of how this applies to IBCs.

One intangible asset that is recognised is the beneficial impact of the HEI's reputation and branding. This also resonates in the literature as the benefits of branding include increased applications for a course and reduced risks for students (Beneke, 2011). A means of assessing a brand is through its ranking, which is increasingly important given the wide availability of this information (Knight, 2015b; McBurnie and Ziguras, 2007) and HEIs with higher rankings being preferred (Binsardi and Ekwulugo, 2003; Drewes and Michael, 2006). Therefore, a strong brand can contribute positively to the operation of an IBC.

The areas within the Competencies sub-factor further support the literature. The need to monitor and understand the environment (Lane, 2011; Zou et al., 1997), the benefits of experience (Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014; Werlau, 2001), adequate control (Geringer and Hebert, 1989; Hitt et al., 2012; Isobe et al., 2000), integration (Farrugia and Lane, 2013) and embedding the ethos of the HEI (Kinser and Lane, 2014; Ranjan et al., 2012) are identified as being important. The main additional findings are related to the aims and the objectives that highlight the importance of adopting an academic focus, which should have a greater importance over financial returns. Despite a high number of similarities with areas in the extant literature, the main contribution of this research is the classification of these items as areas within the ownership advantage, which applies as a context to the generic factor.

Planning is essential and should be based on a comprehensive understanding of the environment (Becker, 2009; Rumbley and Altbach, 2007),
with poor research being identified as a leading cause of failure (Altbach, 2011; Morgan, 2010b). This is also consistent with the findings. However, greater detail is provided as to what should be considered as understanding the environment, which includes student demand, regulations and accreditations, and governmental policies.

The sub-factors related to relationships and campus are respectively related to the Relationship and the Resource factor and will be addressed in the relevant sections. However, both sub-factors serve to show that the factors are inter-related and should not be considered in isolation.

**Resource Factor**

As identified in the literature, resources contribute to establishing a competitive advantage (Barney, 1991), which can be used to create value (Srivastava et al., 2001). This factor examines the key resources which enable the successful running of an IBC.

The findings show that resources are a key contributing success factor, but the literature suggests that resources are an element of ownership advantage (Head and Ries, 2008; Shan and Song, 1997). However, given that IBC’s are very resource intensive (Caruana, 2008; Rumbley and Altbach, 2007); the increased importance of adequate resources is unsurprising. Four resources are identified (as seen in Table 28 and Figure 30) that would facilitate the successful running of an IBC.

Finance is essential, especially when establishing an IBC (Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014; Horton, 2003; Wilson and Amine, 2009). The findings
indicate the use and sources of available finance. Addressing the latter, the sources of funding are suggested in the externally funded IBCs (Lane and Kinser, 2013; Verbik, 2015) (see Table 11). This is linked to the need to maintain control, which would go beyond the management of the IBC if partners are introduced. The need to control partners is further discussed in the Relationship factor. The need to provide financial aid is identified in the findings and the literature, which suggests that the availability of such assistance can increase enrolments (Binsardi and Ekwulugo, 2003; Dynarski, 2000).

The topic of faculty and teaching is prominent in IBC literature and is acknowledged as a key input in higher education (Coelli, 1996; McMilan and Datta, 1998). In the context of resources, this would refer to the availability of staff whether they are sourced from the home campus or locally. First, the number of willing and available home staff to teach at the IBC is important given the potential benefits (Ranjan et al., 2012). Secondly, the availability of local staff is linked to the location advantage of the OLI theory, which suggests that a host country increases in attractiveness if adequate human resources are available (Sadoi, 2008). The faculty sub-factor also relates to teaching, but these are more relevant in the Course factor and will be discussed in that section.

The findings show the importance of having a good campus, which includes both academic and non-academic facilities. The need for academic facilities is essential, given that education is predicated on delivery, but the importance of non-academic facilities is mentioned and supports the research of Wilkins and Balakrishnan (2015).
Course Factor

The course element relates to how well an HEI can deliver its core offering. Thus, this factor can be incorporated into a generic model to reflect the ability of the organisation to deliver its key offerings. A weak link could be made to ownership advantage, as the course provided could be considered a competitive advantage if it is perceived to be superior to local alternatives (Altbach and Knight, 2007; Lane, 2011). However, it is identified as a separate factor that needs to be acknowledged (as seen in Table 29 and Figure 32) as there are facets within it that need to be carefully planned.

The main focal point of the findings concerning the Course factor is the need for standardisation and/or adaption. The findings and the literature show that there is a need to make adaption to suit the local context (Littrell, 2005) without compromising equivalency or quality (Farrugia and Lane, 2013; Ip, 2006). However, as indicated in the literature, the choice of standardisation or adaption can be determined by uncertainty and institutional difference (Phillips et al., 2009), and does not need to be holistically applied to all areas of the IBC (Shams and Huisman, 2011). Therefore, there is still a need to understand what elements of an IBC need to be adapted or standardised. Some of these elements are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Other areas identified concerning the course are not only the necessity to understand the student market but the requirements of local employers. The findings suggest that the course requires adaption to suit the needs of the local industry and a method of achieving this is working with local organisations when designing the course. This is essential given that contributing to the local
The economy is one of the benefits of establishing an IBC for the host country (Jones, 2001; Varghese, 2007).

Related to the previous point, the use of local and home staff impacts the ability to provide either a standardised or an adapted approach. The findings suggest the importance of available home staff (as it is a means of ensuring high quality) and the need to understand the local needs. The literature suggests that for the latter, local staff will have the best understanding of the local context (Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014), but the findings do not suggest this; instead, the importance of incorporating local staff is emphasised. Thus, there is a need to further understand the benefits of using local staff.

Quality is also a dominant sub-factor, and the findings indicate that these are related to the course, the faculty and the students. The faculty consideration has been addressed in the discussion of the use of the home and the local staff. Thus, greater focus will be placed on the course and the students.

The findings show that quality issues concerning the course relate to the standardisation of assessments, which would make the offered degrees equivalent to those at the home campus. Second, the importance of accreditations is suggested. The findings address the need to have accreditations and identify those that would recognise the course. The literature highlights the benefits of accreditations, which include being a selling point and improving rankings (Altbach and Knight, 2007; Knight, 2015b). Therefore, the evidence of the benefits has not been identified, even though the need has been.

The second aspect of quality is related to students and the need to recruit using similar requirements that demonstrate another area that should be standardised. The need to recruit high-quality students is in line with the literature,
which also suggests that this is one facet that contributes to providing a similar experience at the IBC (Altbach, 2015b). Furthermore, Bain and Drengenberg (2016) suggest that students collaborate in producing the product for inputs, which suggests that they will impact the quality of the course. Thus, further strengthening the need to recruit strong students at the IBC.

The remaining three sub-factors, which are course marketing, market demand and student tuition are identified in the findings and are related to elements of the HEI factor, and refer to the ability to understand the specific market for the course being provided. For instance, understanding the affordability of the course in relation to the targeted market. These three areas will require further investigation as to what their impact is on the IBC, which will be addressed in the case studies.

**Host Country Factor**

The factor refers to understanding the key entities in the host country, which can impact the success of an IBC (as seen in Table 30 and Figure 33). The host country is closely linked to the location advantage of the OLI theory, which focuses on the benefits of operating in the country (Sadoi, 2008).

The findings highlight the importance of understanding the potential barriers to operating an IBC. This is closely linked to the HEI factor, which stresses the importance of fully understanding the environment. Some areas within the regulations sub-factor have been previously addressed, with the only exception being the repatriation of funds, censorship and immigration. These areas are also recognised in the literature, with the attention to financial
incentives (Artige and Nicolini, 2005), academic freedom (Gottfredson, 2010; Robertson, 2010a) and ease of entry and visa issues (Binsardi and Ekwulugo, 2003; Kusumawati, 2010) being identified. Furthermore, although identified as a separate sub-factor, the importance of the government is suggested in both the literature and the findings (Kim and Lee, 2006; Rumbley and Altbach, 2007; Sharma, 2007) concerning assistance (Mahani and Molki, 2011) and regulations (Becker, 2009).

Another finding is the importance of market demand, which relates to the size of the student market and the need for appropriate forecasts. First, the size of the student market is related to both the country itself and its neighbours, which coincides with market seeking investments (Dunning and Lundan, 2008; Franco et al., 2010). Second, a lack of appropriate forecasts is identified as the main cause of failure (Lane, 2011; McBurnie, 2015).

**Relationship Factor**

This factor includes the potential entities to establish relationships with, as well as how they should be managed. Given the context-specific nature of this factor, the areas identified have not been previously addressed in the literature, but some of them have been alluded to, such as local industry (in the Course factor), regulatory bodies and government (both in the Host Country factor) and staff (in the Resource factor).

In addition to the entities with whom to establish relationships with, the key considerations for the selection and the management of the partners are highlighted. The main findings again coincide with the literature which highlights
the importance of maintaining academic control (Schoepp, 2015) and sharing a common purpose (Verbik, 2015).

Summary of Factors

Overall, five broad areas are identified, which provides a context to the generic OLI theory. For the most part, the findings confirm the areas defined in the literature, but there are some differences. First, the HEI advantage is divided into three factors (HEI, Course and Resources) and specific areas within them are identified. Second, location advantage is renamed Host Country, but principally the concept is the same. Third, Relationship remains the same, but potential entities have been identified, as well as the need to vet and manage partnerships. Finally, internalisation is not a prominent theme in the findings, but it is important as it relates to risk and uncertainty, which are identified as important when considering IBCs (Caruana, 2008; Philips et al., 2009; Rumbley and Altbach, 2007).

The findings differ from other research as it draws the literature together and verifies the contribution to how an IBC can operate efficiently. However, the findings are theoretical, and further investigation is required to understand how the elements impact the success or the failure of an IBC. This will be addressed in the case studies, which will verify and confirm the factors identified in this chapter.
4.7.2 Research Question 2 – Success Measures

As identified in the findings, failure measures are the opposite of the success measures; thus, the discussion will only focus on how success can be measured. Six broad areas (as identified in Figure 36) that could be used to gauge the success of an IBC are identified. For the most part, these areas have not been explicitly mentioned in the literature as measures, but in essence, refer to realising the benefits of IBC. Moreover, they can be considered as the potential outputs for the IBC (Besanko and Braeutigam, 2013).

Success Measures

The Student and Alumni measures address student accomplishments (both during and after their time at the IBC) and student satisfaction. Some of these areas are already present in the literature, such as graduate employment (Maringe, 2006) and student achievement (Yoo and Donthu, 2002), which relate to the benefits of completing a course. Furthermore, the topic of satisfaction has been addressed in the context of IBC by authors such as Wilkins et al., (2012). The remaining two elements have been identified mainly from the findings of this chapter.

Two areas are identified within the host country measures, and these refer to achieving the benefits of having IBCs in the country and negating the drawbacks. First, contribution to the economy is identified, which coincides with the literature in terms of the reduction of the brain drain effect (Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014; Jones, 2001) and increased revenue (Morgan, 2010b; Shams and Huisman, 2012). Second, a potential success measure in the host
country is the reduced impact on the environment (such as pollution) (Beladi et al., 2000; Reuveny and Thompson, 2007).

Very few measures are identified concerning relationships; among them, three areas are suggested, which are related to those found in the Relationship factor. Although these are mentioned, they remain vague and will require further clarification before linkages can be made to the literature. However, given the importance of integration between campuses (Farrugia and Lane, 2013), working with local organisations (Abe and Zhao, 2000; Schaumburg-Müller, 2009) and regulations (Sharma, 2007), these areas identified would be possible considerations.

Finance and reputation measures are directly related to the benefits of establishing an IBC for HEIs as identified by many authors (for example Altbach and Knight, 2007; Marginson, 2006; McBurnie and Ziguras 2007), who state that the advantages of IBCs include generating new sources of revenue and enhancing the international reputation of the HEI. Furthermore, areas within finance have been identified in previous research conducted by Mazzarol (1998). However, an area within reputation, which has received limited attention in the literature as a measure, is research. Some authors suggest that IBCs act as a distraction for conducting research (Robertson, 2010a), but there are contradicting studies that indicate that IBCs can be a means of increasing research output (Gottfredson, 2010; Wilkins and Huisman, 2011a).
Summary of Measures

Similar to the factors, the measures confirm that some areas within the literature are too generic, which is unsurprising given that specific measures have not been fully addressed in the extant literature. Instead, they can be coaxed out by transforming the benefits of IBCs into measures. Therefore, the findings differ from the existing literature by explicitly stating six potential broad measures of success. However, these remain theoretical; thus, the case studies will be used to understand which measures are employed in IBCs.

4.7.3 Research Question 3 – Success Factor Framework

To this point, each of the factors have been analysed in isolation to establish a better understanding of the elements within them. This section develops each of the factors and illustrates the linkages between them. Furthermore, this is important as it is essential to not only understand which factors contribute to success, but how they can be used to achieve success i.e. how to maximise the IBC’s output (Nonaka and Toyama, 2002).

Success Factor Framework

The first stage identifies five factors (HEI, Host Country, Partnerships, Resources and Course), all of which have many sub-factors that are related to one another. For instance, the Course factor is related to both Resources and Host Country as the course requires teaching staff (which is a sub-category of the Resource factor), and enrolment along with the type of course to provide, is impacted by competition (which is a sub-category within the Host Country factor).
Therefore, this demonstrates a link between the five categories. However, despite these linkages, there is no sequential process of how the factors influence one another. Thus, they can be seen as five separate factors that contribute to the success or failure of an IBC. This is the basis for the first framework (as seen in Figure 37).

**Figure 37: Stage 1 Success and Failure Factor Framework**

The second stage of the expert surveys increases the number of sub-factors identified within each of the factors, as well as confirming and increasing the number of linkages between them. However, the HEI factor becomes a fundamental aspect; thereby dictating the others. The HEI factor directly impacts relationships and elements of the resources, which coincides with the literature which states that a fit is needed between an organisation and a host country (Lynch, 2006). Moreover, the predominate theme in the second stage of the expert survey is ‘contextualisation’, whereby the factors are augmented to suit the purpose of the situation. This further justifies the importance of the HEI, as this would be the context which all the other factors will account for (e.g. the resources would depend on the HEI’s situation and what is needed for the
investment). As a result, *HEI* is the first variable that needs to be considered. (See Figure 38)

Following the *HEI* factor, the responses from the second stage allude to a secondary variable: the host country. The *Relationship, Resources* and *Course* factors are to be led by the host country, which is supported by the need for the HEI to establish a comprehensive understanding of the host country (Fegan and Field, 2009; McBurnie, 2015; Vinen and Selvarajah, 2008). An example is the *Course* factor, which is determined by the needs of students, local organisations and existing offers. Therefore, this suggests that once the HEI has determined that it has an ownership advantage (Head and Ries, 2008; Shan and Song, 1997) and can invest in an IBC, an attractive host country should be available before considering the other factors. Furthermore, this essentially presents a sequential process of establishing an IBC.

The final element of the process consists of the last three factors. This assumes that the HEI is capable of investing abroad and that a suitable host country is available. The extent to which the remaining three factors require adaption or standardisation need to be identified. For instance, considering resources, the availability of governmental financial assistance would reduce the amount of capital needed by the HEI during the initial investment, thus suggesting that the three factors are contextually dependent on the host country. One such method is the use of the I-R paradigm proposed by Shams and Huisman (2011), which could be adapted to incorporate the three factors in this study, rather than those in the original research.
Two key issues are raised in the third stage of the expert survey. The responses below suggest that the relationship and resource elements can be linked to the HEI factor. Thus, the three factors in the third stage cannot be solely augmented based on the host country. Instead, the other factors can be used to determine which host country is selected.

The response by (S3: R5) suggests that HEIs can determine which host country to invest in based on existing relationships, which is also suggested in the literature (Kimura, 1989; Morck and Yeung, 1992), such as invitations from the governments (Arokiasamy, 2010) and local organisations (Verbik, 2015). This could reduce barriers to entering a particular country, as they are likely to have additional knowledge or experience of working in that country (Werlau, 2001). However, an inherent issue is its suggestion that host countries would not be attractive if they had no prior connections to the country, and this could eliminate some lucrative markets. Nonetheless, existing relationships can make host countries more attractive by reducing risks (Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014).
The second response by (S3:R6) highlights that resources are part of the HEI. Therefore, they cannot be augmented solely to suit the host country. This creates another issue in the previous framework. For instance, an investment into a particular host country may require specific resources to be competitive (Barney, 1991). If the HEI does not have these resources, the destination is no longer viable. Thus, available resources could reduce the number of host countries that can be selected.

These responses demonstrate that two of the factors are related to the HEI, but this can also apply to the Course factor. Although it is not mentioned by the respondents, logically, the course is run by the HEI. Therefore, to run a course at an IBC, the HEI needs to provide an equivalent already, and not create a new course to meet the market demand, which is likely to have quality issues. Therefore, Relationships, Resources and Course (RRC) are linked to the HEI. Furthermore, it is identified that certain sub-factors are also linked, which demonstrates a connection among the RRC factors. For instance, a course should be linked to industry; but to enable this, a relationship with local organisations is needed in the host country. The similar applies to resources; for a course to run, an IBC requires the facilities and the staff to do so.

Sequentially, this framework develops on the previous (i.e. Figure 39) by illustrating that the HEI needs to examine the RRC factors before selecting a host
country. For example, an HEI would question whether they are running a suitable course, which could be used at an IBC. Following a review of the RRC factors, a host country can be identified, which again aligns with the concept of a strategic fit (Dunning and Wymbs, 2001; Lynch, 2006).

Figure 39: Stage 3 Success and Failure Framework

A final observation regarding the above framework is the direction of investment. This is not an outcome based on responses but an additional insight into how the framework can be utilised, which also supports the research conducted by Sadoi (2008). As previously mentioned, the HEI will need to consider the RRC factors before considering which host country to select. Similarly, host countries can use the same factors to assess which HEIs they could attract. This highlights that this model can potentially be utilised by the HEI and the host country. However, this goes beyond the scope of this research and presents a potential gap for future research.

Overall, this section has addressed the development of a success and failure model. To date; there is limited literature that proposes such a model which
can be used to understand the significant facets when establishing an IBC. Furthermore, the model may also apply to FDIs in general, substituting course for product or service. The following study will aim to identify whether this process is evident in practice as well as which factors are the key to success or failure.

4.8 Conclusion of Expert Surveys

This chapter discusses the first stage of the data analysis. The findings show that there are five success and failure factors (HEI, Resource, Course, Relationships and Host Country), six measures of success and failure (Student and Alumni, Host Country, Relationship, Quality, Finances and Reputation) and a framework. The above represents a significant contribution to literature, as the factors represent a comprehensive holistic view of what IBCs should consider. Similarly, the measures and frameworks are two areas that have received limited attention in the literature. However, all these remain theoretical and need to be verified, which is the purpose of the next chapter.

4.8.1 Implications for the Second Stage

The factors, measures and framework need to be tested in a practical perspective, i.e. do all factors occur in real investments? How important are they? Furthermore, this will serve to identify how a theoretical perspective translates into a practical situation. Therefore, the next stage of research will determine the success and failure factors based on operational and non-operational IBCs. This will identify which factors lead to the success or failure of a campus; also how the HEI measures success will need to be determined along with specific indicators.
5. Data Analysis – Mini Case Studies Analysis and Semi-Structured Interviews

5.1. Introduction

In total, 10 cases were identified; these represent five successful operational campuses and five failed non-operational campuses. The cases studies comprise of an amalgamation of face-to-face interviews (transcripts are presented in Appendix 8) and secondary data. A number of themes were identified, which strengthen the factors defined in the previous chapter.

5.2 Successful Campuses

As of 2015, there are 259 campuses (total number (279) – closed (20)) still in operation (C-BERT, 2015). The campuses are spread over 82 countries with the most popular being China (33) followed closely by Dubai (30). Further, the campuses originate from 35 countries with a clear majority coming from the US (101), followed by the UK (42).

Like the previous chapter, only one of the success case studies (Campus A) will be presented to demonstrate how the key facets were identified from both the interviews and secondary data. The information regarding campus B – E can be found in Appendix 9.

5.2.1 Campus A

This campus is a US-based higher education institution (HEI) located in the UK, which opened in 2005. Additionally, this HEI has a campus in Singapore...
(which will relocate to Hong Kong). As of 2013, the campus has awarded 2000 MBAs (UChicagoNews, 2013), and The Economist currently ranks this campus first for MBAs (TheEconomist, 2015). Many facets have contributed to the success of this campus, which are discussed below.

**Understanding of the Investment**

The need to understand the market was identified to be essential, in particular, the availability of potential students. Similarly, there is also a need to understand the correct resources that are required to operate successfully. In the case of Campus A, the necessity to have sufficient start-up funds was mentioned. Furthermore, the need to understand the strengths of the HEI’s brand and the associated benefits is highlighted, which is addressed in the next section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(CA:R1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘…..make sure you’ve got enough money to kick it off right and understand what it really takes to make an international campus work.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘…..really understand the market, who you’re trying to attract and what’s your real ability to attract students to your programme is going to be. I think there are more and more schools trying to do international campuses. I think for some of them they go in with the idea that they are going to attract a large class..’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Branding and Reputation**

The importance of branding and reputation was mentioned in the below response, which contributes to the operation of an international branch campus (IBC). Firstly, having a good brand was identified to contribute to a campus’s
success, as it increases the appeal of the campus, which in turn impacts the level of enrolment. Secondly, it was identified that the motivation to establish an IBC is to enhance the international reputation of the HEI.

‘[Campus A] is pretty well regarded around the world and I think that has a big impact on us being successful in all of our international operations, including London.

‘….. I think sometimes they are surprised at how little visibility they have or how difficult it is to attract the right kinds of students.’

‘So I guess those are really the two main things; building a worldwide reputation and allow our faculty to see what’s going on in that part of the world.’

‘I think the first one is – really figure out why you want to do this; what is the real goal, is it to make money, is it to build a reputation, is it to give your students a chance to study abroad, what is the real goal?’

Host Country

A number of issues have to be considered when selecting and operating in the host country. Firstly, the selection of an appropriate location for a campus was identified to be one of the most important and arduous decisions to be made. It was essential that the chosen country provided sufficient benefits and allowed the campus to operate efficiently and competitively.

‘So that’s where I kind of go back to location being a really important success factor. In fact, you know, probably the critical success factor.’

‘I think may be one of the biggest challenges for us was finding a suitable location for the Campus, one that physically met our needs but also was within the budget. Again, not a road block, but just something that took a little time to find.’
Campus A was originally established in Barcelona and was later moved to London in 2005. This type of relocation is becoming a common practice for the institution, as the campus has recently moved one of its programmes from Singapore to Hong Kong (Bradshaw, 2013). Nonetheless, it is evident that London was an attractive destination and provided many opportunities, in particular, the branding of the location. In addition, other benefits cited included access to partners and a large student market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(CA:R2)</th>
<th>‘What we have also found in our attracting students to our programme is that London in itself is just an advantage because students, particularly those who want to have a career in Europe or even a global career, want to have a city like London on their CVs or their resume…. that has become an asset which I think we've probably underestimated in the beginning and that just wasn't, you know. It reminded me because it wasn’t true in Barcelona at all.’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(CA:R1)</td>
<td>‘…London is clearly the business and finance capital of Europe, if not the world. It was just felt that as a business school, we would have a greater access to corporate relationships, greater access to a wider number of students and it would be more attractive as a place to come for business people and people with an interest in studying business.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

…we felt that London not only had a large number of expats living in London, working in London but also that it was easy to get to and from throughout Europe and many people from other parts of Europe had business reasons to be there anyway… So the convenience factor was pretty high and it was an attractive place for business people to come.’

Availability of alumni is another advantage of selecting the host country, which in this case was seen as a precursor to having suitable financial resources. As the campus had previously operated in Europe, there was a large group of alumni which resided within the country, which allowed the campus to utilise this relationship for advice and generating awareness.
Despite the numerous benefits of the host country, there were drawbacks involved as well, namely, the competitive environment and legislation. Firstly, there are numerous competitors in the host country, especially as the country itself has a very developed tertiary education sector. This created some barriers initially during the launch of the campus. Notwithstanding, the majority of students at the campus are from outside the UK.

The final element of the host country to be addressed is the regulations, in particular, visa regulations. Given the unique model of only using “fly in” staff (discussed later) and a high concentration of students coming from outside the UK, several issues were created for the campus that could impact enrolment and the ability to deliver the programmes offered.
‘We needed permission from the Minister of Education for what we were going to do. We needed to make sure that our students were going to be admitted into the country and there was legal and regulatory issues we had to resolve, I wouldn’t call them roadblocks but just one had to go through to make sure that we could operate there and that our students could come.’

‘You know, the immigration environment in the UK, the changing immigration environment, the ever changing immigration environment in the UK has been really difficult to keep up with and costly to keep up with as well…….. And because we do depend on the free flow of people between cross borders to make this work, yeah, that’s added a cost to the programme.’

Regardless of these problems, it is evident that the campus found the benefits of the host country outweighed the drawbacks. When asked what the campus would do differently if they were to start again, both respondents stated that they would not change the current host.

‘I think we’re very pleased with London. It is clearly a place where we have been successful, and I hope continue to be successful. So I would imagine that we’d still seek that direction if we were to start it up today.’

‘We’d still come to London, I think we’re really happy with the location in the city, you know.’

Partnerships

Originally, the campus was established without partners; the main advantage identified for this was greater control. That said, the campus sought advice from an external organisation during the set-up phase; however, this was not a formal partnership. Nonetheless, since opening, they have established a partnership with external organisations, which includes the Chartered
Management Institute and the Oxford University Private Equity Institute. However, it was identified that the campus would have further benefited from additional guidance from other outside organisations during the initial years of operation.

| (CA:R1) | ‘…we’ve taken one approach which is not do partnerships, but there are some disadvantages increases the cost, increases some of the risk but gives us greater control.’ |
| (CA:R2) | ‘Well we worked with Sync London which is an inward investment agency. They were particularly helpful more on the site selection and helping us see what the options were here. And then they were helpful in terms of, specifically in the first year, of helping with introductions…’ |
| | ‘The advisory board, I don’t want to overestimate their value but I think having that in the beginning would have been really helpful and we only established it a couple of years in.’ |

**Branch Campus Model**

A case study of this campus carried out by the AACSB (2011, p. 295) identified that a strong focus is placed on solely using home faculty, as this enhances “collegiality and collaboration”, which enhances standardisation. This is also apparent from the interviews, as it was identified that faculty are often supportive and willing to travel. However, the arrangement with the faculty does not include financial incentives (beyond covering expenses); instead, faculty are allocated higher workload credits. Ultimately, this model allows for a very high level of integration and standardisation between the campuses.
‘Yeah, I mean the benefit of using them is why we’re here in the first place which is we want to offer a [home country] MBA to people, a perspective student population and for whom the opportunity cost of going to [the home country] is too high, so without [home] faculty it’s difficult to offer and promise people the same experience as they’d be getting in [home campus].’

‘Well the primary way is to have a faculty member that’s from [home country]. So the classroom experience is that just because of who’s teaching a class. From the administrative standpoint, again the directors of the programmes tend to have had experience here in [home country], know the faculty well, know the processes well, understand what we are trying to do as an institution… They work together at all of our campuses to connect them up with processes and approaches, and student service concepts that are going to be similar across all of our programmes. Having somebody that understands what goes on here in [home campus], is very very important and it’s really somebody who has worked here for some time to understand that’

The pure use of fly-in faculty has several benefits, as it ensures that the material being delivered is equivalent (albeit some cultural adaptations are made i.e. case studies) to that offered at the home campus. Consequently, this allows for increased level of control over quality.

‘Well the primary benefit is you’re getting a [home campus] education and not somebody else’s education, and we have greater control over the quality of what goes on in the classroom, we have control over the curriculum, and we just make sure that what we do in London is identical to what we would do in [home campus] or in Singapore.

In addition to increased standardisation, the use of home faculty is also used as a measure of failure (i.e. if staff are reluctant to teach abroad, this would be an indicator that the campus is not operating correctly). Furthermore, the campuses have integrated technology into their classrooms to ensure that classes are
conducted even if faculty from the home campus cannot travel (The Economist, 2015). This highlights another issue of commitment; the fact that the campus can operate successfully with this model indicates that the staff buy-in to the campuses. However, it was noted that this model has one downfall, which is the impact on the students' experience as staff are not always present.

| (CA:R2) | ‘So our faculty fly in from [home campus] so it's essentially an important factor. So, you know, another measure that we weren't doing well and no one on our faculty has a particular stated obligation to teach in our programmes, so another part which signs to us that we would not be doing well is us struggling to find faculty that want to teach on our programme.’ |
|         | We don’t have the full richness of a campus life that you might have from having full-time academics around. It hampers us sometimes on visibility and media because we don’t have faculty who are close at hand, easy to reach.’ |

Another element identified was the management at Campus A. The AACSB (2011) identified that although the management team have autonomy regarding marketing and recruitment, they all report to the Dean for Executive MBA at the main campus, and communication is very frequent. Furthermore, it was stated that when senior management is selected, it is essential that the person is well acquainted with the home campus and its philosophy.

| (CA:R2) | ‘All of the directors of our international campuses and our executives of our campuses here in London and [home campus], report to the same person. They have regular communication weekly, if not more often than that…. What we have found is that with directors, it is very important for us to have a director in the international campus who has spent time in [the home campus] and knows the [home campus] approach and the [home campus] philosophy very very well.’ |
Measures of Success and Failure

The main measures of success as indicated by the interviews included students, faculty and fiscal performance; these are included in Table 39.

Table 39: Campus A Success Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student related</th>
<th>Faculty Related</th>
<th>Fiscal Performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of students</td>
<td>1. Quality of Faculty</td>
<td>1. Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quality of the students</td>
<td>2. Staff performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Quality of services provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Student Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Willingness to travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enquiries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Type of Courses Chosen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case Summary

Overall, the campus continues to operate today and has earned many notable awards. Campus A adopted a somewhat unique model that involves only using staff from the home campus. This has several benefits that mainly revolve around control over the investment. In contrast to other campuses involved in these case studies, Campus A was originally established in another country, but was relocated due to the associated benefits of being located in London such as the enhanced market opportunities. To conclude, there were a number of factors that resulted in the success of this campus (as seen in Figure 40).
5.3 Failure Cases

This section consists of two parts, which includes a general discussion on the failed campuses followed by the failure cases. Due to the lack of respondents willing to participate in this research (as a result of confidentiality or no longer being employed by said HEI), secondary sources were assessed to gather information on each campus. Furthermore, it was apparent through analysing secondary information that reluctance to share information about these campuses was a common theme (Marcus, 2011). The only exception is Campus J, which includes an interview with the International Director at the HEI.
5.3.1 Failed Campuses

As of 2015, 29 campuses are no longer in operation; this is an approximate failure rate of 10%, which suggests that 1 in 10 campuses opened have closed (C-BERT, 2015). From Figure 41 and 42, it can be observed that Dubai and the US have the highest number of campus closures for a host country and a home country, respectively. However, Dubai hosts the largest number of campuses, and five failures represent a failure rate of 17%. Similarly, the US has the highest number of campuses abroad, and 15 failures represent a failure rate of 15%. Thus, neither country is substantially above the average failure rate.

Figure 41: Campus Closures (Host Country)
An additional noteworthy observation relates to Australia and the UK. Firstly, Australia has 19 campuses abroad, of which six have failed; this represents a particularly high failure rate of 32%. In contrast, the UK has 42 campuses, and only two have failed; this represents a very low failure rate of 5%. Additionally, on average, operational time until closure was between four – seven years. Furthermore, the majority of closures occurred between 2004 and 2009 (thirteen closures) and between 2012 and 2014 (nine closures) (C-BERT, 2015).

Similar to the success case studies, only one of the failed case studies (campus F) will be presented to demonstrate how the key facets were identified using secondary data. The information regarding campus G – J can be found in Appendix 10.
5.3.2 Campus F

In 2007, a US-based HEI established a new IBC in Dubai and offered five undergraduate programmes, which commenced in 2008 (Mills, 2010; Wilkins, 2010). Furthermore, the HEI entered into a partnership with Dubai Holdings, which provided loans and grants to establish the campus. Following two years of operations, the campus downsized its focus by offering a small number of postgraduate programmes (Lane and Kinsner, 2012; Marcus, 2011; Swan, 2012a). Thus, this campus is not a complete failure, but its operations have been greatly reduced. Nonetheless, there are several issues associated with the campus that needs to be addressed.

Due Diligence Issues

One due diligence issue was the campus’s inability to enrol the forecasted number of students (Marcus, 2011). Sources identified that the campus had forecasted to attract between 100 to 200 students (with future forecasts of up to 800) in the augural year, which was required to cover the operating costs (Abramson, 2010; Mills, 2010; Shaya, 2012). However, the campus attracted approximately 85 students (Redden, 2010; Shaya, 2012). In this case, there were two potential causes for the low enrolments: high tuition fees and entry requirements.

The tuition fees charged were described as being too high (Marcus, 2011; Mills, 2010). Accordingly, Swan (2012b) identified that the fees were approximately Dh58,000 a year. This was high in comparison to other UK branch campuses in the areas, which charged between Dh39,500 and Dh45,000 a year.
Additionally, a reason for the high fees may be related to the primary use of home staff to deliver the course (Shaya, 2012), which allows for greater control at the expense of higher costs. Ultimately, students found cheaper alternatives in the area.

High entry requirements also contributed to the failure to reach enrolment targets (Marcus, 2011). The HEI used the same entry requirements that were used in the home campus (Mills, 2010; Redden, 2010; Shaya, 2012) for the purpose of maintaining the quality of education. Consequently, this reduced the number of eligible students that could be enrolled at the campus. However, with the intention to increase enrolments, the campus offered lower tuition fees to capable students (Redden, 2010), but the campus continued to reject students who did not meet the high entry requirements (Lewin, 2009).

Arguably, although both areas mentioned above are two separate issues, they are interrelated. Furthermore, the impact of these problems could have been reduced by enhancing the HEI’s understanding of the ability of the local students and environment.

Failure to attract sufficient students reduces revenue and incurs losses for the campus, which is the primary cause for the failure of the undergraduate programmes. Furthermore, the financial situation, in this case, is unique in comparison to the majority of the other HEIs that are no longer operational. A Dubai-based organisation had offered a “bail out” before the campus decided to cease its undergraduate operations, but this offer was rejected due to the suspicion that the organisation had investors from the Iranian government, which had ulterior motives and created spy fears (Golden, 2012; Howell, 2012).
Nevertheless, failure to attract students will require campuses to seek additional funding, and over-reliance on funds can be an issue.

**Environmental Changes**

In 2008, the financial crisis impacted the economy in Dubai, with three of the four campus closures occurring after this time (C-BERT, 2015). As a result, resources promised by Dubai Holdings were never delivered, such as a library and student housing (Abramson, 2010; Mills, 2010). This highlights issues of over-reliance on government resources (Crombie-Borgos, 2013; Yung and Sharma, 2013). Thus, more consideration concerning finances and resources is required when establishing an IBC, in particular, having contingencies in place, as the absence of these facilities impacts the quality of the course and student experience.

Increased competition represents another issue that needed to be addressed in the case of Campus F. Upon the campus being established; other HEIs tried to establish themselves. For instance, another American-based HEI opened a new campus; New York University (NYU) opened a campus in Abu Dhabi, which offered a wider range of similar programs (Mills, 2010). Moreover, Dubai has the second highest number (30) of IBCs globally. Therefore, this made it particularly difficult for Campus F to operate for two reasons. Firstly, the HEIs (such as NYU) potentially had better brand recognition and awareness, and secondly, this further exacerbated the previously mentioned issue of high tuition fees, which increased the number of alternatives for students.
Withdrawal

The exit of campus F is different compared to the other failed campuses, as this campus did not fail completely, in that the HEI decided only to stop running the undergraduate programmes. Instead, the focus was switched to post-graduate programmes and a relocation from the Dubai International Academic City to the Knowledge Village (Lane and Kinsner, 2012). Furthermore, it was pointed out that the HEI switched its focus from attracting a large number of students to providing quality education (Swan, 2012a). Nevertheless, this section will concentrate on two issues related to how the campus withdrew and its impact on the HEI.

When the closure of Campus F was announced, existing students were fully informed, supported and offered a place at its US campus or given the option of applying to another HEI in the UAE (Swan, 2012a; Wilkins, 2010). Moussly (2010) identified that approximately 50 students transferred to their US campus, which made up just over half of the students enrolled.

In terms of impact on the home campus, similar to others, the two key issues were financial losses and damage to the HEI’s reputation. Firstly, the estimated cost of exiting was suggested to be between $1.3 million to $1.7 million (Redden, 2010; Wilkins, 2010). However, the losses were covered by a foundation and investment income, and it was stressed that no funds generated from the home campus were used (Mills, 2010). This demonstrates the importance of financial resources, as it is essential to manage financial losses in such cases. Thus, it is not only crucial to have sufficient financial resources during the development of a campus, but also to ensure that the resources are available during its operation and if the campus were to cease operations. Secondly, it has
been suggested that as a result of the failed campus, the home campus suffered damage to its international reputation (Marcus, 2011). Therefore, it will be essential to limit the damage and manage the process of exiting/closing a campus well.

**Case Summary**

Overall, Campus F remains operational, but not as it initially intended. Thus, this campus is not a complete failure. There were issues that resulted in the closure of the undergraduate programme, which were mainly grouped as due diligence and environmental changes (see Figure 43). However, there were successful elements, which include a reasonable exit strategy and the ability to maintain postgraduate programmes.

**Figure 43: Campus F Case Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Due Diligence</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Withdrawal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Forecasts</td>
<td>- Financial Crisis</td>
<td>- Students were offered full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Understanding of students (ability)</td>
<td>- Competition</td>
<td>scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Understanding of existing environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Discussion and Case Study Comparison

Various findings relating to the contributors of success have been identified in the analysis of the successful (SC) and failed (FC) campuses. These are addressed in relation to the research questions by discussing the success and failure factors (Research Question 1), followed by the measures of success and failure (Research Question 2) and finally, developments in the framework for IBCs (Research Question 3). Comparisons will be made with the findings of both, the previous chapter and literature. Below is a table that summarises the basic information about the campuses, which have been taken from the individual cases in this chapter and Appendix 9 and 10.

Table 40: Campus Case Study Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Key Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus A (CA)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>• Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Host Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus B (CB)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>• Strategic Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint Ventures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus C (CC)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>• Strategic Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Host Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Student Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus D (CD)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>• Strategy/Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.1 Research Question 1 – Success and Failure Factors

A total of five areas were identified in the findings of this chapter: the host country, HEI, understanding of the investment, joint ventures and resources. These are discussed in the context of the previously identified five factors. Therefore, the focus of this section is to address the development of the factors from the previous chapter and their linkage to the literature.

HEI Factor

The results of the previous chapter showed that this factor comprised of five sub-factors. The findings of the case studies highlight three broad areas (see

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Key Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Campus E (CE) | 2004 | N/A   | • Political Instability  
|           |      |       | • Host Country  
|           |      |       | • Student Market  
|           |      |       | • Teaching  
|           |      |       | • Management |
| Campus F (CF) | 2008 | N/A   | • Due Diligence  
|           |      |       | • Environment |
| Campus G (CG) | 2004 | 2005 | • Communication  
|           |      |       | • Quality Issues |
| Campus H (CH) | 1998 | 2007 | • Host Country  
|           |      |       | • Partnerships |
| Campus I (CI) | 2007 | 2007 | • Due Diligence  
|           |      |       | • Management  
|           |      |       | • Host Country |
| Campus J (CJ) | 2007 | 2014 | • Management  
|           |      |       | • Due Diligence  
|           |      |       | • Financial Provisions |
Figure 44), which all fall into the previous elements of the Competencies sub-factor, which was the focal point of the previous stage. Furthermore, another key finding of the case studies is the importance of understanding the facets of the investment, which is also strongly related to the HEI. However, given the facets within it, it is addressed separately at the end. Again, these areas relate to the ability of the HEI to establish a campus.

**Figure 44: Case Study HEI Summary**

Integration mainly refers to the communication and the level of control between the home campus and the IBC, additionally, the importance of HEIs treating IBCs as part of their operations rather than viewing them as a separate entity is stressed.

Regarding communication, the findings demonstrate that it is critical to maintain regular contact between the home campus and the IBC, which Lane (2011) suggests is difficult due to temporal boundaries. However, both CA and CE mention weekly management meetings between the campuses. The main purpose of these meetings is to ensure that the quality of the course and the ethos of the home campus is followed. Poor communication (as seen at CG)
raises issues related to reduced commitment and buy-in, which result in poor integration and control over the IBC.

Closely linked to communication is control. All bar one of the SCs (CD) mentioned the importance of maintaining control. The two primary reasons for maintaining control are quality control and ethos. Additionally, control transcends beyond the branch and can also relate to any partners involved (which is addressed in the Resource factor). Furthermore, the topic of control is also prevalent in the literature, with the focus being on retaining academic control to ensure consistent quality across campuses (McBurnie, 2015; Schoepp, 2015).

The findings further demonstrate the importance of ensuring that the ethos and culture of the HEI are prominent at the IBC (e.g. CA and CE). This would allow students to have a similar experience to the one at the home campus. In addition to regular communication, another method of standardising the student experience was through the use of home staff, which is also supported by other studies (Kinser and Lane, 2014; Ranjan et al., 2012).

The campuses which had prior experience demonstrated a better understanding of the nature of the investment such as the associated risks, the need to adopt a long-term approach and potential barriers. For instance, the management at CE fully understood that losses would be incurred initially and would require several years before any sufficient return would be achieved. Therefore, the focus was switched towards improving quality and increasing enrolment numbers. Thus, the understanding of the investment allows management to focus their attention, which would allow the HEI to operate efficiently. However, experience does not negate the need to carry further due
diligence on the investment, as each investment will be vastly different (Fegan and Field, 2009; Lane and Kinser, 2008; Vinen and Selvarajah, 2008).

The findings highlight the importance of strong leadership and a clear international vision and mission. A fundamental aspect of having strong leadership is the ability to materialise the HEI’s international strategy. An observation about the SCs is that the IBC had a clear role and contributed to the HEI’s overall mission (as evidenced by CB and CD), which the literature suggests is essential (Farrugia and Lane, 2013). An example of this is the selection of a host country, which usually coincides with the international targets of the HEI, such as CA and CB targeting Europe and Asia, respectively. Conversely, poor leadership can have detrimental effects (as seen in CI and CJ), which include managerial instability and lack of consistency between campuses. The leadership findings are also in line with Chapleo (2008), who states that strong leadership and a clear vision is the key to an HEI’s success.

In line with strong leadership, all of the SCs stressed the importance of establishing an IBC for an academic purpose rather than financial gains. However, that is not to say finances are not important as campuses need to be self-sustainable. One area that impacted the ability to maintain an academic focus is the involvement of partners who are focused on financial returns (as seen in CC). Although financial targets are often embedded into partnership agreements (Lane and Kinsner, 2012), the findings suggest that the primary focus should be on providing high-quality education and not allowing partners to lower the quality (such as entry requirements), which is also congruent with the findings of Schoepp (2015). This is important given that the SC campuses (such as CB and CE) stressed the importance of local credibility and enhancing the HEI’s
brand. Therefore, this highlights the need to communicate the importance of academic quality to any partner who is involved in the venture.

The case studies suggest that commitment is also a key aspect of management, as it is already established that this type of venture is a long-term undertaking (as exemplified in CE). Therefore, campuses should not expect substantial returns in the short term as suggested by Tascheva (2008). CC demonstrated a strong commitment to the campus despite numerous issues arising when the campus failed to reach the enrolment goals. In contrast, CG illustrated poor commitment that was made evident by the poor level of educational resources provided, which ultimately led to quality issues and delicensing. Furthermore, this campus and CI were criticised for prematurely choosing to close and were deemed to be too short-sighted in light of initial financial losses.

Finally, the case studies stressed the importance of “understanding”, which is also linked to elements within the host country. The main focal points are understanding the environmental forces, planning and seeking advice (as seen in Figure 45).

**Figure 45: Case Study Understanding Summary**
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One of the consistent causes of failure of a campus is insufficient understanding of the student market, which results in poor forecasting (e.g. CF and CJ). Most campuses had poor forecasts, but CF and CI did not fully understand the students’ ability and failed to react to market research. Subsequently, incorrect information was used during the planning process, which coincides with literature as to what contributes to the failure of IBCs (Altbach, 2011; Becker, 2009; Morgan, 2010b). Therefore, it is essential to carry out sufficient research to fully understand the market (as stressed in CB, CD and CE), which is also identified in the literature (Becker, 2009; Rumbley and Altbach, 2007). Additionally, CB highlighted the importance of experience and an existing presence in developing a good understanding of the host country (addressed further in the Host Country factor).

The second area of understanding is the use of external advice, which was commonly used amongst most of the SCs (e.g. CD and CE). The sources of information include advisory board (used by most campuses), local partners and staff (as seen in CB and CD). The use of external sources of information further supports the findings of Werlau (2001), which suggest that the only way to understand a market is to operate within it (e.g. CB, CC and CD). Furthermore, this also demonstrates the importance of using local staff to gather information, which coincides with the work of Ziguras (2008).

Planning is the final element of understanding, as the SCs identified the importance of dedicating sufficient time to planning. To this point, the areas related to understanding the environment have been focused on the collection of information with little attention given to how this can be used. The findings of the case studies demonstrate that it is essential for management to use this
information in the form of planning. This can include identifying potential barriers and designing appropriate mitigation strategies (as evidenced in CC and CD) and supports the assertion by Lane (2011) that HEIs will need to learn how to operate and take advantage of the local conditions. Furthermore, as part of planning, the need for continual monitoring was stressed in the case studies as well as in the literature (Knight, 2015c; McBurnie, 2015). As mentioned before, management needs to react appropriately, as not doing so can result in failure (e.g. CF). Furthermore, HEIs should learn from their experience of developing IBC (Dunning and Wymbs, 2001; Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014), which can be later used in future investments.

Overall, the HEI theme includes areas that are related to the ability to establish and operate an IBC. The core benefits are strong management supported by strong leadership and a clear vision, ensuring that the IBC is fully integrated and utilising knowledge from prior experiences where possible. Furthermore, the importance of developing a comprehensive understanding is critical, as it allows for due diligence to be carried out thoroughly. Additionally, the management at the HEI needs to be able to utilise the information and dedicate sufficient time to planning.

Similarities are drawn to the literature in the above section and are all related to the Competencies sub-factor in the previous chapter, which arguably suggests that this is the most important element of the HEI factor. Therefore, the findings of the case studies confirm both the findings in the literature and the previous chapter, which means that the theoretical areas identified previously can also be applied to a practical perspective.
Resource Factor

Resources refer to incorporating staff and finance issues (see Figure 46). Similar to other themes, some of the areas have been partly dealt with in other factors, but the focus of this section is to acknowledge those areas as available resources.

Figure 46: Case Study Resource Summary

The findings of the case studies further demonstrate the importance of having the correct composition of home and local staff. The majority of campuses (with the exception of CA) had a mix of both home and local staff. The SC identified the importance of using home staff, as this allowed for better control over quality (as seen in CC) and embedding the ethos of the HEI at the IBC, which also coincides with the literature (Kinser and Lane, 2014; Ranjan et al., 2012). Furthermore, numerous barriers can restrict home staff from travelling (Altbach, 2015b), which need to be overcome especially in cases where the IBC does not use local staff (as seen in CA). Finally, the willingness of staff to travel and use of home staff also demonstrate good buy-in and commitment to the campus.
The benefits of utilising local staff have been addressed above concerning seeking information about the local environment. However, the overuse of local staff causes quality concerns (as seen in CC), which support the findings of Ziguras (2008). Furthermore, in agreement with the research conducted by Knight (2015b), there is a need to manage conflicts between home and local staff, as the management at CC suggested that the views of the home and IBC staff were conflicting and resulted in the breakdown of communication and impacted quality. However, unlike the literature which suggests that governments may impose staffing percentages on IBCs (Becker, 2009; Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014), there was no evidence of this in the case studies, and the staff composition is dictated by the HEI.

The second area identified in the case studies is finances. There are substantial costs associated with building a campus abroad with the main bulk attributed to the acquisition or construction of a building. However, there are campuses that due to risk adversity lease buildings or enter partnership who provide the building (e.g. CH and CC, respectively). Additionally, there are many associated operating costs that are involved, all of which need to be accounted.

The case studies suggest three methods of financing an IBC, which can be broadly classed as internal, external and a mix of the two. The types of financing are similar to the types of IBCs identified by Lane and Kinser (2011) and Verbik (2015). One difference between them is the absence of academic partners as a means of establishing an IBC. The internal approach seems to be the least used (CA and CE). The purely external funding (see CD and CJ) derives all of its funds from partners or governmental bodies. Finally, the mixed approach appears to be the most commonly adopted approach (remaining campuses),
which usually involves some form of assistance from the host country’s government or a local partner.

From the findings, it is evident that funding can impact success. Arguably as both of the self-funded campuses (CA and CE) are successful, this method is more likely to succeed, which also supports suggestions by Wilkins and Balakrishnan (2015), with literature illustrating other IBCs succeeding through this approach (Mahani and Molki, 2011). On a similar note, both of the purely externally funded campuses (CD and CJ) have (or are due) to close, which suggests that this model may be the least feasible when establishing an IBC. Finally, the mixed approach has an equal number of SC and FC, with the principal cause of failure in this situation being over-reliance on outside funding (evidenced by CG, CI and CJ). Furthermore, this may be the only way of establishing an IBC due to governmental restrictions (e.g. CB) (Moran, 2005). Therefore, the least viable option is being purely externally funded.

The results of the case studies support the use of financial aid as a means of increasing enrolments, whether it is from the IBC or the government. Both CC and CE benefited from scholarships and sponsorships, respectively, as they reduced the financial barrier for potential students. Additionally, financial assistance was identified as important in the previous chapter and literature (Allen and Shen, 1999; Dynarski, 2000). However, the ability to provide, and the availability of, financial assistance need to be considered. Firstly, HEIs will need to have sufficient funds to provide student aid. Secondly, where sponsorship is predicated on external bodies (such as the government for CE), a clear understanding of the longevity of this support is needed.
A final consideration related to finances is the cost of withdrawal. In some cases, external funds are treated as loans and are subject to the performance of the campus. Therefore, if a campus closes and it has not met its commitments, it may be obliged to buy-out the rest of the agreement or return the funds in full (as seen in CI and CJ). Additionally, there are many other costs that include redundancy and provisions of reallocating students (e.g. scholarships). Hence, it is vital that a clear exit strategy be put in place. Furthermore, this is an area not identified in the previous chapter and has received limited attention in the literature.

Overall, the findings of the case studies place emphasis on two of the sub-factors identified in the previous chapter: Finance and Faculty. Firstly, the main addition to the Finance sub-factor is the need to understand and have available funds to cover the costs of withdrawing or closing an IBC, which is also an area not fully addressed in the IBC literature. In addition, support for the use of financial aid was strengthened as it can increase enrolments. Secondly, the findings of the case studies demonstrate and support the prior need to include home staff, which have been identified to increase consistency and quality as identified in literature (Ranjan et al., 2012). In addition to these two areas, the results further the research of Lane and Kinser (2013) and Verbik (2015) and demonstrate that the least viable type of IBC are those which are purely externally funded.

Regarding the two areas that were not mentioned in this stage, firstly, Administration is holistically covered in the discussion on the use of home and local staff, and this incorporates all employees. Secondly, Campus was not fully mentioned other than in relation to the type of investment, i.e. whether the campus was fully funded or facilities were provided. Given that a form of physical
space is needed to deliver the course at an IBC, it remains a relevant area to retain.

**Course Factor**

The findings of the case studies did not reveal many issues related to the courses provided. Arguably, this may have been the result of focusing more on the strategic operations of an IBC. Furthermore, the *Course* factor identified in the previous chapter consists of six sub-factors. Some of these areas are addressed in other factors such as *Faculty* in the *Resource* factor, *Market Demand* in the *Host Country* factor and *Student Tuition* in the *HEI* factor. Ultimately, the unique sub-factor is *Course Content*, which was addressed in the case studies.

The findings of the case studies show that most of the campuses used the same criteria implemented at the home campus, which literature suggests enhances quality and equivalency between campuses (Altbach, 2015b). The findings demonstrate the benefits of using similar entry requirements, which include higher pass rates (as seen in CE). However, the use of high entry requirements should be predicated on a sound understanding of the students’ capabilities in the host country, as failure to do so will negatively affect enrolments (as seen in CF). Therefore, there is a need to understand the ability of the student in the targeted market.

An issue identified was the importance of accreditations, which was also suggested in the previous chapter. In the case studies, the importance and ease of getting local accreditations was stressed. For some of the campuses (see CC
and CE), accreditations could be ascertained provided that the home campus upheld and maintained the same level of quality. Furthermore, in most cases (see CA and CE), the programmes were standardised with local contextual adaptations. Hence, it is important to ensure that the foundation of the programmes offered are delivered consistently across campuses, and local adaptations can be made where necessary to address local needs, which is also similar to the findings of Farrugia and Lane (2013) and Miliszewska (2010).

The case studies build on the Course Content sub-factor and confirm the elements within it, which highlights that IBCs need to adopt a hybrid approach when deciding the level of adaption required and the need to recruit quality students. This also supports the literature, which suggests that the degree of adaption and standardisation can be seen on a continuum (Kinser and Lane, 2014), and the levels of adaption are based on the needs of the local market.

**Host Country Factor**

The results of the previous chapter identified three sub-factors that needed to be considered when selecting a host country. The findings from the case studies greatly emphasise the importance of the host country. Four main areas were identified (as indicated in Figure 47). Two of these areas were previously identified (environment and demand), with the other areas being identified as important in the case studies. Furthermore, as defined in the HEI factor, the areas within the theme of understanding are closely linked to this factor.
Two reasons were identified that impacted the selection of a host country: market demand and the HEI’s internationalisation aims. SC (including CA and CD) targeted countries that were within certain regions and had lucrative student markets in neighbouring countries, given the importance of international student for IBCs. For instance, CB was established in Malaysia to target the ASEAN market, which reflects an aspect of the location advantage outlined in the “OLI” theory (Eichengreen and Tong, 2007; Kimura, 1989; Li and Guisinger, 1992). In contrast, CH chose a country that was geographically isolated, which created travel barriers and reduced enrolments (Spiess and Wrohlich, 2010). Furthermore, the findings show that both SC and FC choose locations in line with the overall HEI’s internationalisation strategies, which is important as indicated in the HEI factor and literature (Farrugia and Lane, 2013).

The literature identifies the impact of the recession (Ruby, 2009) and economic stability, and the findings support this. A cause of failure for some of the campuses was the reduction in funding promised by the local government. This was problematic for CF, as there was a dependence on said funds to provide suitable facilities for students, and the HEI was unable to provide this through other means of financing. However, CD also suffered from reduced government
funding, but was able to utilise local partners to make up for the deficit. This demonstrates the impact of changing economic conditions, which usually results in reduced governmental spending. The main consideration is how IBCs react to these changes; FC were over-reliant on government funding and were greatly affected. In contrast, SC were able to respond appropriately and find other sources of revenue, which demonstrates the need to understand the environment and react correctly to changes, as shown in the HEI factor and literature (Lane, 2011).

Political stability was another area identified in the findings and impacted CE and CH, which are an SC and FC, respectively. Both campuses experienced political unrest, but the severity varied greatly. CE was affected by protests and issues of censorship, whereas CH was affected by a military coup in the host country. The fundamental difference that resulted in the failure of one and not the other is enrolment; in the case of CH, travelling to the country became incredibly unsafe, which heavily reduced enrolments especially from international students. Therefore, such a case indicates an increased need to understand the political stability of the host country. Although arguably when such events will occur is unpredictable, understanding the history of the country would indicate the risk associated with the country. Given the context-specific nature of these findings, these areas are not explicitly addressed in the literature.

Existing presence is another finding that relates to existing relationships and operations in the host country. A consistent theme amongst SC (CA, CB and CE) is the existence of alumni in the host country. The fundamental advantage of this is an enhanced understanding of the HEI, invitation for investment and availability of advice.
The case studies’ findings identify that IBCs can be invited to open a campus in the host country, which coincides with the findings of the previous chapter and literature (Arokiasamy, 2010; Verbik, 2015). Examples of invitations are apparent in both SC and FC, with the fundamental difference being the existence of alumni and already operating in the country, which contributed to the success of IBCs.

The findings highlight the importance of not only understanding the host country, but also relevant entities within the host country in order to establish an IBC. In some cases (CB and CE), alumni were involved, which meant that they had a better understanding of the HEI, and how they operate. One could speculate that this allowed them to assist the campuses in a more efficient manner. On a similar note, the use of alumni is also an excellent source of information and advice for campuses, which supports the notion of using local personnel to understand the local environment (Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014). CA utilised alumni to gain more information on London and utilised these relationships to benefit the programmes offered through enrichment (e.g. guest speakers). The main advantage of doing so is that it allows for the mutual understanding between HEI and the host country.

Finally, the findings highlight the importance of having an educational focus, which is related to the host country’s government’s commitment to education. The most common indicator of this is the presence of an education hub, which indicates an increased commitment to higher education (Knight, 2015a; Mahani and Molki, 2011). Within the chosen case studies (e.g. CD, CF, CI and CJ), all state the presence of a hub, which shows that the presence of one does not guarantee success. However, the benefits identified are similar to those
identified in the literature, which include allowing HEIs to operate independently and receive benefits such as repatriation of funds (Mahani and Molki, 2011; Robertson, 2010a). However, the findings indicate that the primary drawbacks of education hubs are unrealistic targets (e.g. CI) and changing commitments (e.g. CD), which is also supported by the literature (Gribble and McBurnie, 2015; Schlanger, 2013).

Overall, four areas were identified from the findings of the case studies that related to the host country. Firstly, the need to monitor the environment was identified, in particular, economic and political issues. Secondly, key selection criteria when choosing a host country should be the size of the student market, both in the country and those that surround it. Thirdly, an existing presence enhances the mutual understanding between the HEI and the host country. Finally, the importance of the country having an educational focus was identified, which mainly revolved around the presence of an education hub.

Two of the four areas (environment and demand) confirm areas identified in the previous chapter. The case studies underline the importance of having a stable environment and sufficient demand, which confirms these elements within the Host Country factor, with the main contribution being the identification of additional elements in the environment to acknowledge (i.e. the economy and political stability). Furthermore, the findings show that simply understanding the environment is not sufficient, but there is a need for the IBC to react appropriately, which was seen as a main contributor to the SC and draws further links between the Host Country and the HEI factor.
Relationship Factor

The findings of the previous chapter identified entities within the host country that an HEI could establish a relationship with. Furthermore, some consideration was given to the creation and management of relationships. The results of the case studies focus on the benefits and management (see Figure 48) of the relationships that are needed. Less attention is given to whom these should be with, but these are alluded to in the discussion.

Figure 48: Case Study Relationship Summary

Three main benefits of having a partner were identified: guidance, funding and support, and collaborations. The first of these (guidance) has already been addressed in the understanding theme; thus, the focus will be on the other two elements.

A number of the campuses were established with a partner (see CB, CG and CH). Focusing on funding and support, the main variations included financial assistance (CD) and infrastructural support such as providing a campus (CC and CH), which also coincide with the types of IBCs identified by Lane and Kinser (2013) and is identified in the Resource factor. A potential issue is that an HEI
can be overly dependent on this support (e.g. CG). Furthermore, the decision to utilise resources from partners could be based on the strategy in place. For example, CD wanted to be exclusively externally funded, and CC wanted to reduce risk by not investing in a campus; thus, the partner provided this. Therefore, there is a need to determine the role that a potential partner will have as a part of the investment.

Relating briefly to guidance, the Understanding theme demonstrated the benefits of seeking outside advice. However, whether this is needed can be in part determined by strategies identified by Philips et al., (2009), in particular, focusing on the Hedge strategy, which underlines the need for joint ventures / partners where the HEI is highly uncertain about the environment in the host country. In the case studies, it is not apparent what the level of uncertainty was. However, given the importance placed on seeking external advice (see CB and CD), it is evident that all IBCs are likely to have high levels of uncertainty, as the environment in different countries will vary greatly (Fegan and Field, 2009).

Further observations also raise an issue related to the work of Philips et al., (2009), as it may never be possible to implement the “Transfer” strategy in the context of IBCs given that all environments are different, and this will mean high levels of uncertainty. As a result, it is unlikely that a fully standardised approach would work at an IBC, which is supported by other studies that suggest that HEIs will not be effective if they simply move a programme as is to the host country (Schoepp, 2009).

The second area of collaborations relates to working with partners in the host country, which is linked to elements of the Course factor. One consideration is to establish relationships, especially with other HEIs (see CB), so that they are
not seen as a competitor. Other collaborations were evident in CD and CE, but these relationships were strongly dependent on the nature of the IBC. Ultimately, the benefits of these collaborations enhanced the quality of the education and experience that the students had.

The results of the case studies show that the management of partners is critical, which is linked to the control element of the HEI factor, with the main concern revolving around quality. One of the contributing problems that resulted in the failure of the campuses was poor control, which led to reduced teaching quality and an over focus on finance (see CH and CG), which is also supported by the literature (Luo, 2007; Rumbley and Altbach, 2007). Therefore, it is essential that the home campus maintain sufficient control, in particular, over the academic issues; this is also supported by Kinser and Lane, (2014) and McBurnie (2015). In addition, if a partner is involved, clear expectations congruent with the HEI’s mission must be established (Verbik, 2015).

Another area of management is related to expectations. In the case of CB, the management clearly communicated the focus of the HEI and outlined the details of the venture. Furthermore, the key area that needs to be communicated is the importance of having an academic focus and not to see the campus as a financial exercise. Subsequently, this allowed the partner to understand the investment fully and set realistic exceptions on issues such as financial return.

Overall, the relationship issues demonstrate two significant areas: firstly, the additional benefits of having partners, which include guidance concerning the local environment, financial support and collaborations that can enhance the quality of the education provided; and secondly, the importance of careful management and establishing clear expectations.
A number of the entities identified in the previous chapter were apparent in the case studies. Firstly, concerning internal relationships, relationships with alumni (see CB and CE) and the home campus (see CA and CC) were identified. Secondly, external relationships were also apparent, which include government (see CB, CE, and CI), local partners (see CB and CH) and local industry (see CD), thereby confirming that these are important and used in actual IBCs. However, one area that was not previously identified is the use of advisory boards, which were apparent at numerous campuses (e.g., CA, CB and CD).

The themes related to the management of relationships, which were identified in the previous chapter, were also apparent in the case studies, with the findings suggesting that retaining academic control is paramount to the success of the IBC. Furthermore, the literature suggests that the first step of establishing control is to establish the focus (Geringer and Hebert, 1989). In this case, it is the need to control all academic elements, which include entry requirements. However, what needs to be established is how much control was achieved and the methods used to exercise control.

Summary of Factors

Overall, the case studies further confirm that the five factors identified are relevant in both a theoretical and practical perspective. Similar to the previous chapter, the research conducted contributes to the literature by further clarifying each of the factors and drawing additional elements identified in the literature as well as the new ones, which have received little or no attention. With the results of the expert survey, the case studies and the literature suggesting similar factors
that contribute to the success of an IBC; the importance of each factor and the sub-factors are still unknown. Therefore, the final quantitative stage will address this.

5.4.2 Research Question 2 – Success and Failure Measures

The success measures have been taken from the SC, as they were directly asked to identify how success is measured. Similar to the first stage of data collection, failure is indicated by performing poorly on the measures that were identified. Additionally, rather than respondents focusing on what the failure measures were; instead, understanding the conditions of failure is more important. With that in mind, some of the suggested areas of failure include poor enrolments, inability to be financially sustainable, and damage to the HEI brand; these are also proposed in the literature (Altbach, 2011; Becker, 2009; McBurnie, 2015).

Success Measures

In total, six areas of success measures have been identified. These are related to students, faculty, HEI, fiscal performance, enrolment and research (see Table 41).

Looking at each one, turn by turn, firstly, student measures are focused on performance and satisfaction, which is an area also stressed in research conducted by Ahmad (2015) and Wilkins et al., (2012). This is usually monitored through student feedback and the results of assessments such as exams.
Secondly, faculty measures mainly assess the ability and the performance of staff members. Thirdly, HEI is focused on the reputation of the HEI, which has been suggested to impact enrolment choice (Adam, 2001; Gray et al., 2003). Fourthly, fiscal performance is targeted at financial aspects of the campus such as expenditure and revenue. Fifthly, enrolments refer to both the number and quality of students attracted to the campus. Finally, research focuses on the quality of research and the ability to attract funding. This is increasingly important as there is a suggestion that research is becoming more important at IBCs (Wilkins and Huisman, 2011a) and is seen as a means of attaining a competitive advantage (Curran, 2000; Marginson, 2004).

### Table 41: Summary of Case Study Success Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student related</th>
<th>Faculty Related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>1. Quality of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student Performance</td>
<td>2. Staff performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students Retained</td>
<td>3. Quality of services provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Employment Outcome</td>
<td>4. Student Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Experience</td>
<td>5. Willingness to travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Attrition Rate</td>
<td>6. Engagement with industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEI Related</th>
<th>Fiscal Performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brand Awareness</td>
<td>1. Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brand Recognition</td>
<td>2. Meeting Budgetary Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ability to be independent</td>
<td>3. Break-even</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolment related</th>
<th>Research Related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of students</td>
<td>1. Research Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quality of the students</td>
<td>2. Research Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Mobility</td>
<td>3. Research Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PhD Numbers</td>
<td>4. Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of Applications</td>
<td>5. Collaborations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Type of Courses Chosen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the most part, these areas are similar to the ones identified in the previous chapter (see Figure 36). The main difference is the removal of Host Country, with contributions to the host country not being a clear measure of success in the case studies. Given that this is from the perspective of the IBC, areas concerning the host country may not be prominent. Therefore, there is scope for future research to identify measures in relation to the host country.

Very few additional measures were identified as a result of the case studies. Instead, a number of the measures have been re-categorised. Firstly, elements within the Relationship measures are spread between Faculty and Research. Secondly, Quality Measures have been distributed to Student and Faculty. Finally, items in Reputation have been put into HEI and Research. Given that the measures established in the previous chapter are theoretical, the case studies enhance these by contextualising them into measures that are used at IBCs.

**Summary of Measures**

As a result of the case studies, a total of six success measures has been identified, which are similar to the areas defined in the previous chapter. The main difference between the results of the case study and the previous chapter is the categorisation of the measures and the removal of Host Country. Nonetheless, a series of measures have been identified, with the new categories also being congruent with the literature. Finally, similar to the factors, the importance of the measures needs to be established, which will be achieved through the final quantitative stage.
5.4.3 Research Question 3 – Success and Failure Framework

The previous chapter established the key links between the five factors. Alterations have been made to the model to incorporate the findings of the case studies.

Success Factor Framework

The HEI, Host Country and Understanding theme were the most prominent themes that were identified. However, the Understanding theme arguably links them together (as shown in Figure 49). A key contributor to the success of an IBC is the HEI’s ability to understand the host country (listed as 1 below) through correct due diligence (Aleksynska and Havrylchyk, 2013; Puranam et al., 2006). This is followed by an understanding of the required relationships (listed as 2 below), which is supported by Lane (2011) and resources (listed as 3 below) that are required (Collis and Montgomery, 2008). Additionally, the findings show that resources and relationships can enhance knowledge of the host country. Overall, this demonstrates the key change to the model identified in the previous chapter.

Figure 49: Understanding of Key Factors
Ultimately, the themes identified in the case studies reinforce the factors and the relationships between them. A greater understanding of the potential relationships between the factors has been identified, which primarily relates to the need for HEIs to have sufficient understanding and maintaining control (see Figure 50). Firstly, HEIs need to have a comprehensive understanding of the relationship, resource and course issues. Secondly, the importance of control was identified, and these were related to relationships (i.e. managing partners) and the course (i.e. academic control). Therefore, these represent areas that need to be understood and controlled. Finally, it is apparent that the HEI factor is different to the other four factors, as the HEI factor refers to the competencies, whereas the remaining factors are areas that need to be understood.

**Figure 50: Success and Failure Model 2**
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Summary of Success Factor Framework

Overall, the model presented in Figure 50 highlights the linkages between the factors. The model has been further altered to reflect the nature of the linkages, which is related to understanding and control. Given the aims of the final quantitative stage, the framework will not be further developed.

The model addresses a gap in the extant literature, as there is little research that clearly identifies a holistic operational view of the factors that contribute to the success of an IBC. However, the literature does identify some areas that could allow an IBC to operate successfully (see Wilkins, 2016). Therefore, the model presented provides a foundation for future research to develop when applied to more IBCs. Furthermore, the core model could be adapted to identify whether it is applicable for FDIs in general, by substituting Course for the main product or service provided by the organisation.

5.5 Conclusion of Case Studies

This chapter presented and discussed the findings of the 10 case studies. Five main themes related to the factors defined in the previous chapter were identified. Furthermore, the findings concerning the success factor confirmed the results of the EDT and addressed gaps in the extant literature. Likewise, the measures and framework have been advanced. Firstly, specific indicators have been identified that relate to six categories of measures. Secondly, the framework has been developed to posit the relationships between the factors. In both cases, little prior research has been conducted in these areas and thus reflects a fundamental contribution to knowledge.
5.5.1 Implications for the third stage

The case studies served to identify whether the factors identified in the previous chapter are evident in actual IBCs. The results of this stage and the previous stage will be used in the final quantitative stage, the purpose of which will be to identify the importance of each of the five factors. Furthermore, the measures of success will also be analysed concerning their significance. This will allow practitioners to prioritise certain facets when establishing and operating an IBC.
6. Data Analysis - Quantitative Survey

6.1. Introduction

The prior two chapters focused on the data analysis and discussion on the qualitative elements of the research. This chapter moves on to the final stage of research and addresses the quantitative aspect. The chapter will be divided into two sections, firstly the data analysis will be presented, and this will be followed by a discussion of the results.

6.2. Success and Failure Factors

In total, 87 respondents completed the survey, which comprises of senior managers at higher education institutions (HEI) with international branch campus (IBC). There are currently 278 IBCs globally, but these originate from 204 individual HEIs. Therefore, the combination of the sample size and the small target population reflects an approximate 42% response rate. Having established the nature of the factors, the aim is to assess the importance attached to each by HEIs. Furthermore, given the relatively small number of responses, the scope of the analysis is limited to a descriptive analysis of the data.

This section includes the quantitative analysis of the five factors that have been previously identified (Resources, Host Country, HEI, Course and Relationships). Additionally, the individual sub-factors are examined regarding their relative importance within the factor.

Five composite variables were created, which was achieved by averaging the scores of the items within each of the factors. The creation of composite
variables is a common practice and has been identified to make data more manageable and address type I errors (Song et al., 2013). As shown in Table 42, the number of items ranged between 5 and 10 (as shown in Appendix 3). The purpose of the composite variables is to address the factors holistically before discussing them individually.

Table 42: Composite Variable Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of the composite variables identified that based on the average score, the HEI and Resource factor were deemed the most and least important, respectively, in terms of their contribution to the success of an IBC (see Table 43). This suggests that a greater emphasis is on the HEI factor, which in essence, encompass whether the institution is capable of operating an IBC.

The remainder of this chapter concentrates on analysing the factors.
Table 43: Overall Success Factor Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.84012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.05252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.81775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.76386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.81771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Individual Factors

Each factor is analysed to determine the importance of each of the items within them; this comprises of descriptive and frequency tests. This will allow for the identification of the most important sub-factors.

For the frequency tests, a form of dichotomisation (i.e. a reduction of scale points) was used, which transformed the six-point scale to a four-point scale (as shown in Figure 51). The benefits of this include increasing simplicity and ease of presentation (Altman and Royston, 2006). However, the main disadvantage is related to the loss of data during the process which can skew further tests (Altman and Royston, 2006; Maccallum et al., 2002), and no clear practice of how to create new categories (Altman, 1991). Accordingly, both of these issues need to be addressed. Firstly, only frequencies are carried out on the data. Secondly, as suggested by Baneshi and Talei (2011), dichotomisation is feasible provided that the groups have similar characteristics. To this end, the four new categories represent distinct groups. Firstly, Unimportant and Critical represent extreme points, which makes them unique, as they are polar opposites. Secondly, the four central categories can be classed into two distinct groups.
Figure 51: Frequency Data Transformation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>Low Importance</td>
<td>High Importance</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.1 Resource

Sufficient start-up capital (mean = 4.56) is the most important resource when establishing an IBC, and government assistance is the least (mean = 3.11) (as seen in Table 44). However, one respondent makes an observation that how a campus is funded may be dictated by the regulations imposed by the host country, and this, in turn, will impact the importance of governmental financial assistance. Therefore, (and this applies to all the factors) the items represent broad areas that should be taken into consideration, and the importance of each is dependent on the investment.

(R33) “…….financial government assistances critical if the operating agreement with the branch campus stipulates funding comes from the government. If funding comes from a different source then its unimportant.”
Table 44: Resource Descriptive Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Assistance (Finance)</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Research Staff</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Funding</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions for Financial Aid</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic Facilities</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Administrative Staff</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Facilities</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Academics</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue from Tuition Fees</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-up Capital</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data was further recoded to understand the level of importance of each item. For the most part, the output revealed no further findings and demonstrated that start-up capital was highly valuable, and was deemed critical (32.2%) most frequently, and a high percentage of people suggested that governmental assistance was unimportant (25.3%) (see Table 45). However, the availability of academics (despite not being ranked overly critical), was stressed as being highly important (62.1%). This finding resonates with the case studies, which addressed the importance of having staff that are willing to travel to the IBC.
Table 45: Resource Frequency Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Assistance (Finance)</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue from Tuition Fees</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions for Financial Aid</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-up Capital</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Funding</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Facilities</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic Facilities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Administrative Staff</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Academics</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Research Staff</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.2 Host Country

The repatriation of funds is the most highly rated item (mean = 4.38) within the factor. However, unlike other factors, the mean is not distinctly higher than the other items that were deemed imperative. Thus, it could be argued that the top four items (as seen in Table 46), which had a mean score of over four, are equally important. A closer examination of these shows that they are related to the regulations in the country. Therefore, this overarching area could be considered the most important issue within the Host Country factor.
Table 46: Host Country Descriptive Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country Reputation</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Financial Assistance</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand in Neighbouring Country</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Education Hub</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Competitors</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for International Providers</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating Regulations</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Environment</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa and Immigration Issues</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repatriation of Finances</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The country’s reputation was identified as the least important item when considering the host country. Furthermore, when the data was recoded, it fell into the low importance category (see Table 47). This contradicts some of the findings from the case study, which stressed its importance. However, as the factors have not been tested in a specific context, from a general perspective, it is one area that requires less focus. Furthermore, with the exception of reputation, all other elements were identified to be highly important.
Table 47: Host Country Frequency Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country Reputation</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td><strong>36.8</strong></td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Financial</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td><strong>34.5</strong></td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand in Neighbouring Country</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td><strong>47.1</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Education Hub</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td><strong>44.8</strong></td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Competitors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td><strong>42.5</strong></td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for International</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td><strong>42.5</strong></td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating Regulations</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td><strong>50.6</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Environment</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td><strong>52.9</strong></td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa and Immigration Issues</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repatriation of Finances</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.3 Course

The item with the highest mean (see Table 48) is having a degree that was equivalent to the home campus (mean = 4.51). However, despite this item having the highest mean, having content developed with local industry (32.2%) was identified as more critical (see Table 49). Both of these observations are further supported by comments related to this factor. Therefore, the most important issue within this factor is having a course which resembles the one being delivered at the home campus, but with the inclusion of local industry to aid adaptation to suit the local context.
Moreover the point of a branch campus is to bring ‘international’ education to another country so transforming content into a clone of the local market defeats the purpose of creating a branch campus. So core content between home and branch should be the same but there is inevitably a need to address local contexts.”

Table 48: Course Descriptive Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Tuition Fee</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Tuition Fee to HC</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardised Content to HC</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Assessment Standards to HC</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Adapted Content</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditations</td>
<td><strong>4.19</strong></td>
<td>1.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Entry Requirements</td>
<td><strong>4.28</strong></td>
<td>1.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study at Home Campus</td>
<td><strong>4.30</strong></td>
<td>1.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Developed with Local Industry</td>
<td><strong>4.37</strong></td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Equivalent To HC</td>
<td><strong>4.51</strong></td>
<td>1.335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues surrounding tuition fees were considered the least important. In particular, setting a competitive tuition fee in line with the host country had the lowest mean score (mean = 3.08), with a high percentage of respondents indicating that it was unimportant (27.6) or was of low importance (26.4). Although the mean score of setting a similar tuition fee is distinctly higher, a similar percentage of respondents indicated that this was of high importance (41.4%) and low importance (40.2%). Thus, the fundamental difference lies at the polar
ends of the scale, where a substantial number of respondents found setting a competitive price unimportant. Therefore, arguably, tuition fees can be standardised.

**Table 49: Course Frequency Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Tuition Fee</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Tuition Fee to HC</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardised Content to HC</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Assessment Standards to HC</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Adapted Content</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Entry Requirements</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study at Home Campus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Developed with Local Industry</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Equivalent To HC</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data on tuition fee, one could suggest that the decisions based on tuition fee, are relatively unimportant, but the key point is that fees should be similar to that of the home campus. Notwithstanding this, it was identified that one of the key failure factors in the case studies, was high tuition, which was often the result of charging prices similar to the home campus. Thus, when determining the correct tuition fee, there is a need to understand other facets such as affordability and availability of student finance.
6.3.4 Relationship

This factor consists of two elements, which include one related to whom to establish relationships with and another based on their management. Firstly, questions were posed to identify who it will be beneficial to develop relationships with when establishing an IBC. From this, local staff (73.6%) was found to be the key relationship, but in most cases, over 50% indicated that the entities (see Figure 52), are essential.

Figure 52: Relevant Relationships
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Interestingly, establishing a relationship with existing students was selected the least; the rationale for this was not identified, but what is noteworthy is that a relationship with the alumni was deemed far more essential. Furthermore, there is evidence in the case studies, which suggest that a
relationship with alumni is beneficial concerning relationships with local industry or government bodies. Similar to other factors, the importance of each of the items is dependent on the situation. For example, where a host country stipulates that the HEI will need to partner with a local institution to establish an IBC, the necessity of the local establishment (whichever is required), increases in significance.

The majority of items scored a mean score of 4 or above with the exception of limited inference (see Table 50). Having an understanding of the partner/s (mean = 4.31) was identified as being the most important item when establishing a relationship.

Limited interference is, relatively, the least important item (mean = 3.96). However, it was identified from the case studies that it is inauspicious to allow external partners to interfere with decisions related to the academic elements of the IBC. In contrast, there are also many instances which demonstrate the benefit of input from external partners, especially to aid with the understanding of local regulations, or how businesses operate.

**Table 50: Relationship Descriptive Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited Interference</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics Imperatives First</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed to Learning from Each Other</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Purpose</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Partner</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further analysis of the five items, confirmed that the shared purpose was the most important facet (see Table 51), with the highest percentage of respondents indicating that it is critical (21.8%). However, despite Academic Imperatives First ranking low when considering the mean, this item had the second highest percentage of respondents, deeming this as critical. With this in mind, if coupled with having a shared purpose and a good understanding of the partner (the first and second highest mean), one could posit that in order to cultivate a successful relationship, a clear aim which places academic imperatives first and is based on a mutual understanding of the intentions of each partner is necessary.

**Table 51: Relationship Frequency Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited Interference</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td><strong>49.4</strong></td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Partner</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td><strong>49.4</strong></td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics Imperatives First</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td><strong>42.5</strong></td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed to Learning from Each Other</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td><strong>49.4</strong></td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Purpose</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td><strong>48.3</strong></td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3.5 HEI

All items within this factor have a mean score of 4 or greater (see Table 52), suggesting that all the elements are very important. However, planning and strategic thinking were identified as being the most important (mean = 4.67) and having an exit/withdrawal strategy was the least significant (mean = 4.01) item.

Table 52: HEI Descriptive Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exit/Withdrawal Strategy</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation and Image</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Academic Imperatives</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Expectation on ROI</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration Between HC and BC</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Commitment</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Marketing</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Transnational Education</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Strategic Thinking</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To successfully establish and operate an IBC, an HEI needs to demonstrate an ability to plan and think strategically (32.2%), which draws upon previous experience of TNE (23%). Additionally, clear aims and objectives (21.8%) need to be set which should be devised with the mind-set that a long term commitment (23%) is required. Therefore, the four items that scored the highest percentage are the most critical (see Table 53).
The need for a long-term strategic focus is also a theme that resonates in the case studies, which emphasises the importance of carrying sufficient due diligence initially, and the need to take a long-term viewpoint when looking at the performance of the IBC, in particular, enrolment figures and revenue generated. As the case study shows, the inability to create a sufficient return in the short term resulted in the premature closure of a campus.

Table 53: HEI Frequency Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exit/Withdrawal Strategy</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation and Image</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Academic Imperatives</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Expectation on ROI</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration Between HC and BC</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Commitment</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Marketing</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Transnational Education</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Strategic Thinking</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, despite having an exit/withdrawal strategy being identified as the least important, it can be argued that this could form part of the strategic planning process. Although the intention is not to close an IBC, it remains a plausible outcome; thus, HEIs should have contingencies in place in case a campus needs
to cease operations. Furthermore, this is the one element that is mentioned in the case studies, as the absence of a withdrawal strategy when closing a campus could exacerbate the situation.

6.3.6 Reasons for Failure

Before identifying the appropriate measures of success and failure, the penultimate topic in the survey focuses on the identification of what would cause an IBC to fail (see Table 54). It is identified that insufficient due diligence (mean = 5.63) was the main reason that would cause an IBC to fail, which is also a common theme amongst the failure case studies. Also, a prevalent theme from the failure case studies is poor enrolments and insufficient demand (both with means = 5.49), which strengthen the conclusions.

Table 54: Items that Contribute to Failure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrow Focus on Foreign Students</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Tuition Fees</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Focused on Financial Returns</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Focused on Income Generation</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Integration</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overly Motivated by Profits</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexibility to Adapt</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on Government Funds</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overestimating Supply of Students</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate Partners</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Understanding of Competitors</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lack of Quality Control 5.31 1.497
Weak Links Between HC and BC 5.36 1.411
Insufficient Market Analysis 5.41 1.423
Lack of Buy In 5.46 1.399
Low Enrolments 5.49 1.742
Insufficient Demand 5.49 1.85
Insufficient Due Diligence 5.63 1.512

6.3.7 Success and Failure Measures

Following the identification of the factors that contribute to the success or failure of an IBC, appropriate measures need to be determined; a total of 18 items were tested (see Table 55). Firstly, a descriptive analysis was conducted, which suggested that the quality of the faculty (mean = 5.60) and student achievement (mean = 5.59) were the most important measures of success. Furthermore, a common theme related to the eight items that have the highest means is academic achievement. This is then followed by profitability. Therefore, this reaffirms a previous finding that academic imperatives should be prioritised.
Environmental impact was considered the least important measure of success (mean = 4.42). Moreover, if this is paired with the third lowest, contribution to the national economy (mean = 4.78), one could suggest that the IBC’s contribution to the host country is the least important facet.
6.4 Discussion and Comparisons to previous findings

The factors and sub-factors are tested in this final stage of analysis. The focus is to triangulate the findings from the two previous chapters. The discussion is based on addressing two of the research questions, which are the factors (Research Question 1), and the measures (Research Question 2).

6.4.1. Research Question 1 — Success Factors

The discussion of the success and failure factors incorporates the findings of all three stages of analysis, and existing literature. Each of the five factors originally identified will be discussed as well as the importance of the relative sub-factors. The discussion is focused on the development of each of the factors over the three stages of analysis and addresses the similarities and differences to the literature.

HEI Factor

The HEI factor was identified to be the most important factor and a prominent theme in the case studies (CS), and the findings of the expert surveys (ES) show that this factor is the most complex. The main areas identified are related to the management and the process of establishing and operating an IBC.

The most important item within the HEI factor in the quantitative survey (QS) is planning and strategic thinking, which is also a prominent area in the CS. The significance of an HEI in being able to plan and utilise knowledge of the market was identified to be a key contributor to success in the CS and the
literature (examples include Mazzarol and Soutar, 2002; and Fegan and Field, 2009). This is strengthened by the QS, which indicates that insufficient due diligence is the most significant cause of failure. Furthermore, the literature (examples include Knight, 2015b; and Puranam et al., 2006) and the CS suggest that monitoring and due diligence is a continual process.

Another element of the management at the HEI is the need for the correct vision and commitment. The importance of having a clear vision and long-term commitment is indicated in all three stages of analysis and the literature (examples include Chapleo, 2008; and Levy, 2003). As part of this, it is important to maintain an academic focus, which is apparent in the first and second stage of analysis, and the literature that suggests that all activities should be underpinned by academic imperatives (McBurnie, 2015; Schoepp, 2015).

However, the findings of the QS show that issues related to finance were ranked higher than academic ones. For instance, repatriation of funds in the host country, and the relatively low agreement to statements relating to an over focus on finances contributing to failure. Notwithstanding, it was also identified that the inability to control quality had a greater contribution to failure. Therefore, it can be argued that a key underlining motivation is to ascertain a good financial return, which in some cases outranks academic issues, and contradicts the consensus in the literature. However, providing poor quality education reduces the benefits to the students (Kim and Lee, 2006), which is likely to reduce enrolments, and subsequently, financial return. Therefore, there is a need to have an academic focus, but there is a need to ensure that the IBC is financially sustainable.

One area that was not explicitly mentioned in the CS but was identified in the ES was the need to market the IBC and its courses effectively. The ability to
market the IBC is the fourth most important item within the \textit{HEI} factor. Despite not being prominent in the CS, it does present another function of the management at the HEI. Furthermore, the realisation of the benefits of marketing in HEIs will not be apparent in the short term (Jevons, 2006). However, there is a suggestion that there is animosity towards applying marketing techniques to HEIs (Hemsley-Brown and Oplatka, 2006). Nonetheless, all HEIs carry out some form of marketing to increase the awareness of their programmes.

The two least important areas identified are the exit strategy and the reputation and image. Firstly, the CS highlighted the importance of having an exit or mitigation strategy. However, despite the importance of considering the events following a closure, other areas should be prioritised first, and the plans need to be in place to identify if the IBC is failing, and how to exit, which, the CS suggests, can include financial costs and the need to fulfil the contractual agreement. This can include student transfers and repaying loans. Furthermore, there is little research conducted about how IBC reacts when it fails. However, the research conducted in this thesis does partly address this gap. Secondly, the HEI's brand was not a prominent topic in the CS, except for one campus which stated its benefit concerning recruitment of academics. However, despite little importance being placed on this in the findings, the literature suggests that IBCs that fail face the potential of devaluing the HEI’s local and international brand (Hemsley-Brown and Goonawardana, 2007). In both cases, there is sufficient support to retain them as facets within the \textit{HEI} factor.
Resource Factor

Resources were identified to be the least important factor and were not a prominent theme in the case studies. The most important sub-factors identified during the QS are related to finance, and staff and facilities.

Start-up capital is the most important sub-factor; given the enormous financial commitment required, it is understandable why this is the case. Furthermore, both successful campuses (SC) and failed campuses (FC) were required to commit considerable financial resources initially. However, the amount of funding required can be determined by the approach that the HEI chooses to establish an IBC, as the inclusion of a partner may reduce the amount of capital required (Lane and Kinser, 2013), while increasing reliance on external bodies, which was one of the contributors to failure.

The second financial sub-factor is the revenue from tuition fees. This element coincides with the findings of the CS which stressed the importance of IBCs being financially sustainable. Additionally, the failure of campuses to generate revenue due to poor enrolment was another key contributor to why IBCs fail, which is also suggested by Altbach (2011) and Morgan (2010b).

The use of home staff was an area that was key in the CSs, and ranked the third most important resource element in the QS. The significance of home staff was related to the HEI’s ethos and culture as well as being a means of ensuring quality (Ranjan et al., 2012). A common theme amongst the SC was the importance of using home staff to ensure that the practices adopted at the home campuses are adopted at the IBC, which allows for a consistent student experience.
The campus was not an area that was covered extensively in the CS. However, facilities, namely academic ones, were considered to be important in the findings of this chapter. It can be posited that the campus is important, and is part of the aforementioned area of consistency. Furthermore, the literature also suggests the importance of non-academic facilities due to its link to satisfaction (Wilkins and Balakrishnan, 2015), which was also identified in the ES. Therefore, both academic and non-academic facilities are essential.

Finally, areas that were not considered as important are research and governmental financial assistance. In particular, financial assistance was deemed the least important, and this was due to the contextual nature of this support, as not all IBCs require this type of aid (for example Campus A from the CS). Also, the CS showed that this area was a potential cause of failure as IBCs can become overly reliant on the government. Therefore, the need for assistance is secondary to the management of these funds (i.e. burn rate), which is also suggested by Mahani and Molki’s (2011) review of IBCs.

The two areas that are related to research are not main areas in the CS (with the exception of one campus which was research based), other than as measures of success and failure. Thus, the findings of the CS arguably support the indicated low level of importance identified in the QS.
Course Factor

The Course factor is ranked as being the third most important, but the intricacies of this factor were not prominent in the CS. However, the programmes/courses are the key offerings of an IBC. The ES highlighted many considerations concerning the design of a course. The main areas to be considered as a result of the QS are standardisation and adaptation, which are common areas in the literature (examples include Gray et al., 2003).

Standardisation is a subject that was mentioned indirectly in the CS; the main focus is on the importance of having home staff at the IBC, which supports suggestions in the literature that the teaching approach and main content is delivered to the same calibre as the home campus (Farrugia and Lane, 2013). Furthermore, standardising the course was stressed in the CS as this could impact accreditations and the student experience. The QS also supports this, as the most important item was having a degree that was equivalent to the home campus, which is also in line with suggestions in the literature, which include Miliszewska (2007), who suggest that the overall curriculum between campuses should be standardised. Therefore, course elements such as the specific modules, methods of teaching, assessment and course management are areas that need to be consistent.

An area linked to standardisation and the demand element of the Host Country factor is the need to have similar entry requirements, which ensures that appropriate students are attracted. Furthermore, this coincides with the literature that identifies that recruiting students with the same abilities allow for greater consistency in the student experience at IBCs (Shams and Huisman, 2011). Additionally, capacity to attract excellent students is an indicator of quality
(Hoxby, 2000). Although this is important, the CS indicates the need to understand the ability of the student in the host country before setting entry requirements, as this can alienate students if these are too high, which would result in lowered enrolments.

While it is important to standardise certain elements of a course, it is equally important to make local adaptations to increase relevance, with many authors supporting this (examples include Farrugia and Lane, 2013). The QS highlights the importance of developing content with local industry, which supports the findings of the ES. Furthermore, there is a need to address different learning styles (Joy and Kolb, 2009; Littrell, 2005) and cultural differences (Dunn and Wallace, 2006). Besides, standardising content and having similar assessment standards were identified to be of low importance. It is apparent that local adaptations need to be made, but the suggestion of having different assessment standards is perplexing given the high importance of having an equivalent degree. Therefore, adaptations are necessary to make the course relevant to local needs, and, as a result, appeal to local employers.

The least important area identified was related to tuition fee with the key issue being that a similar tuition fee should be charged. Furthermore, as indicated in the QS, high tuition fees had the second lowest level of agreement as being a contributor to failure, which is similar to the findings of Mazzarol and Soutar (2002) and Pennell and West (2005) who suggest that high tuition fees impact enrolment negatively. Overall, it is important to identify affordability, which was established in the CS.
Host Country Factor

The host country was a key area within the CS but was considered to be the fourth important factor in the QS, which focused on the two areas of environment and demand for education.

The most critical areas identified are the regulations and the stability of the environment in the host country. All three stages of analysis highlighted the importance of the host country’s environment, which includes identifying what elements to concentrate on (regulations, political and economical), and the importance of understanding how these forces impact the ability of an IBC to operate efficiently. The importance of the latter is also prevalent in the literature (examples include Puranam et al., 2006, and Lane, 2011). Additionally, the repatriation of finances was identified as the most important criteria in the QS, and the CS demonstrated the importance of monitoring the three areas mentioned previously, as failure to do so can result in the closure of a campus.

Demand for education is an area established in all stages of the analysis. Furthermore, although not indicated in the three stages, the assessment of demand should go beyond quantitative measures and include three considerations, which include (1) the existence of similar courses, (2) ability to provide a better course than the competitors, and (3) excessive demand not currently being served (Altbach and Knight, 2007). Interestingly, the QS reveals that areas related to demand are second to environmental and regulatory issues. Thus, despite the importance of enrolments to success, it can be argued that regardless of demand, the host country should have an accommodating environment which allows the HEI to operate (Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014).
The two facets that were deemed to be the least important were financial assistance and the country’s reputation. Firstly, financial support is linked to resource seeking (Dunning and Lundan, 2008) in that its importance is specific to the context. Secondly, the importance of reputation was only found to be significant for one campus in the CS. Thus, it is unsurprising that this is ranked relatively low. However, there is contradictory research that the country’s reputation for education is unimportant (see Wilkins et al., 2011).

**Relationship Factor**

The *Relationship* factor was averaged to be the second most important factor and an important aspect of the CS. The QS stage highlighted the key relationships that are needed, and the possible criteria when choosing a partner, whereas the CS demonstrates the benefits, and the management and control issues.

The QS shows that the most commonly selected relationship that is needed is with the local staff, with the majority of the others having fairly equal weightings. Given that some campuses in the CS utilised both home and local staff, which includes academic, administrative and management staff, forming a good relationship with the local staff is understandably necessary. Furthermore, there is a need to manage disputes that may arise (Knight, 2015b). The CS identified the importance of communication with local staff for two reasons: (1) they can provide information about the host country and (2) there is a need to impart an understanding of the culture and ethos of the HEI.
The two least selected relationships are local HEIs and existing students. The latter is somewhat surprising given the importance of students to an IBC. However, one can argue that the relationship with students is different as they can be seen as consumers. Furthermore, when considering the success measures, the ability to measure satisfaction and getting feedback is also dependent on establishing a relationship with students. Concerning local HEIs, they can be viewed as competition, thus, fostering a relationship with them may not be considered as essential. However, the CS highlighted the importance of collaborations with local HEIs (i.e. for research purpose). Therefore, it can be suggested that the importance of these relationships is also specific to the context. Furthermore, there is limited recognition of whom to establish relationships with in the literature; for the most part, they have been inferred from other findings (e.g. invitations to establish an IBC can be from a local organisation or the government).

There are commonalities between the findings of the QS and the CS. The importance of understanding partners and managing expectations was a key contributor to success for those campuses that decided to include partners in the CS. The QS supports this as the most important items are understanding of a partner and a shared purpose, and supports the research by Barringer and Harrison (2000) and Verbik (2015). The CS suggests that there needs to be an understanding between the HEI and partners that an IBC is a long-term commitment, and clear expectations should be established.

Second to the need for understanding, control and placing academic imperatives first is also identified as important in the QS, CS and the literature (McBurnie, 2015; Schoepp, 2015). In general, there is a need to exercise
adequate control over the partner, as not doing so can result in the failure of an investment (Chalos and O’Connor, 2004; Ding, 1997). A key contributor to failure in the CS where a partner is involved is linked to the over-focus on financial gains and lack of quality control. Therefore, it is important to ensure that the HEI maintains control over academic aspects of the campus which include the categories in the Course factor.

Furthermore, partners can also be contextually specific, as campuses can choose not to have one (Lane and Kinser, 2013). However, undoubtedly some forms of relationship between the IBC and an entity in the host country will need to be established (e.g. local government, companies, advisory boards).

**Summary of Factors**

Overall, the relative importance of the factors and sub-factors have been identified. The HEI factor is the most important, which is unsurprising given the importance stressed by respondents in all stages with regards to the factors needing to be augmented based on each individual IBC. Additionally, the important sub-factors within each of the factors have been identified, which demonstrates the key areas for consideration when addressing the factors.

**6.4.2. Research Question 2 - Success Measures**

The final area to be addressed is the measure of success and failure. In total 18 areas, were assessed regarding their importance. The results of this were combined with the six categories identified in the CS. Subsequently, the 18 items
were grouped based on this (see Table 56). However, two additional categories were created to reflect the items that did not fit the main ones identified.

**Table 56: Success and Failure Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super Category</th>
<th>Main Categories</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>Quality of Students (5.52)</td>
<td>Mean = 5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Students (5.36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student Achievement (5.59)</td>
<td>Mean = 5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Employment Outcome (5.49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion Rate (5.30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback and Satisfaction (5.30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admittance to Graduate School (5.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Course</td>
<td>Quality of Faculty (5.60)</td>
<td>Mean = 5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Course (5.36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Accreditations (4.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal</td>
<td>Profitability (5.20)</td>
<td>Mean = 5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Relationship with Local Industry (5.18)</td>
<td>Mean = 5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship with Regulatory Bodies (5.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration between HC and BC (5.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Brand Awareness and Recognition (4.95)</td>
<td>Mean = 4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research Activity (4.70)</td>
<td>Mean = 4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>Contribution to National Economy (4.78)</td>
<td>Mean = 4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Impact (4.42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most important measures are related to enrolments, students and, the faculty and course. Furthermore, as a result of the CS, one key indicator of failure was the lack of enrolments; thus, it is unsurprising that this is the most important. Furthermore, fiscal measures were ranked fourth, arguably behind academic related issues, again, demonstrating the importance of having an academic focus, but issues related to finance are also crucial.
The least important areas are related to research and the host country. Firstly, the importance of research measures can be context specific. For instance, campus D was predominately focused on research; arguably, the importance of research success is likely to be ranked higher. Furthermore, the low importance of research contradicts the literature which suggests that research is a means of ascertaining a competitive advantage (Curran, 2000) and a key performance indicator (Marginson, 2004). Secondly, the low ranking of host country measures also supports the findings from the CS, where no cases highlighted the need to benefit the host country.

**Summary of Measures**

A total of eight areas have been identified from the findings that can be used to measure success at an IBC. Furthermore, the relative importance of each of the eight areas have been established, which indicates that enrolments are the most important measure of success, which is also suggested in the research conducted by Mazzarol (1998). Additionally, Table 56, illustrates that academic measure ranked higher than financial ones, which supports the notion of placing academic imperatives first (Vignoli, 2004). Additionally, the CS suggests that providing a quality course will result in more enrolments and subsequently increase revenue generated (examples include Mazzarol and Soutar, 2002). Finally, the importance of each measure may be context specific. Therefore, the measures identified above include broad areas to consider, as defined in the ES and CS. As a result, it is likely that some adjustment is needed, and these should be made in line with the goals of the IBC and the HEI.
6.5 Conclusion for Quantitative Survey

The purpose of the QS is to further verify the findings of the ES and CS. For the most part, this has been achieved, and the five factors of success and failure have been substantiated. However, the QS enhances the understanding of each of the factors by identifying the most important facets within them. In general, all items included scored above three, which signifies that all of them were ‘very important’. A similar observation can be made regarding the measures, which also confirms previously determined measures and highlights the most important ones.

Overall, the QS aided in the development of the issues within the five factors and measures of success. Most of the findings support the previous stages, with only a few instances of contradiction, but even those provided further support for the need to understand the context-specific requirements of each.
7. Discussion

7.1 Introduction

In the previous chapters, factors that contribute to the success of an IBC and appropriate measures of success have not only been developed through the literature but also empirically tested. The factors and measures were assessed through a mixed methodology. A model to demonstrate how the factors are interrelated was also developed through the qualitative stages. As research suggests, Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and specifically international branch campuses (IBC) carry a large inherent risk (Caruana, 2008; Hitt et al., 2012), the five factors identified suggest fundamental areas to consider that would reduce the likelihood that an IBC would fail. The chapter focuses on summarising the key findings and identifying the parallels where appropriate with the results of existing research; although many comparisons have already been made in Chapters 4 to 6.

The structure of the chapter is based on the research questions. Accordingly, the factors that contribute to the successful operation (research question 1) of an IBC and the associated sub-factors will be discussed first. Following this, appropriate categories to measure success (research question 2) will be discussed, which will include addressing the specific measurement criteria. Finally, the success factor framework will be presented; especially the way in which the success factors can be used and also the main linkages will be addressed (research question 3).
7.2 Research Question 1—Success Factors

To date, only a few studies have explicitly and holistically addressed the factors that would result in the success of an IBC. While there are numerous studies that look at strategic considerations for IBCs, they tend to focus on specific areas such as standardisation vs. adaption (Shams and Huisman, 2012), student satisfaction (Wilkins et al., 2012) and student choice criteria (Wilkins and Huisman, 2011b). For this reason, the first research question was created, which focuses on:

1. Which factors contribute to the success or failure of FDI in transnational education (TNE)?

To address this research question, both qualitative expert surveys and case studies, along with quantitative survey methods were used. Given the attributes of these methods (see Chapter 3), the quantitative research was used to establish the importance of the factors and the sub-factors identified in the qualitative stages. The findings demonstrate the key points to consider when establishing and operating an IBC. Furthermore, the factors will be addressed only in terms of success, as the results of the qualitative research suggested that failure factors were the opposite to these.

Overall, five factors were identified from the three stages of analysis and they are, in relative importance, HEI, Relationship, Course, Host Country, and Resource. Furthermore, as identified these factors represent the IBC inputs, as these are the main factors to consider when establishing an IBC (Besanko and
Braeutigam, 2013). Each of these factors will be addressed in turn, with a focus on defining the factor itself and the sub-factors in it.

The results of all of the analysis suggest that the HEI factor relates to the ability of the HEI to establish an IBC. In total, three areas were identified (as seen in Table 57), which relate to issues to consider when assessing the capacity to set up and run an IBC.

Table 57: HEI Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super Category</th>
<th>Main Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Strategic Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experience of TNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit/Mitigation Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear Vision</td>
<td>Long-Term Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear Aims and Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internationalisation Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Control over IBC and Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integration between Campuses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first main category is management, which refers to the managerial capabilities of the HEI. Many of the areas identified are apparent in all the three stages of data analysis. The case studies (CS) strengthened the critical issues of strategic planning (Levy, 2003; Rumbley and Altbach, 2007), experience of TNE (Werlau, 2001), and the importance of leadership (Hemsley-Brown et al., 2010).
Furthermore, the main additional finding was the importance of the exit/mitigation strategy, which was the result of the conclusions of the SC. In contrast, the quantitative survey (QS) shows that the importance of having an exit strategy is relatively the least significant, notwithstanding it does not negate the need to plan for the possibility of failure or at least the process of exiting if an outstanding issue arises.

Clear vision is the second category which is identified, and it relates to the management's strategic focus. All of the matters in the sub-category were evident in all the stages of data analysis, with greater emphasis on the need to consider the overall internationalisation strategy of HEIs being expressed in the CS. Furthermore, Farrugia and Lane (2013) and Verbik (2015) suggest that all of the HEI's activities need to be in line with the overall mission of the institution. The primary consideration for the management is to have an academic focus and understand the need for a long-term commitment. Interestingly, an over focus on financial aspects had relatively lower levels of agreement as the main contributors to failure (see Table 54). Despite the importance of having an academic focus, it is essential that financial viability is prioritised.

Finally, the process category relates to the ability of the HEI to manage the IBC. The two facets of this are integration and control. Both of these areas were identified in the expert survey (ES) and strengthened further as a result of the analysis in the CS. The Failed Campuses (FC) illustrated that one cause of failure was poor control of the operations at the IBC and reduced integration. Furthermore, the importance of using home staff was stressed, which coincides with the need to have healthy levels of buy-ins from the HEI.
The Relationship factor consists of two broad relationship issues that have been identified, and they are Relationship Entities and Relationship Supervision. Three categories have been identified within the Relationship factor (as seen in Table 58). Given that the number and type of relationships required vary for different IBC, the areas identified represent potential consideration when deciding on which of the relationships are needed, if any.

Table 58: Relationship Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super Category</th>
<th>Main Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Entities</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Staff (Home and Local) Alumni Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Local Industry Regulatory Bodies Government Partners Advisory board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Supervision</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Clear Expectations Understanding of Partners Academic Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Funding Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first category represents the possible relationships that can be formed, and they have been divided into Internal and External as identified in the ES. Furthermore, given that the specific relationships for each campus are unique, a list of the most common ones are suggested.

Three areas have been identified under Internal relationships. First, the Resource factor stresses the importance of the staff. Second, the CS emphasises the importance of the alumni and the advisory boards that aid in gaining an
understanding of the host country. At the same time, alumni have a sound knowledge of the HEI, which can be beneficial if they are involved in a partnership, as this helps with management issues. Finally, it is important to understand the performance of the IBC; thus, a relationship with existing students is needed.

Five areas have been identified in the External relationships. Some potential relationships are identified in the ES, and these have been grouped into bigger areas based on the CS. For instance, the ES mentions accreditation and quality assurance; these have been grouped into regulatory bodies. Furthermore, the QS highlighted that both areas had a similar percentage of respondents, indicating that they were equally significant. Additionally, the CS highlighted the use of advisory boards as a source of information about the local environment.

The management of partners was an area stressed in the CS. A key relationship issue for FC was a lack of control over partners (Geringer and Hebert, 1989; Mjoen and Tallman, 1997), and the opposite was observed at Successful Campuses (SC). Therefore, maintaining control, especially over academic issues, is crucial (Lane, 2011). Another relationship trait that contributes to successful partnerships is a mutual understanding and the establishment of a clear vision and expectations (Verbik, 2015). Both were ranked the most important criteria when forming relationships.

The final category is benefits, which again was highlighted in the CS; two areas have been identified, but this is not to say that these are the only two considerations. First, linked to the finance aspect of the Resource factor, one potential source of funds is from partners (Lane and Kinser, 2013). Therefore, this represents one benefit, which is funding, but it is important to understand the
role of the partner in the investment and any agreements in place (Schoepp, 2015). Second, relationships can be established as a means of getting information about the host country. Furthermore, the QS highlights that the main contributor to failure is the insufficient understanding of the environment. Therefore, working with partners or entities in the host countries can enhance the IBC’s knowledge (Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene, 2014; Tsang, 2000), reduce risk (Almor, 2001), and increase the likelihood of succeeding. Also, it is noteworthy that these relationships can be formed during the planning stage as this can become a part of the due diligence process.

Overall, two main Course categories have been identified, which are Content and Management (as shown in Table 59). These reflect key areas of consideration when devising the appropriate courses to be run at an IBC.

Table 59: Course Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super Category</th>
<th>Main Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Standardised Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Adaption (Content)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Movement between Campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethos and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuition Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The content refers to the delivery of the course. Most of the points have already been addressed with the need for a hybrid of a standardised and an adapted approach. This will be centred around standardising the curriculum, such as the assessments and the modules delivered (Miliszewska, 2008; Shams and Huisman, 2011) while making the content more relevant to the needs of the local education market (also suggested by Littrell, 2005). One further area identified in the CS, which is ranked third in importance, is the ability to move between campuses. All the campuses in the CS have at least two campuses (the IBC and the home campus), and a selling point was that students could migrate between campuses to study. However, the capacity to transfer between campuses stresses the importance of having a standardised degree and student experience as the degree should be consistent regardless of location.

The management refers to the running of the course and focuses on areas outside of teaching and delivery. The main issues are prevalent in all the stages of data analysis, but the importance of the student experience and ensuring that the ethos of the home campus is apparent in the IBC is especially significant in the CS and the literature (Lane, 2011).

Two sub-factors identified in the ES have been excluded as they are areas that are better represented under other factors. These include market demand and course marketing as they are more relevant in the Host Country and HEI factor respectively.

The result of the three stages led to the identification of the three main areas (as indicated in Table 60) in the Host Country factor. These represent issues that need to be understood by the HEI before deciding the suitability of a host country. The need for sufficient comprehension of the environmental forces
is supported by the findings of the CS and the QS. Both stages and the literature (Becker, 2009; Morgan, 2010b) indicate that a key contributing factor to failure was poor due diligence and market understanding.

**Table 60: Host Country Factor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super Category</th>
<th>Main Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Regulations, Political Issues, Economic Stability, Competitors, Accreditation/Education Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Local Neighbouring Countries, Quality of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Education Hub, Financial Assistance, Reputation, Existing Presence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of the ES, several environmental forces were identified, and some of these were confirmed in the CS. Also, regulatory issues were identified to be the most important items in the QS. Hence, six sub-categories have been identified that encompass the key considerations from the findings of all the three stages and summarise the main elements of the environment that are to be considered.

The second category that is identified is demand, and this is related to the number of potential students. The number of available students is linked to failure, as a lack of enrolment and demand was a common trait amongst FC in the CS.
and was the second most agreed upon area that resulted in failure in the QS. A final demand concern, as identified in the CS and the literature (Hoxby, 2000), is the need to not only focus on the number of the students but their quality as well. Furthermore, given that the suggestion that students are a co-creator of quality, this strengthen the support that students are key inputs for HEIs (Salerno, 2003).

The final area of benefits underlines the potential advantages of a host country, but they are contextually specific. These include existing presence, which includes the presence of alumni and already operating in the country; the main benefits of this revolve around understanding. First, HEIs that are already operating in the country gets a better perspective of how to function in that environment (Werlau, 2001). Secondly, existing alumni are beneficial in cases where they are involved with the IBC (i.e. management in a partnering firm) as they have a better understanding of the HEI. Therefore, it is also beneficial to assess the host country in these areas.

Two broad resource areas have been identified (as seen in Table 61) in the Resource factor. This includes knowing which resources are needed and how they can be used. Additionally, the resources encapsulate the traditional classification of inputs (Besanko and Braeutigam, 2013).
Table 61: Resource Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super Category</th>
<th>Main Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources Needed</td>
<td>Sources of Finance</td>
<td>Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government (if required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Staff</td>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Academic Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Academic Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>Uses of Finance</td>
<td>Start-up capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit Costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, three Resource categories have been identified as a result of the analysis. The ES indicated four key issues, with two key areas being reiterated in the CS and the QS, which are finance and staff. These relate to the sources of funds and the availability and the willingness of the staff to travel to the IBC. Additionally, as part of the ES, the administration was identified as separate, but this has been grouped with academic as they are both related to availability. In addition, faculty and staff are recognised as a key input for HEIs (Coelli, 1996; McMilan and Datta, 1998). The final area of infrastructure was not a key theme in the CS but is considered necessary in the ES and the QS. Arguably, IBCs need to have a physical campus, so this element is also included.

Second, the management of these resources also needs to be considered. These are primarily related to the correct use of finances. The three uses of finances include start-up capital, financial aid, and potential exit costs. The ES identified the need for start-up funds (which is the most important item in the QS) and to consider allocating finances to support academically able students who
would struggle to cover their tuition fees. Addressing the latter, both the literature and the CS suggest the benefit of providing financial aid (Kusumawati, 2010). However, this was ranked relatively low in the QS, but again this may have been due to the contextually specific need for this type of support, which is also exemplified in the CS. The final use of finances is the cost of closing a campus, which was identified as a result of the CS. This needs to be considered as some of the FC illustrated the high costs of closing an IBC. However, this facet was ranked the least important in the HEI factor and is not prevalent in the literature. Even though not all campuses fail, there is a need to consider the required resources if it does. Overall, given the importance of financial sustainability, there is a need to manage financial resources appropriately.

Five success factors and a series of sub-factors have been identified (as seen in Table 62). These factors are HEI, Resource, Course, Host Country, and Relationships. The findings both support existing literature and address some of the gaps that exist. The purpose of this summary is to address the comparisons to the conceptual model in the literature review and illustrate the contribution to theory.
Table 62: Overall Success Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super Category</th>
<th>Main Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEI Factor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Factor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Needed</td>
<td>Sources of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>Uses of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Factor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Host Country Factor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Factor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Entities</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Supervision</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conceptual model created as a result of the assessment of literature underlines a series of potential factors that would contribute to the success of an FDI. The foundation of the model is based on Dunning’s OLI theory (1988), which addresses an assessment of the ownership advantage (OA), location advantage (LA), and internalisation. However, this theory was identified to be generic and
required contextualisation. Therefore, the research conducted in this thesis addresses this issue and adapts the basic theory to the context of IBC.

First, before addressing the factors, internalisation is not evident in the findings of this research as the benefits are mainly seen in the manufacturing industry (Dunning, 2000). The only link to internalisation is risk, as Williams (1997) suggests that FDI can internalise risk, so in the context of TNE, as the HEI is purely responsible for the delivery of the course, the risk associated with outsourcing the course to another HEI is reduced.

OA is prevalent in the findings and is directly related to the HEI factor. As identified by Bevan and Estrin (2004), OA refers to exploiting the assets of an organisation in a foreign country. In essence, it focuses on the ability of an organisation to successfully invest abroad, which the HEI factor addresses. A number of areas have been identified that have been broadly classified into three sub-factors. The majority of the areas have been addressed in the literature with the one exception of having a withdrawal strategy.

In addition, the product (Kimura, 1989) and the resources (Horton, 2003) are part of the ownership advantage. First, the product for an HEI are the courses provided. Thus, as it forms a part of the OA, there arises a need to understand whether the courses are superior to those in the local market (Altbach and Knight, 2007). Two sub-factors were identified that are related to the creation of content (the need to balance a standardised curriculum with local adaptations) and management of the course (e.g. quality control and entry requirements). Secondly, given the resource intensive nature of FDIs (Almor, 2001), resources are important. Furthermore, there is a need to leverage resources in order to gain a competitive advantage (Shan and Song, 1997). The Resource factor has a
strong focus on finances, such as its sources and the correct management. Additionally, the other resource areas include the staff and the infrastructure.

The Host Country factor is strongly related to LA, which focuses on the benefits of operating in a particular country (Sadoi, 2008). The benefits and the demand sub-factor demonstrate the advantages of investing in a country. However, one difference in this factor is the Environment sub-factor, which relates not only to the need to understand the local market and the environment (Farrugia and Lane, 2013) but having a stable environment can also be considered a benefit. In essence, there is a need to understand whether the HEI can operate in the host country (Fegan and Field, 2009).

The final factor is Relationship, which is also an area that was identified to be missing from the original OLI theory. Nonetheless, the main areas within the literature are how to establish relationships (Luo, 1998) and control (Chalos and O’Connor, 2004; Ding, 1997; Geringer and Hebert, 1989). The findings of the analysis identify two areas: whom to establish a relationship with, and how to manage them. The latter addresses the areas mentioned above in the literature. Moreover, it was identified that not all IBCs require partners, and this is dependent on the approach taken by the HEI to establish an IBC.

The OLI theory identifies the three areas but not the linkages between them, although these are alluded to. There are many linkages between the five factors identified. For instance, the Host Country factor is closely linked to the HEI factor, as understanding the environment is not sufficient as there is a need to utilise this information to identify how to operate in the host country (Lane, 2011) and this demonstrates a managerial competency.
As a result, the findings of this research contribute to theory by demonstrating the application of the OLI Theory in TNE, in particular, what factors need to be considered in order to operate an IBC successfully. The findings are mainly related to OA and LA, and supports the addition of relationships as a key consideration. Furthermore, there is scope to identify whether the five factors from this study can be used in other industries if the HEI and Course factors are generalised to Organisation and Product/Service respectively.

7.3 Research Question 2—Success Measures

The literature addressed in Chapter 2 has a focus on the benefits of IBCs for an HEI and a host country. There is little research that directly identifies and discusses the appropriate measures of success. However, the research conducted by Mazzarol (1998) was one of the first to identify two measures of success through quantitative methods. The two measures are market success and contribution to the financial performance of the HEI. Both of these measures are focused on enrolments, which has been identified to be the key measure of success (Lewis, 2016). However, the research conducted by Mazzarol (1998) related to marketing education abroad in general terms and was not specifically related to IBCs. Additional research suggests that the ultimate measure of success is the alignment of IBC activities with the overall HEI (Chalmers, 2011; Lewis, 2016). Overall, this demonstrates the narrow focus on enrolments, and vague suggestions related to the contribution to the HEIs mission. For this reason, the second research question focuses on:
2. What are the appropriate measures of success and failure in FDI in TNE?

Similar to research question 1, the measures were identified in the same manner through the use of both qualitative and quantitative methods. The findings identify potential measures beyond enrolment that could be used to gauge the success of an IBC. However, only the measures of success will be discussed, as the findings suggest that the opposite would be indicators of failure. Moreover, the measures also represent the potential outputs for an IBC (Besanko and Braeutigam, 2013).

The findings of the three stages illustrate eight potential areas that can be used as success measures (as seen in Figure 53). The literature does not directly identify appropriate measures. Instead, these have been inferred by examining the benefits of establishing IBCs for both the HEI and the host country. The benefits to the host country include decreased brain drain (Jones, 2001; Mughal and Vechiu, 2009), increased revenue from international students and operating taxes (Schulz, 2006; Ziguras, 2003). The benefits to the HEI include increased revenue (Robertson, 2010a), wider learning opportunities through new collaboration (Vignoli, 2004) and enhancement to international reputation (Morgan, 2010b; Naidoo, 2007). These were subsequently transformed into measures (e.g. the amount of revenue generated became a measure).
The eight measures identified in the QS summarise all of the areas identified in the qualitative stages and the literature (which are all discussed in the relevant chapters). Ultimately, it was identified that enrolment is the most important measure of success, which supports the studies mentioned above by Chalmers (2011) and Lewis (2016).

Student Measures are related to the performance of the students and satisfaction. Again, this was supported in all three stages and the literature (Maringe, 2006; Wilkins et al., 2012; Yoo and Donthu, 2002). Interestingly, student measures were identified as more important than financial ones in the CS, but the QS suggested the opposite. The focus on academic issues above financial gain is also common in literature (Vignoli, 2004). Furthermore, it could be argued that both of these areas are linked, as providing a high-quality course is likely to increase enrolments (as exemplified in the CS) and have a positive effect on enrolments, which in turn increases the generated revenue (Mazzarol and Soutar, 2002). Finally, it is apparent than one of the main outputs for HEIs are student related, which include areas such as progression rates, higher degree
awarded and student numbers (Avkiran, 2001; Coelli, 1996; Drengenberg and Bain, 2016).

Faculty measures were broadly identified in the ES, further defined in the CS, and prioritised in the QS. These are related to the performance of the staff at the IBC, which has a direct impact on the quality of the course provided (Ranjan et al., 2012). Furthermore, this is also considered to be a key output, as it impacts the value added as part of completing a degree (Drengenberg and Bain, 2016). This measure, when combined with the previous one, can be argued to be related to the quality of the education provided as it relates to the performance of the students and the staff at the IBC.

Financial measures refer to the profitability and revenue that an IBC can achieve. However, it is essential for any IBC to be financially sustainable. Furthermore, this supports the research conducted by Mazzarol (1998), which identifies the benefits of financial gains to the HEI.

The Relationship measure was not separated in the CS but was alluded to, such as engagement with industry and research collaborations. Moreover, it is important to work with local organisations and design courses that would appeal to them (Varghese, 2007). Therefore, this underlines the need to measure the success of the relationships that are formed.

The three final measures are the least developed. First, the HEI measures are focused on the benefits provided to the HEI and revolve around branding and recognition benefits (Gribble and McBurnie, 2015; Morgan, 2010b; Rumbley and Altbach, 2007). Second, the Research factor is based on the research output of the IBC, which is increasing in its importance (Gottfredson, 2010; Wilkins and
Huisman, 2011b). Finally, *Host Country* is the least important measure and refers to the benefits of establishing an IBC for the host country.

Thus far, the broad categories of measuring success and their relative importance have been identified. Indicators for each of the measures have also been established from the findings (as seen in Table 63). For the most part, these have been taken from the CS as these are indicators which have been used by existing IBCs. Where measures were not apparent in the CS, the indicators were taken from the ES and QS. The importance of each of the measures are contextually specific, and the indicators are not a comprehensive list. Therefore, there is a need to identify further indicators of success.

**Table 63: IBC Performance Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolment</strong></td>
<td>Number of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of PhDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Types of Courses Chosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Employment Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attrition Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td>Quality of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of services provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willingness to travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement with industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial</strong></td>
<td>Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Budgetary Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relationship with Local Industry</th>
<th>Relationship with Regulatory Bodies</th>
<th>Integration between HC and BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HEI</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Awareness</td>
<td>Brand Recognition</td>
<td>Ability to be independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of accreditations achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Research</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Income</td>
<td>Research Activity</td>
<td>Research Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Host Country</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of graduate created in the workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of international students attracted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.4 Research Question 3 – Success Framework

A number of potential facets that contribute to the success of an IBC are identified in the literature, but these tend to be recognised in isolation and linkages between theories have not been made. One recent paper by Wilkins (2016) identifies three areas (environmental, industry, and organisational) for assessing opportunities and risks when establishing IBC. However, although derived from empirical evidence, this was based on literature and secondary sources. This research study identifies a framework based on primary and secondary data. Thus, research question 3 was proposed, which is to:
3. Identify a framework for the successful establishment and operation of an international branch campus.

To address this research question, only qualitative methods were used, and the framework was not tested quantitatively. The findings underline the linkages between the five factors. The individual factors have been addressed in Section 7.2, but the linkages have not (see Figure 50 below).

**Figure 50: Success and Failure Model 2**

![Success and Failure Model 2 Diagram](image)

The *HEI* factor is the most important one as it is based on the ability of an HEI to establish an IBC. This is similar to ownership advantage, which refers to the assets that can be exploited in a foreign country (Dunnings, 1988). Thus, for any organisation to commit to FDI, it needs to have the correct resources and competencies to establish a competitive advantage (Horton *et al.*, 2003; Wilson, 1992). Furthermore, thus far the factors have been identified as inputs and the measures as outputs, but as suggested in literature there is a need to understand how the inputs can be used to maximise outputs (McMilan and Datta, 1998;
Nonaka et al., 2000), which further supports the need for the above framework. Additionally, both the ES and the CS stressed the importance of contextualisation, and that all of the remaining factors will need to be augmented based on the HEI’s overall mission (Farrugia and Lane, 2012; Verbik, 2015). Ultimately, there is a need to fit the HEIs capabilities and resources with the host country, which is in line with the notion of strategic fit (Dunning and Wymbs, 2001; Lynch, 2006).

As mentioned above, the Resource factor is closely linked to the HEI. Within the framework, the factors demonstrate the need to understand what resources are required to establish an IBC (i.e. a campus and adequate finances). Furthermore, the resource requirements can be determined by the host country and relationships. As identified by Lane and Kinser (2013), there are five types of IBCs and that partners can provide financial support and facilities. Also, Resources and Course have a cyclical relationship, as resources can determine the course that can be delivered (depending on the availability of staff and the size of the campus) and the course demanded in the host country can dictate which resources are required (i.e. a large student demand would require large facilities or a high tuition fee would require the availability of financial aid).

Addressing the Course factor, as established, this can dictate resources and is an area that needs to be understood and controlled, due to the need to maintain quality. Furthermore, there is a need to work with local organisations to allow for local adaptions that make the course appealing to local employers (Mitra, 2010). Furthermore, this demonstrates a link to the Host Country factor as the course will need to meet local needs (Moogan et al., 1999).

The Relationship factor has been addressed concerning the Course and the
Resource factor. There are also linkages to the HEI and Host Country, as the HEI can use partners to gain knowledge about the local environment, which reduces risk and uncertainty (Tsang, 2002). Furthermore, the need for a partner coincides with the ‘Hedge’ strategy (Philips et al., 2009), which demonstrates that partners can reduce uncertainty in the host country. Furthermore, there is not only a need to understand the relationships required, but also a need to exercise sufficient control over partners, especially over academic issues (McBurnie, 2015; Schoepp, 2015). Additionally, the host country can invite HEIs to establish an IBC (Arokiasamy, 2010; Verbik, 2015) and dictate the relationships that are required.

The last factor, Host Country, refers to the benefits and barriers that need to be understood by the HEI. This is closely linked to managerial competencies and the need to monitor the environment and carry out sufficient due diligence (Knight, 2015b; McBurnie, 2015). Furthermore, it is no longer sufficient to simply understanding the environment; there is also a need to devise strategies to respond appropriately (Lane, 2011). To this end, the three central factors (i.e. Course, Relationships, and Resource) are elements that can be augmented to suit the host country.

A final finding is the direction of the investment which supports the suggestion by Bevan and Estrin (2004) and Sadoi (2008) that there is a need to understand how countries can attract FDIs. The framework presented can be augmented in the opposite direction to attract IBCs, given the rising popularity of education hubs as means to develop the relative tertiary education sectors (Gondwe, 2011).
7.5 Summary and Conclusion

This chapter has presented an overview of the key findings on the research questions. The discussion relating to both the qualitative and the quantitative aspects of the research has been presented. The findings show that the investigation both confirms and contributes to existing literature (i.e. success factors, measures of success, and a success framework). The following chapter will focus on the main contributions made to knowledge and practice, and the final thoughts about this research.
8. Conclusion

8.1 Introduction

This chapter represents the last in the thesis. The main intention is to present an overview of the entire study with specific emphasis on the contribution to theoretical knowledge and practice, which partly reflects the discussion given in the previous chapter. Furthermore, greater consideration will be given to how and where gaps in the existing knowledge have been filled. Additionally, the areas that caused difficulties and/or limiting inferences are also given. Finally, suggestions for the future directions of research are discussed.

8.2 Contribution to Theoretical Understanding

In Chapter 2, an initial review of the literature revealed that more research was needed to identify the factors that contribute to the success of an international branch campus (IBC) and appropriate measures to gauge success. This became the aim of the research, which is underlined by three research questions (see Section 3.3). These were comprehensively addressed, details of which were discussed in Chapters 4 – 7. The investigation provides a number of contributions to theoretical understanding based on the gaps in the literature. The discussion presented here will look at how the findings add to a better understanding of success factors and measures.
8.2.1 Success Factors for IBCs

As demonstrated in Chapter 2, there is a need for a better understanding of the factors that contribute to the success of an IBC, with researchers such as Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene (2014, pp. 34) suggesting that the topic of IBCs ‘has been little explored by scholars and policy makers’. Similarly, Farrugia and Lane (2013) and Mazzarol (1998) underline the need to better understand how IBCs operate and are integrated with the HEI as a whole. Furthermore, Mazzarol (1998) states the need to examine multiple countries, which is addressed in the CS, as multiple host countries and investing countries were included.

A key theory developed by this study is the identification of five factors in one theory, which confirms and classifies existing theories related to the operations of an IBC. The five factors include \( \textit{HEI} \) (1), \( \textit{Relationship} \) (2), \( \textit{Course} \) (3), \( \textit{Host Country} \) (4) and \( \textit{Resource} \) (5) (number indicates importance), which were established using both qualitative and quantitative methods. More recently, research conducted by Wilkins (2016) identified potential considerations for assessing risk and opportunities when establishing an IBC, which includes similar areas such as understanding the environment and capabilities of the HEI. However, the study was based on a review of the literature and secondary sources. Again, this study differs as it incorporates primary data and furthers the theoretical understanding by identifying factors based on practice. Furthermore, the three areas have been expanded to five, to better define the areas and incorporate additional complexities related to the course and relationships required.

Although the factors presented are unique to the context of IBCs, it is also possible to generalise each element, which can make the factors applicable to
FDIs as a whole. The main amendments are to *HEI* and *Course*, which can be altered to Organisation and Product/Service. The factors are related to elements of Dunnings (1988) ‘OLI’ theory (i.e. ownership advantage and location advantage), which is applied to FDIs in general. The five factors and associated sub-factors can be used in a similar manner and addresses the need to develop Dunning’s model (Mathews, 2006).

Additional contributions to the literature include furthering the identification of variations of IBCs. Lane and Kinsner (2013), and Verbik (2015), identify five types of IBCs, which are broadly grouped in wholly owned, externally funded, and facilities provided. The main variation of IBCs in the case studies (CS) utilises both internal and external funding, with the main cause of failure being poor control over partners and over-reliance on external funds. Ultimately, it was identified that wholly owned IBCs are the most likely to be successful (also suggested by Mahani and Molki, 2011) and support the suggestion that these types of IBC will be the most sustainable (Wilkins and Balakrishnan, 2015). In contrast, those IBCs that were purely externally funded (in the CS) are most likely to fail, as all the campuses that adopted this approach are closed (or closing). However, these assertions are only related to ten CS and some inferences from literature. Thus, further research is required to identify the validity of which variation of IBCs is the most likely to succeed. Although this was not an intended outcome of this study, it still represents a development of existing theory.
8.2.2 Success Measures for IBCs

There is very little consideration for appropriate measures for gauging the success of IBCs. To date, research conducted by Mazzarol (1998) has directly identified success measure, but these were based on ‘market success’ and finance, which, in essence, focus on enrolments and revenue. However, this study relates to marketing international education in general and does not specifically relate to IBCs, thus, demonstrating the need for research to identify specific success measures for IBCs. Furthermore, Chalmers (2011), and Lewis (2016), state that the key measure of success is enrolment, but also indicate that success is contextually specific to the HEI. Although it may be possible to objectively measure success, perceptions of success are subjective and contingent on various factors, including the viewpoint (i.e. success according to who?). Thus, this may also change over time (e.g. with new HEI leadership or changes in government). Furthermore, it has been identified that success can be difficult to measure due to the inability to measure intangible soft qualities (Knight, 2015b).

Despite little acknowledgement for specific measures, a number of benefits related to establishing an IBC have been identified. Numerous papers demonstrate the advantages of IBCs, which include increased revenues and enhanced reputation (Altbach and Knight, 2007; Mahani and Molk, 2011; McBurnie and Ziguras, 2007; Naidoo, 2007; Rizvi, 2005; Shams and Huisman, 2012; Van Vught, 2008). Therefore, these areas can be translated into measures. However, there is a need to identify whether any other measures exist.

The findings of this research identify eight categories of success measures, which includes Enrolment (1), Student (2), Faculty (3), Financial (4),
This confirms that enrolment and financial are appropriate measures for gauging success. Furthermore, the importance of each measure reveals that academic measures (1, 2, and 3) are foremost to financial (4) issues, which is in line with Vignoli (2004) who also echoes the same thought. In addition to the categories, a number of indicators were identified, which were determined from the CS and reflect actual measures used in practice. Furthermore, Host Country is the least important, but this is likely to be the result of the sample, as IBCs were targeted. Therefore, with regards to future research, there is a need to identify the relative importance and presence of these measures in more cases and to determine the measures that a host country would use to gauge success.

8.2.3 Success Factor Framework for IBCs

With the five success factors identified the focus pivots to the linkages between them. Currently, there is little research that links areas within IBC together or demonstrates the process of establishing an IBC. One notable paper is that of Wilkins (2016), who sets out a framework. However, as established, the findings were based on a review of the literature and secondary sources. Furthermore, although the framework was based on three areas, the need to draw linkages between potential factors is required.

Through the use of qualitative research, a five-factor success framework was identified. The framework shows the importance of the HEI factor and the need for the HEI to have the ability to establish and operate an IBC. Following this, the Course, Resources, and Relationship factor can be augmented to suit
the host country, which substantiates the need to establish a strategic fit (Lynch, 2006). Furthermore, this demonstrates that the factors are contextually specific and will require adaptation based on each IBC, because the environment in each host country will be different (Fegan and Field, 2009). Moreover, it is important to acknowledge that monitoring the environment is a continual process (Knight, 2015c; McBurnie, 2015). Additionally, there is a need to place extra emphasis on control, in particular, over academic issues (Schoepp, 2015), which, in this case, refers to partners and the course offered. Therefore, this demonstrates the need to not only understand the success factors but also to identify how they are related. Although each investment is unique, the framework presented provides a springboard for HEI management to consider when establishing an IBC. Nonetheless, the framework presents a contribution to the theoretical understanding of how IBCs can be established successfully.

8.3 Implications for Practice

This section will be divided into two parts as the study has implications for both, policymakers and HEI management. Firstly, general inferences to those responsible for controlling and regulating IBCs will be discussed. This will be followed by a discussion surrounding how the factors that contribute to the success of an IBC can be operationalised and measured.
8.3.1 Implications for Policy Makers

Given the rising numbers of IBCs, this study supports the need for a better understanding of how IBCs operate. A review of the existing literature indicates that little research has been conducted to holistically understand the factors that contribute to success. Furthermore, there is a need for policy makers such as education authorities (e.g. Singapore’s Education Development Board) and management in education hubs (e.g. Dubai International Academic City) to factor in how IBCs operate and reduce the potential for poor education (see section 2.4.3).

In recent years, many quality issues have arisen (such as degree mills Morgan, 2010a), that has resulted in the failure of IBCs and has led to tighter restrictions in certain countries, which only permit private institutions through invitation (such as Malaysia). Therefore, there is a need to monitor the level of quality at an IBC. The findings shed light on how the host country can vet the HEIs (and their practices) that enter the country.

Given the importance of the HEI factor; regulators need to assess the ability of the HEI to establish an IBC, which can include understanding the HEIs prior experience and their overall internationalisation strategy. The latter also provides insight into the level of commitment and integration between the home campus and the potential IBC. Furthermore, prior experience of establishing campuses also demonstrates managerial competencies, such as the ability to monitor and react to the environment.

A primary cause of failure is poor control over academic issues, which relates to both partnerships and the course. Firstly, there is a need to scrutinise any partner that the IBC is involved with. This includes understanding not only
the nature of any agreement in place but also the role that they will play (i.e. involvement in course delivery). Secondly, the course being provided needs to be assessed, and an indication of quality can be found by observing the ranking of the HEI and the number of accreditations.

Finally, although it is essential for an HEI to monitor and respond to the environment in the host country, a suitable environment that will allow the IBC to operate efficiently is needed. Therefore, the host country needs to provide suitable benefits, and a growing number of countries are introducing education hubs, which, in some cases, allows HEIs to operate independently outside of normal regulations, and provide incentives (i.e. tax breaks).

8.3.2 Implications for HEI Managers

The study has shown that the inappropriate management of IBCs is likely to result in failure, and the detrimental effects are severe, given the potential for wasted resources and damage to the reputation of the host country, TNE, and the HEI (see Section 5.4). In the case of the latter, the research has highlighted five factors that should be considered to reduce the likelihood of failure. Furthermore, these are related to the stages of operation such as pre-planning and operation (as seen in Figure 54).

First and foremost, and related to the HEI factor (as discussed in Section 7.2) the findings demonstrate three considerations for management. Before the HEI decides to establish an IBC, there is a requirement to assess the need, and its ability to open an IBC. The HEI needs to have a clear mission and vision, which is incorporated into the overall internationalisation strategy. Furthermore,
managers need to understand how having an IBC fits in with said strategy. Once the HEI sets its intentions, there is a need to focus on planning the opening of an IBC. This includes ascertaining information about the host country’s environment and assessing whether the IBC will be able to compete effectively. The HEI can utilise numerous sources of information, which can include working with personnel from within the host country. The HEI may also consider recruiting people who have experience in IBC, externally. The benefits of experience can include a better understanding of the process and the risks associated with IBCs. Additionally, there is a need to consider a potential withdrawal strategy in the event of a failure. Finally, once an IBC is operational, management need to consider the importance of control and integration. Both of these will ensure that quality and student satisfaction are consistent between campuses.

Closely linked to the HEI is Resources. The HEI needs to consider the availability of resources and how they are used and managed (as discussed in Section 7.2). Firstly, before an HEI can consider establishing an IBC, there is a need to assess available financial resources. This assessment could include private (local) partners and the government in the host country who may be able to provide support. However, this can come with associated issues related to agreements that may be put in place.

Secondly, the management will need to consider the willingness and availability of home staff to travel to the IBC. This is important, as there is a need to instil the ethos of the HEI at the IBC and to ensure that the student experience is equivalent to the one at the home campus. Once it has been determined that relevant resources are available, there is a need to consider how the finances will be used. The two prime areas of consideration are the initial start-up costs, which
need to include infrastructural costs (i.e. building or leasing a campus), and provisions for financial aid for academically able students who cannot afford the tuition.

During operation, the use of resources will be based on the initial financial plans, and the ability to monitor and control the costs of the IBC. This can include establishing interim objectives and benchmarks to ensure that the IBC does not over spend.

Finally, if management decides to close the campus, there may be associated exit costs. This will include the cost of compensation for students and staff and any breach in agreements (i.e. not fulfilling the contracts that may have been used to attract funding).

Establishing relationships with entities in the host country is inevitable (as discussed in Section 5.4.1). Thus, there are a series of issues to consider. Firstly, HEIs may be invited to establish an IBC; this reveals the need to fully vet the opportunities that may arise and ensure that any investment is aligned with the HEI’s overall mission.

During the planning stage, there is a need to understand the regulatory requirements for partners and contractual agreements. In some cases, the need for a partner is dictated by the host country; thus, an HEI will need to consider fully, the risk and benefits involved with working with a local partner. The benefits of local partners can include gaining information about the local environment and beneficial resources (i.e. finance and campus buildings). Furthermore, it is likely that where a partner is involved, a contractual agreement will exist between the HEI and the partner. Again, there is a need to ensure that this is in the best interest of the HEI, in achieving its mission, and to understand the role of the
partner fully. As part of this, there is a need to ensure that HEIs retain control over academic issues (such as enrolment criteria) to ensure the quality of the education being provided is not compromised. Furthermore, there is a need to establish clear expectations, given the long-term commitment required before any financial return is possible.

Once the IBC is operational, the key focus is on maintaining control. Given the likely deficits that will be incurred in the initial years of an IBC opening, there is a need to ensure that partners do not impart influence on academic areas as a means of increasing revenue. Finally, in the event of the campus closing, the HEI should understand the length of the contractual agreements and any penalties that may be incurred through early termination. This is closely linked to the need to have a withdrawal strategy and sufficient financial resources.

The management will also have issues within the Course factor to consider, but these will happen after it has been decided that an IBC is appropriate for an HEI. Firstly, during the planning stage, the courses to be run at the IBC will need to be selected. This could be based on the needs of the local students, which are usually related to employment opportunities. Following this, quality controls are necessary to ensure that standards are consistent across campuses. One method of achieving this is the use of home staff (particularly in the early stages of a degree) to ensure that the quality of the course and student experience are equivalent across all campuses. However, in most cases, some form of local adaption is required. Therefore, the use of local staff will be beneficial, but there will be a need to ensure that they fully understand the course being delivered as well as the culture of the HEI. Additionally, the HEI may seek accreditations, which can be an indicator of quality. Finally, appropriate tuition
fees will need to be charged, but in most cases, these are standardised across all campuses. However, provisions for financial aid and availability of government sponsorship should also be considered when determining the correct tuition fees.

During the operation, the performance of the course should be monitored. Appropriate measures will need to be used as indicators of success or failure (as discussed in Section 7.3). These measures should be related to students while they are at the IBC, and once they have graduated. For the former, this can include student feedback and performance (such as pass rate). The latter of the above could include employability, as this can provide an indication as to whether the local industry has accepted the degrees offered by the HEI.

Finally, concerning the withdrawal strategy, the HEI will need to consider their teaching commitments and whether they will teach out the course/s or compensate students (financially) and provide support to find suitable alternatives.

The final area for consideration for managers is the Host Country factor. This mainly addresses the suitability of a host country for an HEI (as discussed in Section 7.2). Similar to the previous factor, the issues begin during the planning stage. During this stage, it is essential to understand the main forces within the environment (such as regulations, government and economic), and how they will impact the HEI. Furthermore, there is a need to ascertain how stable these forces are, as high levels of uncertainty can dictate which strategic approach is required (Philips et al., 2009). The analysis of the environment should take precedence over other issues in the host country, as this dictates whether an IBC can operate effectively. If this is not possible, then regardless of the size of the student population, an IBC is unlikely to succeed. Thus, once the environment is dubbed
suitable, the HEI can consider student demand, which should include those in the country and those that surround it. Furthermore, the overall mission of the HEI (i.e. targeting specific continents or regions) can determine which host country is chosen. Finally, the government’s commitment to higher education will need to be understood, as this can impact the amount of support received. One indicator of commitment is the presence of an education hub, which can provide many benefits to an HEI. A further indicator is the history of the country; an HEI can look at the failure rate and the number of rejected invitations as a means of understanding the country’s ability to host IBCs.

During the operation of the IBC, it is fundamental that the environment is continually monitored. This should highlight any problems that may arise. Furthermore, the HEI will need to be able to react to significant changes (such as changes in government, which may pivot national priorities) appropriately, and in a timely manner.
### Figure 54: Managerial Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEI</th>
<th>Pre-Planning</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Exit (If needed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internationalisation Strategy</td>
<td>Environment Monitoring</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Exit Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The IBC needs to be part of the HEIs overall mission.</td>
<td>- Need to understand the key forces in the host country</td>
<td>- The HEI needs to maintain control over the IBC and its operation, in particular the quality of the course being delivered.</td>
<td>- The HEI needs to fully understand the implications of closing an IBC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Aims and Objectives</strong></td>
<td>- Establish whether an IBC can be competitive.</td>
<td>- The HEI needs to ensure that it maintains academic control if partners are involved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear aims and objectives need to be set and should be in line with the HEIs strategy.</td>
<td><strong>Information Source</strong></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Information about the host country can be obtained from secondary sources or local personnel and organisations.</td>
<td>- Regular communication is required between campuses to ensure that standards are met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recruit Experience Staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- If the HEI has limited experience of IBCs, it may consider recruiting additional personnel.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- This can help with risk recognition and process optimisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HEI**

**Aims and Objectives**
- Clear aims and objectives need to be set and should be in line with the HEIs strategy.

**Internationalisation Strategy**
- The IBC needs to be part of the HEIs overall mission.

**Environment Monitoring**
- Need to understand the key forces in the host country
- Establish whether an IBC can be competitive.

**Information Source**
- Information about the host country can be obtained from secondary sources or local personnel and organisations.

**Recruit Experience Staff**
- If the HEI has limited experience of IBCs, it may consider recruiting additional personnel.
- This can help with risk recognition and process optimisation.

**Control**
- The HEI needs to maintain control over the IBC and its operation, in particular the quality of the course being delivered.
- The HEI needs to ensure that it maintains academic control if partners are involved.

**Integration**
- Regular communication is required between campuses to ensure that standards are met.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Available Finances</th>
<th>Start-up Costs</th>
<th>Financial Sustainability</th>
<th>Withdrawal Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The HEI needs to have sufficient finances to fund an IBC.</td>
<td>- The HEI needs to understand the initial costs which can include provisions for infrastructure.</td>
<td>- Management will need to control costs at the IBC and ensure that the campus does not continually operate in a deficit.</td>
<td>- The HEI will need to consider the financial costs of closing a campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The amount of finances required can be determined by the host country but funding can be tied to agreements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The availability of staff can be determined by the HEI’s commitment to the IBC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Willingness of Staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>Financial Aid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Home staff are required to ensure equivalency and quality standards</td>
<td>- Based on an understanding of the student market, financial support may be required to support those who are academically able but do not have sufficient funds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Invitations</td>
<td>Legal Requisites</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Honour Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Foreign governments can invite HEIs to establish campuses, but there is a need to fully vet each opportunity.</td>
<td>- Certain countries will require HEIs to work with a local partner.</td>
<td>- The HEI should maintain control of academic issues at all times. This includes limiting interference from partners if the IBC is not performing well financially.</td>
<td>- Related to contractual agreements, any partnership should be honoured for the duration of the contract. If this is not possible, then the HEI will need to consider any penalties that will be imposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Contractual Agreements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Any agreement has to be in line with the HEI’s overall mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The role of the partner needs to be clearly established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Academic control must be retained by the HEI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear expectations need to be established.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Forming relationship with local organisation can improve the HEI’s understanding of the local environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Selection of Courses</td>
<td>Monitor Performance</td>
<td>Teaching Commitments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The course chosen has to be relevant to the host country and meet student needs.</td>
<td>Feedback from students will be essential for monitoring potential problems at the IBC.</td>
<td>There is a need to consider teaching out courses or to provide suitable alternatives, should an IBC decide to close.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Quality Control</strong></td>
<td>The performance of the students will also indicate the quality of the education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home staff can be used to ensure that the quality of education is similar to the home campus.</td>
<td>Monitoring should go beyond performance while students are at the campus (i.e. rate and types of employment).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local staff may require training to not only be familiar with the course, but the ethos and culture of the HEI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accreditations can be used as an indicator of quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular contact between the IBC and home campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standardisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related to quality, the essence of a course should remain the same (i.e. modules and assessment standards)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaption</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Content should be adapted to suit local learning styles, contexts, and needs of the local industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tuition Fee</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Most IBCs adopt the same pricing policy as the home campus; thus, there is a need to understand affordability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of sponsorship provided by the government.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>Stability of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A stable environment will be beneficial for an IBC, which include economical, governmental, regulatory and political.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Market Demand</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There needs to be sufficient demand in both the host country and those that surround it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Government Commitment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The presence of an education hub demonstrates a commitment to higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a need to understand the incentives of operating in a particular host country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider history of the country in relation to IBCs to understand the ability to host foreign institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4 Study Limitations

As in most studies, the research presented in this study has several limitations. Where possible, limitations were restricted through the management of the research design and process. The limitations identified in Figure 55, are distributed between the three stages of data collection, and address sampling, collection, and analysis of the data.

Figure 55: Possible Limitations Associated with the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expert Delphi</td>
<td>Case Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sampling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- List obtained from a series of conference delegate lists.</td>
<td>- Limited availability of people from failed campuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Time passed between iterations.</td>
<td>- Failures cases mainly based on secondary sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of self-completion Delphi technique.</td>
<td>- Interviews over Skype.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4.1 Sampling

In the qualitative research, a non-probability convenience/judgemental approach was used. The expert survey was based on a delegates’ list from a series of conferences related to TNE and IBCs, which also contained email addresses. Although not all participants at the conferences would have sufficient knowledge of IBCs, given their attendance, one could argue that this group is likely to have more knowledge about IBCs. However, it could be disputed that this approach attracted bias due to the neglect of people unable, or unwilling, to attend conferences of this nature. Also, where possible, authors of the main journals related to IBCs were contacted. However, it was not always possible to ascertain current contact information. In both cases, the expert criteria (see Section 3.5.4) was enforced, to ensure that only the most relevant and valuable respondents were retained.

For the case studies, a similar sampling approach was used, and campuses were selected, based on the availability of one senior official from both, the home campus and IBC. Due to convenience and time constraints, the campuses chosen were based on those that responded first and met the criteria. Therefore, it can be argued that this biased the data towards those that were most willing to provide data, which may suggest that these campuses are exceptional examples. Therefore, there is a need to conduct further research into a larger number of campuses. Additionally, as of 2015, there were 20 failed campuses, which is not a large number of campuses to choose from. All of the failed campuses were contacted directly on numerous occasions but most ignored the emails, and phone calls were filtered by gate keepers. In some instance, respondents stated that the relevant personnel were no longer working
at the institution, or that the information was deemed to be sensitive, and all but one campus agreed to an interview. However, the information from the interview was, for the most part, anecdotal.

The sample for the quantitative survey was based on the list of IBCs, created by C-BERT, which contains all of the campuses (i.e. developing, operational and closed). This is the only comprehensive list of IBCs that exist. However, this meant that the sample list was dependent on an external source. The contact information (emails) from all 204 individual campuses needed to be identified, but this was not possible for all campuses. Therefore, the mailing list did not include all of the campuses. Where possible, the campuses were contacted by phone to get the necessary email addresses, but language barriers were a primary cause of not getting the information. In total, respondents from 87 campuses completed the survey, which is low, but can be argued to be representative of the population (42%). However, in future studies, multiple people from the same HEI could be used, which would increase the potential sample size. Nonetheless, all attempts were made to ensure that the entire list of campuses was contacted, and the use of email was the most convenient, given the geographical dispersion of the campuses.

8.4.2 Data Collection

The expert Delphi survey and the quantitative survey were completed through self-completion. Although this is more time- and cost-effective, and allows for respondents from multiple countries, an assumption is made that the respondents are capable of, and literate in, answering the questions. This is particularly pertinent for the expert Delphi survey, as all of the questions were
qualitative and required long answers, which are more complex and time-consuming. Furthermore, the time taken between each iteration could have been reduced, which may have allowed respondents to have a consistent line of thought, without needing to re-familiarise themselves with the research. Additionally, as an incentive, respondents were offered a copy of the analysis if they provided a contact address. The chapter was sent to all those that requested one, and some respondents provided some additional feedback, and further confirmed the results.

In both cases, the data was collected online, and invitations were sent via email. The use of emails may have severely reduced response rate (as discussed in Section 3.7.4). It should be noted that in both cases, the instrument was piloted to ensure that the questions were clear, and respondents who had not completed the survey were contacted by phone to encourage completion, or identify any other issues that prevented them from completing the survey.

As mentioned, only one interview for the failed campuses was conducted; information on the failed campuses was collected primarily through secondary sources. Therefore, one campus was selected based on the availability of respondents, and the four others were based on analysing a number of secondary sources that were available on each of the remaining 19 campuses. Given the need to build a comprehensive case of each campus, the four campuses with the most information were selected. This method arguably presents additional bias, as they can represent extreme examples of failed campuses due to the increased level of media and journalistic attention. Furthermore, the information from secondary sources are based on the viewpoint of the journalist and, in some cases, may have been subject to censorship.
Therefore, the individual articles may not provide an accurate viewpoint of the campus. In all cases, the information was confirmed through numerous sources, and where there was potential for censorship, sources from countries which do not have this issue were used to verify the information. Overall, if coupled with the selection of successful campuses, it could be argued that the campuses represent extreme examples of successful and failed campuses. Therefore, future studies may consider the inclusion of more campuses that sit between these extremes.

The interviews for the case studies were conducted through the use of Skype. While this provides the main advantage of access to IBCs and HEIs globally, a number of technical issues occurred. Firstly, the use of Skype is predicated on respondents having an account and needing to know how to use the software. However, if respondents did not want to use the software, calls were made using Skype, which offers a lower price for international calls. Secondly, the call quality was variable and, in some cases, this made it problematic when recording the interviews, and a number of phrases were not clear. Finally, there was little control over the respondent environment, given that the interviews were conducted during office hours, in multiple interviews, the respondents were disrupted, and their chain of thought was interrupted. This presented issues of repetition in some cases. The two previous issues were addressed by sending a summary to the respondents, to confirm whether the main points were correct. In all cases, this was confirmed to be correct. Given the geographical spread of the interviewees, the use of video calls or voice calls represented the only viable method of conducting the interviews, but all efforts were made to ensure that the interviews were conducted properly, and any ambiguity was addressed.
8.4.3 Data Analysis

Very few issues were encountered during the analysis of the qualitative stages of research. All transcripts were checked on multiple occasions to ensure accuracy, and multiple iterations of coding and grouping were conducted to ensure that the factors and sub-factors identified were correct. However, given the subjective nature of qualitative analysis, this can be based on the researcher's interpretation. Therefore, future research should focus on the existence and relevance of the factors in more IBCs.

The main limitation to analysis is related to the quantitative stage of research. Due to the small response rate, this limited the number of tests that could have been carried out. Previous work by Mazzarol (1998) used exploratory factor analysis to identify critical success factors. However, research suggests that either a minimum of 100 respondents (Gorsuch, 1983), or a ratio of 10 respondents for each item (Velicer and Fava, 1998) should be used. Given that the minimum was not achieved, this was not possible. As a result, Frequencies and Descriptives were used to demonstrate the importance of each factor and sub-factor. Therefore, it would be valuable to use the factors and measures identified, in a larger quantitative study. Furthermore, additional complex quantitative tests could be used to understand the contribution of each of the factors to success.
8.5 Directions for Future Research

This study presents a number of opportunities for future research. In both, this chapter and the previous (Chapter 7), many directions for furthering the current investigation are/ were suggested. The research has presented the potential areas of exploration, both concerning which factors contribute to the success of IBCs and how this can be measured. This section will introduce several directions, for new research considered essential for developing knowledge.

Academics (and practitioners) are encouraged to continue research into what makes an IBC successful. This will further the understanding of how IBCs operate and reduce the risk of failure, wasted resources and damage to reputation.

Future research should focus on the applicability of the five factors in a wider range of IBCs. This would provide a more comprehensive picture of how IBCs currently operate, and facets within them, that make them successful. Furthermore, despite the factors being contextually specific to IBCs, generalising the HEI and Course factor to Organisation and Product/ Service (respectively), would allow for further research into whether these contribute to success in other industries, which can include services (e.g. banking), and products (e.g. automotive). For example: Is the organisation and its ability to invest abroad the most important factor that contributes to success?

The interviews carried out in the case studies, are based on reflection by the respondents. Therefore, further longitudinal studies should be conducted to follow the development of an IBC from conception to operation (and in some cases, failure). This supports the calls for further research by Mazzarol (1998).
This will allow for the observation of key decisions and processes, which can be compared and contrasted against the factors identified in this study.

The focus of this study has been on which factors and measures are the most suitable, from the perspective of the HEI. The findings present a framework for understanding the process of investment (see Section 7.4) beginning with the HEI. However, it may be possible to augment the factors in a similar manner from the host country, and determine how they can attract HEIs. This supports the work of Bevan and Estrin (2004), and Sadoi (2008), who suggest the need to understand how locational advantage can be used to attract FDI. Therefore, the framework and factors can be further used, to explore which elements are the most beneficial in attracting an HEI. For example: Are provisions of resources the most important factor for HEIs when considering a host country? Furthermore, as part of this, additional research is needed to better understand what measures qualify an IBC as a success from the perspective of the host country, whether it be from the viewpoint of education authorities, or management at education hubs.

Finally, there is little (if any) research on IBC, which utilises quantitative methods. This is due to IBCs being a relatively new phenomenon and much of the research being conducted, being of an exploratory nature. However, the findings of this research present five factors, and relative sub-factors, that could result in the success of a campus. Furthermore, measures have been established that can be used to gauge the level of success. Therefore, the factors can represent independent variables, and the success (using the measures) can be used as a dependent variable (see Figure 56). This would allow for regression tests to be carried out, to identify which factors have the greatest statistical
contribution to the success of a campus. However, before this can occur, further exploratory work will be needed, to confirm the factors and sub-factors.

**Figure 56: Statistical Conceptual Framework**

![Diagram](image)

**8.6 Summary of Final Thoughts**

The purpose of this study was to identify the success factors for FDI in TNE. In addition to this broad area, the study has produced significant contributions to theory. Through the use of a mixed methodology, five success factors have been identified that contribute to the success of an IBC. This outlines the main considerations when HEIs decide to establish an IBC, thus allowing them to reduce the potential for failure. Additionally, a framework has been presented which shows how the factors are linked and demonstrates the process of how the factors can be used. Also, success measures have been identified along with associated indicators. The findings of the research do not only present
a means of better understanding how IBCs operate but presents a new conceptualisation of how the success of IBCs can be measured.

The study incorporates many areas within literature (see Section 2.4.5) and confirms their contribution to the success of an IBC. This research goes one step further and is one of few that incorporates primary data into identifying strategic implications and a suitable framework for establishing an IBC. A number of suggestions for policy makers and HEI managers for increasing the likelihood of success have been proposed as a result of the findings. In general, this study makes a valuable contribution towards a better understanding of IBC operations, but there is still a need to research the applicability of the factors and measures in future years as IBCs become more established, and as the potential for collection of longitudinal data increases.

Yuen Ben Siu

August 2016
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