

Chapter 13

A Review of Transnational Higher Education

John David Branch
University of Michigan, USA

ABSTRACT

The internationalization of higher education is as old as the university itself. Recently, however, there has been a growing interest in transnational higher education, a specific form of internationalization that considers education as a product which can be packaged and sold abroad. The purpose of this chapter is to review the phenomenon of transnational higher education. More specifically, it aims to 1) define transnational higher education, situating it within globalization and the internationalization of higher education, 2) enumerate the various perspectives on transnational higher education, and 3) provide guidelines for the appropriate conduct of transnational higher education.

INTRODUCTION

Adam Smith (1776), often considered the father of modern economics, claimed that humans have an intrinsic propensity to “truck, barter, and exchange one thing for another” (p. 17)—that is to say, to trade. This propensity to trade is so basic, he continued, that it probably developed in concert with the ability to speak. As summarized by Bernstein (2008),

*[w]hile other animals, particularly primates, groom and share food with each other, systematic exchanges of goods and services, particularly over great distances, have not been observed in any species besides *Homo Sapiens*. (p. 8).*

Trade among humans has occurred for thousands of years. Documents from present-day Turkey allude to a 19th century BCE Assyrian merchant colony near Capadocia (Stearns & Langer, 2001). International trade—defined here as the voluntary exchange of products (goods or services) which occurs between two countries—has likewise existed for millennia. Evidence “of the exchange of shells, arrowheads, and other goods over long distances... goes back well before any written record” (Pomeranz

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-4972-7.ch013

A Review of Transnational Higher Education

& Topik, 2013, p. 3). Perhaps the most famous manifestation of this international trade is the Silk Road, which was established during the Han Dynasty (206 BCE to 220 CE) to facilitate the exchange of spices and other exotic goods from the Far East in Europe.

Today, international trade accounts for more than 25% of the gross world product, according to the World Trade Organization, whose members imported and exported US\$17.3 trillion in merchandise in 2012 (WTO, 2014). More than 50,000 merchant ships ply the oceans with bulk cargo (Hellenic Shipping News, 2013). And many small countries which lack resources of their own—Singapore, for example—punch well above their weight because of international trade (Ministry of Trade and Industry Singapore, 2014). Channelling both Bernstein (2008) and Pomeranz & Topik (2013), international trade and the history of the world economy go hand in hand.

It ought not to be surprising, therefore, that higher education has also come to be traded internationally. Full fee-paying foreign students play an important role in higher education, triggered to a large degree by countries such as the U.S.A., the United Kingdom, and Australia, all of which deregulated and restructured their economies in the 1980s (Chadee and Naidoo, 2009). But in recent decades other forms of this ‘transnationalization’ have come to the fore. Between 2006 and 2009, for example, the number of foreign branch campuses increased by 43% to 162 (Altbach, 2010; Morgan, 2010).

Transnationalization has now been incorporated into not only the lexicon of higher education, but also its mission. Indeed, according to Campbell et al. (2000), “at the university of today, a new force has supplanted Latin texts, classical scholarship and nobility of thought and deed. It is, quite simply, the philosophy that universities offer a product which can be exported to a global marketplace” (p. 1). In practical terms, this philosophy has translated into various international and often commercial manifestations of the university, including franchise agreements, online degrees, and, more recently, foreign branch campuses. As suggested by Wilson & Vlăsceanu (2000),

these new developments in higher education share certain common characteristics and similarities, mainly in terms of the ways they cross the borders of national higher education systems. It is for this reason that they are usually identified by the generic phrase of transnational [higher] education (p. 75).

Transnational higher education is particularly pronounced in business schools. Indeed, according to Altbach (2010), the most popular transnationalized programs are in business, due to the low start-up costs and to the significant worldwide demand for these programs. Some of these programs, “(MBA programs for example) are clearly larger and potentially more profitable than others” (Wood et al., 2005, p. 2). Business schools have seemingly also embraced—more than other faculties in higher education—the marketization, neo-liberalism, and globalization with which transnational higher education is most often associated. English has doubtless become the *lingua franca* of business schools, especially as more and more students choose to study at foreign business schools. Business schools are also said to live and die by the league tables which, in recent years, have become more and more global in nature. And this global competition also extends to the recruitment of students, which now includes fairs, road shows, and other courting rituals which occur from Singapore to São Paulo.

The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to review the phenomenon of transnational higher education. More specifically, it aims to: 1. define transnational higher education, situating it within both globalization and the internationalization of higher education, 2. enumerate the various perspectives on transnational higher education, and 3. provide guidelines for the appropriate conduct of transnational higher education.

TRANSNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

The origins of the modifier transnational are uncertain. Australia has been employing it since the early 1990s, and consequently as a nation it is often considered to be both a terminological and executional pioneer (ACA, 2008). Knight (2005) suggested that the term transnational was used initially in Australia to distinguish off-shoring (any activities which crossed Australia's borders) from on-shoring (full fee-paying foreign students who had moved to Australia for their education). Whatever its origins, the term has "entered the literature to describe various aspects of 'international education' and the internationalisation of education" (Sanderson, 2005).

According to de Wit, however, "in the literature and in practice, it is still quite common to use terms that only apply to a small part of internationalisation and/or emphasize a specific rationale for internationalisation" (de Wit, 2011b, pp. 242-243). And using "these terms without explaining what they mean...is sloppy practice" (Sanderson, 2005). The terms cross-border and borderless, for example, have often been used synonymously to describe the transnational phenomenon (ACA, 2008). Bennett et al. (2010) provided the following definitions:

Cross-border education literally means that education provision crosses borders. Both cross-border education and transnational education geographically denote provision based in one country but delivered in another country. Instead of classical student mobility, we have mobility of provision, although one does not exclude the other. A third term, borderless education, emphasises that national borders are irrelevant to this kind of education, which is not necessarily based in any specific country (p. 8).

But by no means is there agreement on the meanings of transnational, cross-border, or borderless.

The distinction between globalization, internationalization, and transnationalization has likewise been fuzzy (de Wit, 2000). Mitchell & Nielsen (2012) brought some clarification, arguing that "internationalization is seen as something which higher education institutions *do* while globalization is something that is *happening to them*" (1. introduction). Indeed, internationalization can be viewed as a process of innovation (van der Wende, 1999) in which a higher education institution engages; globalization is a set of environmental forces within which the internationalization occurs. Transnationalization, therefore, is not equal to but instead a "component of the wider phenomenon of the internationalization of higher education" (British Council, 2013, p. 6).

This hierarchical relationship between internationalization and transnationalization is most conspicuous in the evolution of work by Jane Knight, who is a prominent scholar in the international higher education discipline. Callan (2000) noted that the changing nature of higher education since WWII led her to her first formulation of internationalization—"the process of integrating an international dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution" (Knight, 1997, p. 8). Recognizing the importance of culture in internationalization, and homing in on higher education, she then offered a slightly revised version. The "internationalization of higher education is the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution" (Knight, 1999, p. 16).

It was Knight's 2003 definition, however, which, with the addition of delivery, recognized transnational higher education as a component of the internationalization of higher education. Accordingly, the internationalization of higher education "at the national, sector, and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or

A Review of Transnational Higher Education

delivery of postsecondary education “ (p. 2, my emphasis). Also noteworthy in this new definition are the possibility of internationalization at different educational levels, and the concept of global.

In 2007, Knight called out ‘delivery’ explicitly, defining cross-border tertiary education as...

...the movement of people, knowledge, programs, providers, ideas, curricula, projects, research and services across national or regional jurisdictional borders. Cross-border education is a subset of internationalisation and can be part of development cooperation projects, academic exchange programs and commercial initiatives. Cross-border is a term that is often used interchangeably with other terms such as transnational, offshore, and borderless education. There are some conceptual differences among these terms, they usually refer to similar types of activities (p. 24).

The evolution of work by Jane Knight also parallels the evolution of transnational higher education itself. Indeed, that which began earnestly in the 1970s as the passive receipt of foreign students who were on exchange or part of aid programs, moved systematically to a direct export model in the 1980s in which universities pushed aggressively to recruit full fee-paying students. A period of strategic growth followed into the new millennium, as big countries set out to become global leaders in transnational higher education with more sophisticated forms of transnationalization, leading to the present situation in which liberalization and deregulation of higher education allow any and all institutions to play the game (Chadee & Naidoo, 2009). In essence, this evolution represents a transition from aid to trade (Naidoo, 2006).

In a similar way, Chen (2015) identified three distinct historical phases of transnational higher education: 1. student recruitment, 2. twinning agreements, and 3. overseas campuses. Distance education could possibly be considered the newest phase, and as suggested by Wilson & Vlăsceanu (2000), “there seems to be no limit to the proliferation of such modalities or arrangements, as long as the demand for higher education is still growing, and the possibilities for a global market continue to emerge” (p. 78).

For de Wit (2011b), however, the year 2000 was a kind of watershed moment for higher education. He contended that the Bologna Process of 1999, whose central features underscore the cooperation of European nations, was overshadowed by the Lisbon Strategy of 2000, thereby shifting the focus almost entirely to competition. The “increasing competition in higher education and the commercialization and cross-border delivery of higher education have challenged the value traditionally attached to cooperation” (de Wit, 2011b, p. 242).

Whatever the exact origins of the modifier transnational, many definitions of transnational higher education have materialized. Beginning at the national level (See Table 1.), China, as one of the most significant targets of transnational higher education (and now a player in its own right), established a definition for transnational higher education early on. Unsurprisingly, three of the major national players in transnational higher education (Australia, the United Kingdom, and New Zealand) have their official definitions. And Germany, a relative newcomer to transnational higher education, has its own (rather loose) definition. Absent is a definition from the U.S.A., which is understandable, considering that both American higher education policy and transnational higher education have historically rested at the institutional rather than government level.

Multi-lateral institutions, trade associations, and other organizations have also weighed in on transnational higher education (See Table 2.). One of the first organizations to do so was GATE, which, incidentally, was transferred to the United States Distance Learning Association in 2003, but whose emphasis on transnational higher education has since then disappeared under its new parent. The AVCC

Table 1. National definitions of transnational higher education

Nation	Definition
China Ministry of Education (1995)	Those foreign corporate, individuals, and related international organizations in cooperating with educational institutions or other social organization with corporate status in China, jointly establish education institutions in China, recruit Chinese citizens as major educational objectives, and undertake education and teaching activities.
Australian Department of Education and Science (2005)	Australian transnational education and training, also known as offshore or cross-border education and training, refers to the delivery and/or assessment of programmes/courses by an accredited Australian provider in a country other than Australia, where delivery includes a face-to-face component...as distinct from education and training provided in a purely distance mode, transitional education and training includes a physical presence of instructors offshore either directly by the Australian provider, or indirectly through a formal agreement with a local institution/organisation.
British Council (2006)	Transnational education refers to education provision from one country offered in another. It does not include the traditional international student recruitment market where students travel to another country for their studies. Transnational education includes a wide variety of delivery modes including distance and e-learning; validation and franchising agreements; twinning and other collaborative provision.
Education New Zealand Trust (2007)	The delivery of New Zealand formal education qualifications by New Zealand providers outside New Zealand shores.
German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) (2012)	In German transnational higher education projects, the German university acts as education provider and sets the standards for curricula and academic quality benchmarks, within an otherwise mutually cooperative framework.

Source: Adapted from British Council (2013)

offered up its own definition, which is also understandable, considering the pioneering role of Australia in transnational higher education. One of the most oft-cited definitions arose out of meetings which were held by the Council of Europe in service of the development of codes of good practice for the provision of transnational higher education. The OECD and INQAAHE definitions followed suit, spurred by the “more and more people taking university degrees from foreign providers” (OECD, 2005).

Now, definitions are doubtless important, because a nebulous definition makes it difficult to “differentiate between the concept of interest and other concepts...Communication is impaired as questions regarding vague and ambiguous concepts are met with confused responses that are dependent upon individual and often *ad hoc* interpretations” (Rodgers, 1989, p. 330). More important than a consensus on the definition of transnational higher education, however, is the clarity of its purpose within the mission of any business school. Indeed, as transnational higher education becomes an increasingly more common feature of modern business education, business school administrators must ensure that the rationale for its inclusion is logical and well-articulated...especially considering that is not without its controversies.

PERSPECTIVES ON TRANSNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

The emergent nature of transnational higher education means that there are various perspectives on transnational higher education. These perspectives range from the relatively innocuous (general comments on transnational higher education in an almost op-ed style) to the vitriolic (harsh criticisms of transnational higher education and its basic tenets). Many of the most recent perspectives focus specifically on foreign branch campuses.

A Review of Transnational Higher Education

Table 2. Organizational definitions of transnational higher education

Organization	Definition
Global Alliance for Transnational Education (GATE) (1997)	Transnational Education denotes any teaching or learning activity in which the students are in a different country (the host country) to that in which the institution providing the education is based (the home country). This situation requires that national boundaries be crossed by information about the education, and by staff and/or educational material.
Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee (AVCC) (2001)	The program is conducted in accordance with a formal agreement between the Australian university and an overseas institution or organization; the program offered is taught partly or wholly offshore...; the completed program results in a recognized higher education qualification; the Australian university has developed the program and has a responsibility for overseeing the academic standards. (p. iv)
Council of Europe (2002)	All types of higher education study programmes, or sets of courses of study, or educational services (including those of distance education) in which the learners are located in a country different from the one where the awarding institution is based.
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2005)	Cross-border education includes higher education that takes place in situations where the teacher, student, programme, institution/provider or course materials cross national jurisdictional borders. Cross-border higher education may include higher education by public/private and not-for-profit/for-profit providers. It encompasses a wide range of modalities, in a continuum from face-to-face (taking various forms such as students traveling abroad and campuses abroad) to distance learning (using a range of technologies and including e-learning).
International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE) (2010)	Transnational higher education includes distance education courses offered by higher education providers located in another country, joint programs offered between a local provider and a foreign institution, franchised courses offered with or without involvement or staff members from the parent institution, and foreign campuses of institutions developed with or without local partnerships.

Source: Author

Beginning with general commentary on transnational higher education, it has been claimed that there is widespread misunderstanding of the internationalization of higher education (and by extension, the transnationalization of higher education). The consequence is that a myriad of myths and misconceptions has circulated within higher education (de Wit, 2011a; Knight, 2011). These myths and misconceptions include:

1. More foreign students produce a more internationalized institution.
2. International reputation is a proxy for quality.
3. More international agreements make an institution more reputable.
4. More international accreditation stars mean more international.
5. An international promotional campaign is an internationalization plan.
6. Internationalization means teaching in English.
7. Internationalization equals study abroad.
8. Internationalization is teaching an international subject.
9. Internationalization requires only a few international students in the classroom.
10. Intercultural competencies need not be assessed.
11. Higher education is international by its nature.
12. Internationalization is an objective in itself.

According to Brandenburg (2011), however, internationalization ought to be viewed not as the destination, but as the journey. That is to say, internationalization is not an objective in itself, but instead an instrument in service of the objective. The key, therefore, is to identify the rationale for using the instrument. And for many commentators, the rationale is clear...globalization. According to Scherer et al. (2005), for example, globalization has diminished the hegemony of American higher education. Writing about the field of management education specifically, they declared that “business schools in the U.S.A. have gained a reputation and global dominance in the higher education marketplace” (p. 652), but that the gloss is now off. Consequently, American business schools are not the only option, with competitors popping up all over the world. For Ryan (2001), this competition is a good thing, shaking up the entire higher education system.

Douglass (2005) provided a more detailed and nuanced version of the argument, enumerating eight mega-forces which coincide with globalization, and which, he predicted, would cause a paradigm shift in higher education: 1. student and instructor recruiting, 2. international networks of research, 3. international collaborations, 4. organizational convergence, 5. information and communication technologies, 6. non-traditional and alternative competitors, 7. institutional mergers and acquisitions, and 8. international frameworks. He also cited four organizational forces which, he warned, could be trouble for some higher education institutions as they are forced to compete: 1. supply and capacity imbalance, 2. unpredictability of the market, 3. the need for flexibility and creativity, and 4. academic conservatism. In fairness, he also suggested that there are six countervailing forces to globalization which could temper its effects: 1. economic wealth and political stability, 2. local market demand, 3. national regulations, 4. cultural pride, 5. academic culture, and 6. incumbent advantage.

To many commentators, however, the nature of the new paradigm of higher education which globalization is driving is obvious. Higher education will be a commodity, with the production of knowledge, the dissemination of knowledge, and, most importantly, access to knowledge, all going global (Naidoo, 2003). The result will be a multinational or global university (van Rooijen, 2003; Wilkdavsky, 2010), and “as with a multinational company, this institution will have branches or campuses in several countries in the world...but treasures in its profile the geographical base of its headquarters” (p. 4). This new multinational or global university will have different organizational forms compared to the traditional institution (Hanna & Latchem, 2002). And transnational higher education will be one component in a mix of an institution’s activities (Skidmore & Longbottom, 2011).

It is important to note, however, that this new paradigm of higher education need not lead to the homogenization of higher education. Indeed, as suggested by Pease (2001), globalization is often associated with homogenization, but the “integration of markets, a global market, does not inevitably lead to cultural ‘mud’ ” (p. 12). On the contrary, culture still matters, despite—perhaps even because of—globalization.

This new paradigm of higher education, however, does have implications for higher education institutions. Indeed, it calls for a doubling down on internationalization, or running the risk of falling behind (Teekens, 2011). It necessitates strong leaders with strategic vision (Mestenhauser, 2000). And it points squarely to a market rationalization via mergers, acquisitions, and global networks in higher education (de Wit, 2000). According to Mazzarol & Souter (2012), “many of the world’s leading institutions appear to have recognized this and started building strong global networks, such as those seen in Singapore and Qatar examples. However, others have undifferentiated marketing strategies, despite seeking to operate in this highly competitive international market” (p. 731).

A Review of Transnational Higher Education

This new paradigm of higher education also means the need for a new focus on international students (Jones & Brown, 2007), especially with respect to teaching and learning. Issues such as plagiarism, international communication, and groupwork, for example, will come to the fore (Dunn & Wallace, 2008). It will undoubtedly have impact on curriculum and instructional design, assessment, and administration (Wood et al., 2005). And it will lead to questions about reputation, quality assurance, and accreditation (Vignoli, 2004).

This new paradigm of higher education, however, it is suggested, is not immune to the risks from unforeseen circumstances. Indeed, Naidoo (2010) stated that a “debate needs to be highlighted to consider the impacts of transnational higher education” (p. 7). Starting in the early 1990s, worries about Australia’s pioneering transnational higher education activity were voiced: racism, xenophobia, brain drain, McDonaldsization, ethnocentrism, and neo-colonialism, for example (Alexander & Rizvi, 1993). Maslen (2009) warned that higher education is particularly susceptible to exogenous shocks, citing the changes which were made in the mid-2000s to the work eligibility for foreign students who were studying in Australia. Or consider the significance of the tightening of VISA requirements for foreign students who were hoping to study in the U.S.A., following the 9-11 attacks. And Altbach & Knight (2007) speculated about the possible impact of market uncontrollables such as politics, the rise of the English language as the lingua franca of education, European policies, national security, domestic capacity, and private sector players.

Switching to the criticisms of transnational higher education, first and foremost among these harsher perspectives on transnational higher education is a broader critique of globalization itself. Rizvi (2007), for example, railed against the reification and assumed inevitability of globalization. In turn, he also questioned the taken-for-grantedness of the internationalization of higher education. Sursock (in CRE, 2001) did not dispute globalization outright, but instead reasoned that globalization constitutes a threat to higher education systems everywhere, and especially those “in the more protected and homogeneous national systems which do not offer sufficient choices to students and cannot integrate (and therefore regulate) non-official institutions” (p. 7). Likewise, Yang (2003) maintained that because globalization is based on the notion of free markets, it brings with it the dangers from which free markets suffer, including a lack of quality control, under-regulation, and restrictions on academic values. In summary, it is a bad idea “to permit caveat emptor to dominate in higher education” (p. 284).

Continuing with the free market theme, Bone (2008) worried that American universities, Oxbridge, and a handful of other higher education institutions around the world have historical and performance-related reputations, thereby allowing them to dominate the ‘prestige goods’ category. This jibes with Mestenhauser’s (2000) claim that higher education is not a commodity, but instead must be considered a prestige good. Viewing higher education as a product also has its limitations. Indeed, Standish (2005) censured the notion of higher education as the focus of an economic exchange. Doing so, he argued, impoverishes the value of education. Robertson (2006) also decried the view, avowing that education is a basic human right. And Baldwin & James (2000) thought that treating students who entered into the supposed economic exchange as well-informed consumers was dubious.

Campbell (2012) condemned the secular neo-liberal underpinnings of globalization, insisting that it inhibits human development. Writing of developing nations specifically, he claimed that

developing nations face the need to develop the capacities and capabilities of their citizens in the broadest possible way and education is widely considered as a key institutional conduit through which this occurs. However your capabilities and capacities as human beings are deeply connected to our ability

to realize and maintain a sense of dignity and moral balance in a world increasingly beset by the values of instrumental reasons competitive rationality and consumerism (1. Introduction).

Similarly, Collins (2007) wrote scathingly of GATS, arguing that its neo-liberal ideology creates a new imperialism of intellectual superiority. Rutherford (2001) worried that “GATS could destroy the public interest in policy making in services such as education and end the ideal of a democratic education system run by accountable public authorities” (p. 1). Academia, according to CHEA (2005), is special, and by rights, therefore, deserves a privileged position. “Trade frameworks are not designed to deal with the academic, research, or broad social and cultural purposes of higher education...Trade policy and national educational policy may conflict with each other and jeopardize higher education’s capacity to carry out its social and cultural mission” (p. 5).

Czinkota (2006) demurred. “While education may see itself exempt from international service industry rules, it certainly is not immune from the rules of economics, particularly when it comes to issues of supply, demand, and money” (p. 151). Pease (2001) was less conciliatory, alleging that GATS is both welcome and necessary because higher education has for too long been riddled with unfair and distorting trading barriers. For example,

National legislation and policy often serve as inhibitors, singling out foreign education providers delivering services. Examples include: acquiring licenses, registering as private businesses, forcing students to pay a consumption tax, not affording the same benefits to students attending foreign institutions, or restricting accreditation or the granting of degrees entirely (Abstract).

With respect to transnational higher education specifically, Alderman (2001) cited several fundamental problems, including a threat to national culture, quality control, and cultural imperialism. Custer (2016) voiced concerns over the finances, quality, and outcomes of transnational higher education. Adam (2001) was particularly worried about consumer protection in an age of transnational higher education. National regulatory frameworks are notoriously inflexible, he mentioned, degree-mills sell services to ill-informed students, and many transnational entities have poor or non-existent quality control. Altbach (2003) was likewise concerned, noting the neo-colonial overtones of transnational higher education, especially considering the rise of English as its lingua franca. Altbach & Knight (2007) raised concerns about quality assurance and recognition of awards. And Danaher et al. (2000) pointed to the changing nature of instructor professionalisms which have resulted from transnational higher education.

Ending with perspectives on foreign branch campuses, the growth of this transnationalization mode in recent years has garnered it much attention, and consequently, has also generated many comments... and likewise many criticisms. Speaking at a 2013 conference at the Emirates Centre for Strategic Studies and Research, Dr. Warren Fox, head of higher education at the Knowledge and Human Development Authority of Dubai, summarized the positive claims succinctly:

Branch campuses are an expanding and important part of transnational education. They provide access to meet rising demand, they bring certified quality programmes, they offer international degrees recognised around the world, they often have faculty from the home campus, they have experience and expertise, and they expand cross cultural experiences (in Swan, 2013).

A Review of Transnational Higher Education

According to Altbach (2010), however, governments and accreditors have started to question the truth in these claims. According to Hussain (2007), for example, foreign branch campuses tend to concentrate on the subjects of business and technology which are more marketable in developing countries. Rumble & Altbach (2007) charged higher education institutions with underestimating the risks of financial loss, operational challenges, market fluctuations, and the potential for damage to institutional reputation. Altbach (2010) even argued that the term foreign branch campus is a misnomer. It is often difficult to lure instructors from the home institution. Courses are frequently taught as intensive modules. And in many cases these modules are taught by local temp workers. Is it really a foreign branch, therefore?

Similarly, Altbach (2010) also suggested that foreign branch campuses are usually not very campus-like. “Except where generous hosts—such as in the Arabian Gulf, Singapore, and a few other places—provide facilities and infrastructure, branch campuses become rather spartan places, resembling office complexes rather than academic institutions” (p. 2). The student body, he added, never replicates that of the home institution. And the academic experience and culture are rarely, if ever, reproduced at the foreign branch campus.

In 2011, Altbach continued his assault on foreign branch campuses, observing that student demand is difficult to predict. The University of New South Wales, for example, closed its operation in Singapore after only one year of operation, citing low enrollment. Administrators in higher education institutions, he insisted, have not considered the long-term implications of foreign branch campuses: pitfalls, financial losses, and poor service quality, for example. And he alleged that the decision to open foreign branch campuses—which is often commercially-motivated—causes higher education institutions to stray too far from their academic mission.

These various perspectives on transnational higher education—both the comments and the criticisms—intimate again that the purpose of transnational higher education within the mission of any business school must be clear. Indeed, as transnational higher education becomes an increasingly more common feature of modern business education, business school administrators must not only be cognizant of its controversies, but, perhaps more importantly, must also be prepared to defend the decision to include it as a component within their schools’ missions.

GUIDELINES FOR TRANSNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

Considering the various perspectives on transnational higher education—both the comments and the criticisms—it is understandable that there are also many guidelines for the appropriate conduct of transnational higher education. At the most general level is advice about the internationalization of higher education institutions. Brandenburg & de Wit (2011), for example, made four high level suggestions for moving forward:

1. Move away from dogmatic and idealist concepts of internationalization.
2. Understand internationalization as a means to an end, not as an end in itself.
3. Regard mobility and other internationalization activities as instruments.
4. Focus less on the instruments and more on their rationales and outcomes.

Somewhat less abstractly, Davies (1995) suggested that “universities need a reasonably robust framework to develop their international activities, comprehensive strategies appropriate to that mission, adequate resources and effective management (p. 5). Likewise, Yang & Hsiao (2006), writing about Asian universities specifically, linked the success of internationalization to a mindful marketing approach. And Garton (2010) pointed to the need for a strong strategic focus, the management of intellectual capital on a global basis, and the organization of necessary logistics across borders.

Keeping with this management theme, van der Wende (1999) proposed that internationalization can be viewed as an innovation process which consists of four phases: 1. recognizing the need for change, 2. planning and formulating a solution, 3. initiating and implement the solution, and 4. institutionalizing (or terminating) the solution. She continued by arguing that the institutionalization phase is most critical. Consequently, she concluded, institutionalization is also the key to success of internationalization.

Knight (2001) insisted that internationalization must be monitored closely, with respect to both progress and, more importantly, quality. Indeed, for Adam (2001), quality ought to be the most important aim of an institution, and a precondition for internationalization. Consequently, quality assurance in internationalization, including audits, evaluation, accreditation, registration, licensing, recognition, and other review processes and elements, is cardinal (Knight, 2003). The Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of the Universities of the United Kingdom (CVCP) concurred in its 2012 report—

We suggest that the main elements of a quality framework for borderless education should include: currency and security of qualifications; audit of the system for the design and approval of curricula or appropriate learning contracts; an internationally-recognised system of education audit; licensing of staff; security of assessment; an internationally-recognised approach to recording and certifying attainment; adequate public information about learning opportunities; approved guidance and complaints systems for learnings; transparent quality management processes for each agent in the educational supply chain; access to learning resources assured by the provider; and publication of guidance relevant to different modes of provision (p. 30).

Czinkota (2006) added that some form of an international league table would also help, the workings of which ought to be managed by an international association such as INQAAHE, the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (Cheung, 2006). But to date, “academic institutions have typically been unwelcoming to any comparative rating system, even though such a system would be a key prerequisite for greater sector transparency for both institutions and individuals” (Czinkota, 2006, p. 151).

Several national and international associations have committed to the prospect of greater transparency, however, by publishing formal policy statements on the internationalization of higher education. In 2001, for example, UNESCO developed a policy statement which highlighted the need for new regulation, recognition, quality assurance, and accreditation of international education (van Damme, 2001). The International Association of Universities (IAU) has continually affirmed its stance on academic values with respect to internationalization, through its policy statements. And both the Union of Students’ Unions in Europe (ESIB) and the European Students’ Union (ESU) have published policy statements which delimit their views on internationalization (ESIB 2011; ESU, 2013).

A Review of Transnational Higher Education

Even more concrete than these policy statements, however, are the numerous codes of practice which have been developed by different national and international associations (See Table 1 for some examples.). Their purpose is to define very tangibly the appropriate conduct of transnational higher education. To some degree, accreditation agencies have already begun to use their own codes of practice for accrediting foreign branch campuses (CRE, 2001). In the context of business education specifically, accreditation agencies such as the European Foundation for Management Development (EFMD), the association for the Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), and the Association of MBAs (AMBA) now include transnational higher education in their accreditation requirements.

Less formally, Lenn (2000) provided a check-list of sorts for implementing quality assurance in transnational higher education. Tsiligiris (2014) proposed a step-by-step model which he called prospective quality, and which emphasizes the comprehension and appreciation of student factors prior to the design and delivery of transnational higher education. And Adam (2001) suggested that diploma supplements could also add transparency, and provide information about both the content of the award, and the status and qualifications of the diploma provider.

Similar to these codes of practice is a discussion about GATS, which provides a kind of manual for understanding its principles, its functions, and its impact on higher education. As a reminder, GATS, or the General Agreement on Trade in Services, is the result of the WTO negotiations which were held in Uruguay. It entered into force in January 1995, and shapes the rules for world trade and investment in services. It compels member countries, for example, to afford each other market entry conditions which

Table 3. Codes of practice

Association	Title
Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA)	The UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Overview and Expectations
Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (Formerly Australian Universities Quality Agency)	Higher Education Standards Framework
European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area
European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	Quality Assurance in Transnational Higher Education
UNESCO/Council of Europe (COE)	Code of Good Practice in the Provision of Transnational Higher Education
European National Information Centres and National Academic Recognition and Information Centre (ENIC-NARIC)	European Area of Recognition Manual
European Consortium for Accreditation in Higher Education (ECA)	Code of Good Practice for the Members of the European Consortium for Accreditation in Higher Education
National Council for Higher Education of Rwanda	Code of Practice: Cross-border/Transnational Provision
New Zealand Qualifications Authority	Code of Practice for the Pastoral Care of International Students
European Association for International Education (EAIE)	Code of Good Practice for Students Abroad
Middle States Commission on Higher Education	Code of Good Practice in Accrediting Higher Education
Universities Australia (formerly Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee)	Provision of Education to International Students: Codes of Practice and Guidelines for Australian Universities

Source: Author

are equal to or better than the nation which enjoys the most favorable conditions. And it stipulates that foreign companies must be subjected to equal regulatory treatment as domestic companies. According to Czinkota (2006), “the resulting reduction of risk is likely to substantially encourage trade and investment [in services]” (p. 150).

In 2002, Knight authored a report which commented on the impact of trade liberalization on higher education. She followed it with a 2003 update which provided a where-are-we-now on the GATS ratification status in various countries. Her 2006 report which was commissioned by UNESCO outlined the changes, challenges, opportunities, and risks of GATS, in the context of higher education. Robertson (2006) also provided a similar GATS overview, enumerating its corresponding controversies for higher education. And a 2010 book by Verger dove headlong into the politics of GATS and higher education.

These many guidelines for the appropriate conduct of transnational higher education suggest that the success of transnational higher education in a business school is more than the clarity of its purpose within the mission...more than a logical and well-articulated rationale for its inclusion in the mission. The success of transnational higher education in a business school also relies on the ability of business school administrators to implement it appropriately.

CONCLUSION

Recently, there has been a growing interest in transnational higher education, a specific form of internationalization which treats education as a product which can be packaged and sold abroad. Transnational higher education has now been incorporated into both the lexicon and mission of higher education, especially in business education which has embraced the notion of transnationalization. This chapter reviewed the phenomenon of transnational higher education. Specifically, it defined transnational higher education, situating it within globalization and the internationalization of higher education; it enumerated the various perspectives on transnational higher education; and it provided guidelines for the appropriate conduct of transnational higher education.

REFERENCES

- ACA. (2008). *Transnational education in the European context – Provision, approaches, and politics*. Retrieved from http://aca-secretariat.be/fileadmin/aca_docs/documents/reports/TNE_in_the_European_context_-_Geographical_Annex.pdf
- Adam, S. (2001, March). *Transnational education project report and recommendations*. Confederation of European Union Rectors' Conferences.
- Alderman, G. (2001). The globalization of higher education: Some observations regarding the free market and the national interest. *Higher Education in Europe*, 26(1), 47–52. doi:10.1080/03797720120054175
- Alexander, D., & Rizvi, F. (1993). Education, Markets and the Contradictions of Asia-Australia Relations. *Australian Universities Review*, 36(2), 16–20.
- Altbach, P. (2003). Globalization and the university myths and realities in an unequal world. *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, 17, 227–247.

A Review of Transnational Higher Education

Altbach, P. (2010). Why branch campuses may be unsustainable. *International Higher Education*, 2010(58), 2-3.

Altbach, P. (2011). Is there a future for branch campuses? *Industry and Higher Education*, 2010(65), 7–10.

Altbach, P., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 290–304. doi:10.1177/1028315307303542

Baldwin, G., & James, R. (2000). The market in Australian higher education and the concept of student as informed consumer. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 22(2), 139–148. doi:10.1080/713678146

Bennett, P., Bergan, S., Cassar, D., Hamilton, M., Soinila, M., Surssock, A., ... Williams, P. (Eds.). (2010). *Quality Assurance in Transnational Higher Education*. Helsinki, Finland: European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education.

Bernstein, W. (2008). *A splendid exchange: How trade shaped the world*. New York, NY: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Bone, D. (2008, November 13). Internationalisation of HE: A ten-year-view. *Times Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://timeshighereducation.co.uk/>

Brandenburg, U. (2011). *The end of internationalisation? Some reflections*. Retrieved from <http://www.che-consult.de>

Brandenburg, U., & De Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalization. *Industry and Higher Education*, 2010(62), 15–17.

British Council. (2013). *Going global 2013: The shape of things to come: The evolution of transnational education: Data, definitions, opportunities and impacts analysis*. Retrieved from <http://ihe.britishcouncil.org>

Callan, H. (2000). Higher education internationalization strategies: Of marginal significance or all-pervasive? The international vision in practice: A decade of evolution. *Higher Education in Europe*, 25(1), 15–23. doi:10.1080/03797720050002161

Campbell, A., Cameron, P., Klein, M., McCormack, C., & Wilson, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Proceedings of the Offshore 2000 Conference: Education and Training in an E-Learning World: Boom or Doom?* Canberra, Australia: Centre for the Enhancement of Learning, Teaching and Scholarship, University of Canberra.

Campbell, J. (2012). Higher education reform values and the dilemmas of change: Challenging secular neo-liberalism. In H. Cuadra-Montiel (Ed.), *Globalization—Education and management agendas*. Academic Press. doi:10.5772/45739

Chadee, D., & Naidoo, V. (2009). Higher educational services exports: Sources of growth of Asian students in US and UK. *Service Business: An International Journal*, 3(2), 173–187. doi:10.1007/11628-008-0041-7

CHEA. (2005). *Sharing quality higher education across borders: A statement on behalf of higher education institutions worldwide*. Retrieved from www.chea.org/pdf/StatementFinal0105.pdf

- Chen, P. (2015). Transnational education: Trend, modes of practices and development. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology (IJJET)*, 5(8), 634–637. doi:10.7763/IJJET.2015.V5.582
- Cheung, P. (2006). Filletting the transnational education steak. *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(3), 283–285. doi:10.1080/13538320601072891
- Collins, C. (2007). A General Agreement on Higher Education: GATS, globalization, and imperialism. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 2(4), 283–295. doi:10.2304/rcie.2007.2.4.283
- CRE. (2001). *Towards accreditation schemes for higher education in Europe? Final project report*. Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTAFRREGTOPTEIA/Resources/Towards_Accreditation_for_European_Higher_Education.pdf
- Custer, S. (2016, June 15). Finances, quality, outcomes could stymie UK TNE growth. *The PIE News*. Retrieved from <http://thepienews.com/>
- CVCP of the Universities of the United Kingdom. (2012). *The business of borderless education: UK perspectives*. London: Higher Education Funding Council for England.
- Czinkota, M. (2006). Academic freedom for all in higher education: The role of the general agreement on trade in services. *Journal of World Business*, 41(2), 149–160. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2006.01.007
- Danaher, P., Gale, T., & Erben, T. (2000). The teacher educator as (re)negotiated professional: Critical incidents in steering between state and market in Australia. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 26(1), 55–71. doi:10.1080/02607470050007138
- Davies, J. (1995). University strategies for internationalisation in different institutional and cultural settings: A conceptual framework. In P. Blok (Ed.), *Policy and policy implementation in internationalisation of higher education* (pp. 3–18). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: European Association for International Education.
- de Wit, H. (2000). Changing rationales for the internationalization of higher education. In L. Barrows (Ed.), *Internationalization of higher education: An institutional perspective* (pp. 9–22). Bucharest, Romania: UNESCO-CEPES.
- de Wit, H. (2011a). *Lecture on Misconceptions in internationalization of higher education*. Retrieved from <http://www.eurashe.eu/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/intlztion-Misconceptions.pdf>
- de Wit, H. (2011b). Monograph: Globalisation and internationalisation of higher education. *Revista de Universidad y Sociedad del Conocimiento*, 8, 241–248.
- Douglass, J. (2005). How all globalization is local: Countervailing forces and their influence on higher education markets. *Higher Education Policy*, 18(4), 445–473. doi:10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300096
- Dunn, L., & Wallace, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Teaching in transnational higher education: Enhancing learning for offshore international students*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- ESIB. (2011). *2004 policy paper “transnational education”*. Retrieved from <https://www.esu-online.org/>
- ESU. (2013). *Policy paper on mobility and internationalisation of higher education*. Retrieved from <https://www.esu-online.org/>

A Review of Transnational Higher Education

Garton, J. (2010, October). *What does it take to become transnational? Public and private alliances in transnational education*. Paper presented at Australian International Education Conference, Adelaide, Australia.

Hanna, D., & Latchem, C. (2002). Beyond national borders: Transforming higher education institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6(2), 115–133. doi:10.1177/1028315302006002003

Hellenic Shipping News. (2013, April 8). Too Many Ships in the World Merchant Fleet. *Hellenic Shipping News*. Retrieved December 31, 2014 from <http://www.hellenicshippingnews.com/984ef639-7f94-4d62-88a9-f80b3ecc6fb9/>

Jones, E., & Brown, S. (Eds.). (2007). *Internationalising Higher Education*. London: Routledge.

Knight, J. (1997). Internationalization of higher education: A conceptual framework. In J. Knight & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Internationalization of higher education in Asia-Pacific countries*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: European Association for International Education.

Knight, J. (1999). Issues and trends in internationalization: A comparative perspective. In S. Bond & J. Lemasson (Eds.), *A new world of knowledge: Canadian universities and globalization* (pp. 201–238). Ottawa, Canada: International Development Research Center.

Knight, J. (2001). Monitoring the quality and progress of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5(3), 228–243. doi:10.1177/102831530153004

Knight, J. (2002, October). GATS – Higher education implications, opinions and questions. In *UNESCO first global forum on international quality assurance, accreditation and the recognition of qualifications in higher education: Globalization and higher education*. UNESCO.

Knight, J. (2003). GATS, trade and higher education. Perspective 2003: Where are we? *The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.obhe.ac.uk/>

Knight, J. (2005). Borderless, offshore, transnational and cross-border education: Definition and data dilemmas. *The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.obhe.ac.uk/>

Knight, J. (2006). *Higher education crossing borders: A guide to the implications of the general agreement on trade in services (GATS) for cross-border education*. Paris, France: UNESCO/Commonwealth of Learning.

Knight, J. (2007). Cross-border tertiary education: An introduction. In S. Vincent-Lancrin (Ed.), *Cross-border tertiary education: A way towards capacity development* (pp. 21-46). Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Knight, J. (2011). Five myths about internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 2011(62), 14-15.

Lenn, M. (2000). Higher education and the global marketplace: A practical guide to sustaining quality. *On the Horizon*, 8(5), 7–10. doi:10.1108/10748120010803555

Maslen, G. (2009, July 19). Australia: Has the export education bubble burst? *University World News*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/>

- Mazzarol, T., & Soutar, G. (2012). Revisiting the global market for higher education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 24(5), 717–737. doi:10.1108/13555851211278079
- Mestenhauser, J. (2000). Missing in action: Leadership for international and global education for the twenty-first century. In L. Barrows (Ed.), *Internationalization of higher education: An institutional perspective* (pp. 23–62). Bucharest, Romania: UNESCO-CEPES.
- Ministry of Trade and Industry Singapore. (2014). *Free Market System*. Retrieved from <http://www.mti.gov.sg>
- Mitchell, D., & Nielsen, S. (2012). Internationalization and Globalization of Higher Education. In H. Cuadra-Montiel (Ed.), *Globalization - Education and management agendas*. Retrieved from <http://www.intechopen.com/books/globalization-education-and-management-agendas>
- Morgan, J. (2010). ‘Mushrooming’ branches may turn out to be poisonous. *The Times Higher Education Supplement: THE*, (1934), 18. Retrieved from ProQuest Newsstand.
- Naidoo, V. (2003). Repositioning higher education as a global commodity: Opportunities and challenges for future sociology of education work. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 24(2), 249–259. doi:10.1080/01425690301902
- Naidoo, V. (2006). International education: A tertiary-level industry update. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 5(3), 323–345. doi:10.1177/1475240906069455
- Naidoo, V. (2010). Transnational higher education: Who benefits? *International Higher Education*, 2010(58), 6-7.
- Pease, P. (2001). *Transnational education and quality assurance for online learning*. Abstract retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/edu/skills-beyond-school/1853930.pdf>
- Pomeranz, K., & Topik, S. (2013). *The World that trade created: Society, culture, and the world economy, 1400 to the present*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.
- Rizvi, F. (2007). Postcolonialism and globalization in education. *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies*, 7, 256-263.
- Robertson, S. (2006). Globalisation, GATS and trading in education services. In J. Kallo & R. Rinne (Eds.), *Supranational regimes and national education policies: Encountering challenge* (pp. 2–17). Helsinki, Finland: Finnish Education Research Association.
- Rodgers, B. (1989). Concepts, analysis, and the development of nursing knowledge: The evolutionary cycle. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 14(4), 330–335. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.1989.tb03420.x PMID:2661622
- Rumbley, L., & Altbach, P. (2007). *International branch campus issues*. Retrieved from http://archives.democrats.science.house.gov/Media/File/Commdocs/hearings/2007/full/26jul/altbach_appendix_1.pdf
- Rutherford, J. (2001) *A Discussion Paper GATS and the WTO in Geneva March*. Retrieved from <http://www.signsofthetimes.org.uk/GATS.html>

A Review of Transnational Higher Education

- Ryan, Y. (2001). Higher education as a business: Lessons from the corporate world. *Minerva*, 39(1), 115–135. doi:10.1023/A:1010334721507
- Sanderson, G. (2005). *'Internationalisation' and related terms*. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved from <http://www.unisanet.unisa.edu.au/staff/GavinSanderson/Internationalisation-terms.pdf>
- Scherer, R., Javalgi, R., Bryant, M., & Tukul, O. (2005). Challenges of AACSB international accreditation for business schools in the United States and Europe. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 47(6), 651–669. doi:10.1002/tie.20074
- Skidmore, M., & Longbottom, J. (2011). The future of transnational education. *Borderless Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.obhe.ac.uk/>
- Smith, A. (1976). *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Standish, P. (2005). Towards an economy of higher education. *Critical Quarterly*, 47(102), 53–71. doi:10.1111/j.0011-1562.2005.00614.x
- Stearns, P., & Langer, W. (2001). *The encyclopedia of world history: Ancient, medieval, and modern, chronologically arranged*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Swan, M. (2013, September 18). International branch campuses' key role in the UAE. *The National*. Retrieved from <http://www.thenational.ae/>
- Teekens, H. (2011). Rethinking mobility. *EAIE (European Association for International Education) Forum*, 38–41.
- Tsiligiris, V. (2014). Internationalisation – A student-centred approach is key. *University World News Global Edition*, (316).
- Van Damme, D. (2001). *Higher education in the age of globalisation: The need for a new regulatory framework for recognition, quality assurance and accreditation*. Paper presented at UNESCO Expert Meeting, Paris, France.
- Van der Wende, M. (1999). An innovation perspective on internationalisation of higher education institutionalisation: The critical phase. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 3(1), 3–14. doi:10.1177/102831539900300102
- Van Rooijen, M. (2003). The emergence of global and multinational universities. In *The Multinational University* (pp. 3–13). Paris, France: International Institute for Educational Planning, UNESCO.
- Verger, A. (2010). *WTO/GATS and the global politics of higher education*. London: Routledge.
- VignoliG. (2004). *What is transnational education?* Retrieved from http://www.cimea.it/files/207_114.pdf
- Wilkdavsky, B. (2010). *The great brain race: How global universities are reshaping the world*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Wilson, L., & Vlăsceanu, L. (2000). Transnational education and recognition of qualifications. In L. Barrows (Ed.), *Internationalization of higher education: An institutional perspective* (pp. 9–22). Bucharest, Romania: UNESCO-CEPES.

Wood, B., Tapsall, S., & Soutar, G. (2005). Borderless education: Some implications for management. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(5), 428–436. doi:10.1108/09513540510607752

WTO. (2014). *2014 international trade report*. WTO.

Yang, J., & Hsiao, C. (2006). Educational marketing of transnational education in Asia. *The Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge*, 9(2), 72–77.

Yang, R. (2003). Globalisation and higher education development: A critical analysis. *International Review of Education*, 49(3/4), 269–291. doi:10.1023/A:1025303303245

APPENDIX

Figure 1.

