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Abstract

This qualitative study examines U. S. international branch campus (IBC) administrative leadership structures and the interconnections they have to their respective host countries. While several factors concerning the sustainability of IBCs have been cited, this study introduces “leadership networks” to the discourse on IBC sustainability. Open access website documents were reviewed to identify IBC leadership and their interconnections. Using Atlas ti, concept maps were constructed for 48 U.S. IBCs to conduct a social network graphical analysis. The maps were coded and assessed for the emergence of patterns of interconnectedness between onsite administrative leadership or board members and their respective host country. An American International Branch Campus Leadership Structure Typology was created from the emergence of patterns found in the leadership structures identified, the themes of interconnectedness found, and the density of these interconnections at each U.S. IBC. The typology included six categories of U.S. IBC leadership structures based on five criteria. In addition, the study compares leadership structures and host country interconnections by looking at differences between U.S. IBCs established by public universities to those of private nonprofit universities. It also examines the differences in funding with respect to leadership structure, interconnections, and public versus private nonprofits. The key findings indicate that U.S. IBC administrative leadership has multiple connections with their host countries. Six themes of interconnectedness were identified during the study and differences in funding were found among leadership structures and in comparing U.S. IBCs established by public versus private nonprofit universities. In
this globally competitive innovation driven environment it is envisioned that IBC leadership and their interconnections to the host country will play a critical role in fostering opportunities in research and development between the IBC and the private sector. Implications of this involve IBC leadership using their relationships within the host country and region to help sustain IBCs by reducing their reliance on government financial contributions and tuition as a sole source of revenue.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Introduction

Cross-border movement of students, programs, institutions, and faculty from one geographic location to another for educational purposes is a prevalent and growing phenomenon in the 21st century (Verbik & Lasanowski, 2007). This phenomenon is in part due to advances in technology and communication that are changing economic and educational opportunities on a global scale (Altbach, 2004). These changes are perpetuating interaction and interdependence between cultures and societies worldwide as well as changing the landscape of international higher education (Beerkens, 2003, Becker, 2010). In particular, emerging economies with increasing access to resources are in some cases seeking out foreign expertise in order to create educational opportunities for their citizens. In other cases, these countries with emerging economies are being sought after by educational entities that have identified them as potential sites for investment, hoping to capitalize financially on the growing market for educational services (Becker, 2009). One type of educational entity changing the landscape of international educational opportunities and perpetuating interaction between differing societies and cultures is the establishment of International branch campuses.

Definition of an International Branch Campus

The establishment of international branch campuses (IBCs) is one such example of cross-border education being provided by an institution from one region
to citizens residing in an entirely different geopolitical region. Although the exact
definition of an IBC is not universally agreed upon (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012,
Becker, 2009, Altbach 2011, Kinser, 2010), Kinser (2010) noted that the
characteristic distinguishing IBCs from other types of cross-border higher
educational entities is that there is “the physical movement of the institution from
one geopolitical environment to another” (p.108). The Observatory on Borderless
Higher Education’s (OBHE) commonly cited 2009 definition defines an IBC as an
entity meeting the following two criteria,

- The Unit should be operated by the institution or through a joint venture in
  which the institution is a partner in the name of the foreign institution, and
- Upon successful completion of the course program, which is fully taken at the
  unit abroad, students are awarded a degree from the foreign institution.

(Becker, IBCs: Markets and Strategies [OBHE, 2009], p.2)

Even more recently The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education updated their
2009 definition, now defining an IBC as,

A higher education institution that is located in another country from the institution
which either originated it or operates it, with some physical presence in the host
country, and which awards at least one degree in the host country that is accredited
in the country of the originating institution. (Lawton & Katsomitros, IBC Data and
Developments [OBHE, 2012], p. 7)
According to Lawton and Katsomitros (OBHE, 2012) the difference between the 2009 and the 2012 definitions reflects the expanding and changing scope of IBCs. The updated definition recognizes dual degree arrangements where the host country can award the degree as long as it is accredited by the home country (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012). The updated definition also includes institutions that offer part of a degree program at a branch campus as opposed to the entire degree (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012). The OBHE 2012 definition is also in contrast to Altbach’s (2011) definition in that he states 1) successful completion of the course program must be fully undertaken at the unit abroad and 2) that students are awarded a degree from the foreign institution regardless of whether or not the host partner is accredited by the home country.

Lawton and Katsomitros (2012) attribute the difficulty in settling on an agreed definition of an IBC to the fact that “there are constant innovations in how universities position themselves internationally” (p.6). Lawton and Katsomitros (2012) state that there will always be “borderline” cases where a “judgment call” needs to be made on whether the arrangement meets the definition of an IBC. The business models emerging to support IBCs worldwide are numerous, which complicates the ability to define an IBC and makes settlement on a definitive definition a moving target (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012).

Despite the lack of agreement on the exact definition of an IBC, there are some overlapping commonalities in the definitions. Most agree that 1) there
must be a physical presence of a foreign institution in a host country, 2) a degree program must be offered, 3) awards for completion of the degree must be given, and 4) students must complete all or part of the degree program at the host country campus (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012, Becker, 2009, Altbach, 2011, Kinser, 2010). For the purpose of this study and in keeping with the current definitions posited by experts in the field, this utilized the four key characteristics noted above to define an IBC. I used both the CBERT and the OBHE lists, as well as campuses uncovered through my own investigations, to identify qualifying IBCs.

**Context for this Study**

The interaction and interdependence between the host country and the home institution in the establishment of an IBC introduces a number of challenges for higher education institutions (HEIs) operating in a multinational environment. Such challenges include the availability of qualified candidates, differences in cultural norms, changing political climates, legal considerations, and long term funding (Altbach, 2011, Lane, 2011, Knight, 2006). These challenges can be classified as threats to an IBC’s viability as they are factors external to the organization and potentially harmful (Weihrich, 1982). For example, the lack of qualified candidates would limit the number of enrollees an IBC would be able to admit and therefore would limit the potential revenue gathered through tuition needed to maintain operations.
In order for an organization to survive, individuals working within the
organization must find ways to manage the uncertainty of their external
environment and minimize threats such as limited enrollment numbers or changing
economic conditions for IBCs (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). One way individuals in
organizations are known to manage uncertainty and externalities is through
establishing network ties (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, Scott & Davis, 2007, Nahapiet &
Ghoshal, 1998, Mizruchi, 1996). Previous research on networking and interlocking
behavior by individuals holding leadership positions such as chief operating officer
or corporate board member in organizations, suggests that establishing network
ties can reduce uncertainty through the sharing of information (Nahapiet & Ghoshal,
1998, Zajac, 1988, Pennings, 1980). Through network ties, individuals have been
known to share information to help their organizations adapt to changing
environmental conditions such as best practices, changing legal regulations, or
opportunities for financial investments (Fleming & Frenken, 2007, Peng & Luo,
establishing network ties cited in the literature include the ability of organizations
to achieve legitimacy, cooptation¹, social cohesion, and in some cases collusion
(Zajac, 1989). The information gained through these network ties is used to
strategically manage organizations and minimize factors that are external to the
organization and potentially harmful (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). Both communities
and industry have used network ties as a strategy to acquire valuable resources

¹ Scott & Davis (2007) define cooptation as “the incorporation of representatives of
external groups into the decision-making or advisory structure of an organization’
(p. 235). Scott & Davis (2007) point out that the significance of cooptation for the
purposes of organizations is to link organizations with their environments.
through the sharing of information for survival and functioning (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998).

The extent of the effect of networking on achieving these outcomes is unclear, but interlocking relationships between individuals in one organization with individuals in another organization have been shown to be beneficial for both entities, particularly those organizations dependent on similar resources (Mizruchi, 1996). Research has identified the value of networking and interlocking relationships by individuals in key leadership roles at firms and select American universities (Fleming & Frenken, 2007, Peng & Luo, 2000, Dyer & Nobeoka, 2000, Porter, 1998, Baker, 1990). For example, the U.S. investment banking industry, IBM, Toyota, and the top 20 U.S. public and private research universities have been the focus of research on the competitive advantages of networking (Fleming & Frenken, 2007, Peng & Luo, 2000, Dyer & Nobeoka, 2000, Baker, 1990). The focus of the research centered on the establishment of network ties undertaken by individuals in an organization to reduce uncertainty and increase sustainability.

Given that prior research has demonstrated the value of network ties as one mechanism of reducing the threats of harmful externalities facing organizations, the proposed study concentrates on identifying the ways in which American IBCs are establishing network ties as a potential means to manage the uncertainty of the external environment in which they operate. In particular, it focuses on exploring the types of network ties that exist between individuals holding leadership positions at American IBCs and the host country’s government, industries, or associations.
where opportunities for sharing of information important to the survival of an IBC may take place.

In addition to drawing from prior research found in the literature on the value of network ties, this study is guided by a pilot study I conducted on American IBCs in Qatar. The pilot study used a systematic collection of information on 327 individuals through analysis of website documents to determine the backgrounds and connections of members of the Joint Advisory Boards (JAB)\(^2\) of 4 U.S. IBCs located in Qatar and 4 home campus boards of trustees. The data was then compared to identify similarities and differences between the composition of JABs and home campus boards of trustees. The data collection technique enabled identification of the member’s gender, primary employer, location of employer, as well as the primary role they assumed for their employer such as CEO, vice president, or legal advisor. Data was also collected on the size and composition of the JABs. The data gathered was then coded and evaluated for patterns and general characteristics of the JABs. These characteristics and patterns were presented in a descriptive manner highlighting key findings. Given that a significant amount of information was easily accessible through the combination of Google web-based searches and a thorough review of institutional websites, a similar method for collecting data is used for this study to identify members of IBC leadership and their network ties within a host country.

\(^2\) The Joint Advisory Boards are a quasi governance structure to provide oversight at the IBCs located in Qatar. They are not equivalent in authority to the home campus Board of trustees however they are defined as being boards providing advice regarding management and operation of the branch campus as well as being responsible for ongoing review and evaluation of the success of the program (retrieved from http://www.qf.org.qa).
IBC history and recent development

International expansion of U.S. Higher Education

Expansion of the U.S. higher education system during the period post WWII did not occur exclusively within U.S. borders. Academic programs were offered by American HEIs outside of the United States through contracts with the military. In addition to serving U.S. troops at home through the GI Bill, several universities obtained military contracts to offer educational services and programs abroad for the military personnel stationed overseas (Lane, 2011). Boston University, prior to establishing itself as an IBC offering graduate and certificate programs, was initially one such university that held a military contract to provide educational programs in Brussels. Other examples provided by Lane (2011) and Becker (2009) of the early expansion of U.S. universities abroad include Florida State University (Panama) in 1933, Johns Hopkins University (Italy) in 1950, and Webster University during the 1970’s. To this day universities such as the University of Maryland have a significant overseas presence offering educational programs to military personnel.

The 1980’s brought the real first surge in the development of IBCs and with it the beginning of yet another trend in the delivery of academic programs (Chambers & Cummings, 1990, Lane, 2011). Rapidly growing economies in countries such as Japan began to look towards the United States to assist them in developing their education system for the purpose of educating the citizens of Japan (Lane, 2011). The shift in focus now became that of a country in one region being sought after to provide educational programs and services to another region for the citizens of that
region (Knight, 2006). Approximately 30 U.S. institutions began offering educational programs in Japan during this time period (Lane, 2011). Strikingly, Temple University is the only university that to this day remains in operation from this 1990’s expansion into Japan (Lane, 2011). It is difficult to determine all the factors contributing to the large failure rate of these HEIs in Japan, however poor networking between Japan as the host country and the U.S. HEIs may have contributed to the demise of many of these branches (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998, Zajac, 1989).

**Expansion of IBCs**

Knight (2008) reports that the last 2 decades have been a period of substantial growth in the physical establishment of educational facilities in the form of IBCs. A variety of business models have emerged in response to the requirements of the host countries (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012). From 2006 to the end of 2011, the number of IBCs reported by OBHE increased by 144% (85 to 200) (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012, Verbik & Merkley, 2006). During the period from 2006 to 2009, the U.S. HEIs lead the way in terms of total number of IBCs in operation as well as in total overall growth rate (Becker, 2009).

In 2010 Lasanowski reported a total of 162 IBCs in operation, of which 48% were noted to be IBCs from the U.S. Currently the OBHE documents a total of 200 IBCs, a 23 percent increase from 2009 with the U.S. continuing to dominate in terms of total numbers but not in overall rate of growth (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012). IBCs originating from universities in Australia and the United Kingdom also occupy
a significant presence in the international HE landscape. Using data verified by the Cross-border Education Research Team at the University at Albany, State University of New York (C-BERT), Lane (2011) reported the total number of IBCs has grown to 183\(^3\). IBCs are documented in 8 regions; Africa, Asia, Middle East, Europe, Caribbean/Central America, Europe, Australia/Oceania, South America, and North America (See Figure 1.1)

**Figure 1.1** Distribution of IBCs worldwide by region

![Distribution of the 183 IBCs worldwide by region](image)

Source: Calculated from C-BERT, 2012

Of these 183 IBCs currently listed on the C-BERT website, U.S. branch campuses represent 44% of the total number of IBCs and are located in 7 regions (See figure 1.2. and Table 1.1).

---

\(^3\) The discrepancy in the number of IBCs between the OBHE (2012) and Lane (2011) is most probably due to the fact that there is not an agreed upon definition of an IBC and individual judgments are made on whether to classify an entity an IBC.
**Figure 1.2** Percentage of U.S. IBCs

![Distribution of U.S. IBCs compared to total number of IBCs](image)

Source: Calculated from C-BERT, 2012

**Table 1.1** Number of **U.S. IBCs** by Geographic Region
Where IBC is Located

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continent/Area</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Australia/Oceania</th>
<th>Caribbean/Central America</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Middle East</th>
<th>N. America</th>
<th>S. America</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculated and Adapted from C-BERT, 2012 and Lane, 2011
Research Theme and Purpose

University Leadership

Previous research has demonstrated that exogenous relationships in the form of director interlocks (inter-organizational relations) shape the flow of information on strategy and decision-making practices of governing boards (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006). Director interlocks are identified as the act “of a person affiliated with one organization sitting on the board of directors of another organization” (Mizruchi, 1996, p.217). Identification of interlocking directorates has become one of the primary ways in which to examine the access to resources (information needed to strategically guide an organization) for key institutional leaders in both corporate and HE organizations (Mizruchi, 1996, Davis, 1991, Zajac, 1998, Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006). As a mechanism for access to resources through relationships, networking ties are deemed a form of organizational social capital and often a necessary part of organizational behavior for survival and adaptability (Davis 1991, Mizruchi, 1996, Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006). To date no known prior research has been conducted on networking ties and director interlocks at IBCs as a variable for organizational survival and adaptability in a foreign environment.

Given that administrative governance (University President, Vice Presidents, Deans and or Directors) and board governance are central leadership components in HE organizations, the focus of this study will be on the structure and networking characteristics of individuals holding similar types of positions at IBCs. Faculty, staff, students, alumni, state and government officials are a few of the constituencies
that members of university administrators must negotiate and network with in the management of a university (Kaplan, 2006). HEI administrative teams often work in concert with these internal and external constituencies in the decision-making process when considering future directions a university should head (Kaplan, 2006). Even though university administrative governance is often considered the overriding body that determines the mission of the university, the direction of the university is often the result of many influences internal and external to the university environment (Kaplan, 2006)

Central Aim

Viewing IBCs as organizations designed to fulfill a specific purpose or achieve certain goals, this study will examine specific aspects of formal and informal organizational structures within American IBCs (Scott & Davis, 2007, Bolman & Deal, 2003). Formal structures in an organization commonly refer to how an organization is designed in terms of departments, positions, rules and policies, and established channels of communication to foster coordination throughout an organization (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Organizations design these formal structures in order to best achieve their goals and objectives depending on their particular circumstances such as their environment (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Informal structures are more intangible and refer to the “organization’s culture, norms, and values; social networks inside and outside the organizations; power and politics and the action of leaders” (Scott & Davis, 2007, p.23). Scott and Davis (2007) refer to these informal structures as “emergent characteristics” of an organization that affect how an
organization operates (p.23). Social networks in particular, as informal structures and emergent characteristics of an organization, are the focus of this study. Social networks (network ties) refer to the informal connections individuals have with each other that foster the “exchange of resources, sharing of information, and the trading of favors” (Scott and Davis, 2003, p.23).

Keeping in mind the structures inherent to organizations, the purpose of this dissertation research is threefold. The first is to identify the formal organizational structures of IBC administrative leadership: the specific administrative titles, positions, and hierarchy arrangement for each IBC. The goal is to organize the data in order to create a typology of the administrative structures at U.S. IBCs. The goal of creating a typology is to help illuminate patterns in the organization of administrative leadership among the cohort of U.S. IBCs. The second is to identify the informal organizational structures of network ties (social networks) between IBC leadership and the host country in which the IBC operates. Third, it is also the purpose of this study to gain a better understanding of the types of interconnectedness IBC leadership has within the host country external to the IBC organization. The following section will establish a set of guiding hypotheses based on the literature review to aid the researcher in establishing patterns and themes in the data collected (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Keeping in mind, however, that due to the exploratory nature of this qualitative study, there is room for flexibility and discovery of evolving patterns not yet foreseen (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).
Research Questions and Hypotheses

Main Research Questions

A. In addition to Joint Advisory Boards, what other types of administrative leadership structures exist within American International Branch Campuses?

B. Are individuals who hold administrative leadership positions at American IBCs displaying a characteristic of interconnectedness to the host country environment through network ties external to the branch campus?

Hypotheses

Hypothesis for the study of research question A

1. The administrative leadership structures within an IBC will differ depending on the source of funding for the IBC (Lane 2010, Verbik & Merkley, 2006).

Hypotheses for the study of research question B

1. There will be no difference between the types of network ties established by public universities as compared to the network ties established by nonprofit private university branch campuses within their respective host countries, because public institutions behave much like private entities when moving across borders to establish branch campuses (Lane & Kinser, 2011, Knight, 2008).

2. The types of network ties found between IBC administrative leadership and their external environment will be different depending on the source of funding for the
IBC, as some IBCs are more dependent on the host country as a source of funding (Lane, 2010, Verbik & Merkley, 2006).

**Operationalizing constructs: Organizational Social Theory and Resource Dependence theory**

In order to conceptualize and operationalize the constructs in the posited research questions and hypotheses, two theoretical frameworks are used. This study is grounded by organizational social capital theory as well as resource dependence theory. The terms governance, access, resources, and relationships are key constructs in the proposed research. Organizational social capital and resource dependence theory are used to understand these constructs and to understand the relationships between these constructs as they relate to the central purpose and specific aim of the study.

The origins of social capital theory stem from research on urban communities and the types of networking strategies utilized for survival and functioning (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). The concept of networking is critical to the survival and the functioning of a community, making social capital an ideal framework for this study. This theory will be used to guide the understanding of the types of relationship networking that members holding key leadership positions at an IBC in a foreign community engage in. More specifically, organizational social capital theory allows a lens through which to view the connectedness between governance, access, resources, and relationships. The theory enabled the researcher to reveal how information (resources) is acquired through channels (social
structures such as governance) and that the information acquired has value. The value of this information provides a basis for action and achievement of certain ends that otherwise would not be possible without it (Coleman, 1988).

Certain relationships or affiliations (network ties) can provide opportunities for access to key resources and often reduce the expense for costly acquisition of information (Coleman, 1988, Beerkens & Derwende, 2007). While different types of organizations require and define the value of certain resources differently, the term access generally refers to the ability to receive and make use of a valuable piece of information (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). Access can also be used as a means to identify the role of networks in the acquisition of information (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). Acquisition of information external to the university is deemed a critical component of the role of university governance for strategic decision-making in the United States (Kaplan, 2006). It is undetermined as to whether the acquisition of external information by IBC leadership plays a critical role in strategic planning. However, the literature review in Chapter II suggests that theoretically, an IBC, as a multinational entity, needs access to external information through networks to sustain (Fleming & Frenken, 2007, Peng & Luo, 2000, Dyer & Nobeoka, 2000, Porter, 1998, Baker, 1990).

In this study resource dependence theory, with its origins in viewing organizations as natural and open systems operating in a social context, acts as a complement to organizational social capital theory (Pfeffer & Selznick, 2003, Scott & Davis, 2007). Resource dependence theory widens the theoretical lens by allowing perspective on how resources are important to the function of an organization and
how rational decision-making by individuals is used to ensure the viability of an organization. The theory also guides the study in understanding why individuals make choices to engage in certain types of inter-organizational relations for the benefit of the organization (Scott & Davis, 2007).

Resource dependence draws on three core ideas (Scott & Davis, 2007). Through these three core ideas, the theory offers an explanatory framework for exploring (1) how organizations such as universities operate in response to their environment, (2) how organizations engender differing strategies to pursue their interest, and (3) that power (such as having access to valuable information) is a factor in the decision making activity of individuals in an organization (Scott & Davis, 2007). These core ideas will be used to understand the networking (relationships) between individuals holding key leadership positions and the potential access to resources they may acquire to aid in decision making for the IBC.

In summary, utilizing the two frameworks together will enable a better understanding of how organizations operate in a social context and how they respond to their environment to ensure survival. These theoretical lenses will also highlight the importance of resources for organizational longevity and that individuals within an organization seek networks to acquire these resources.

**Significance of the Study**

The U.S. higher education system, with historical roots originating from the Continental education model, followed by an unprecedented expansion as a decentralized system, displayed tremendous resilience during eras of substantial
change. This resilience makes it an intriguing system to examine within the context of the current and changing landscape of HE in the global marketplace. As one of the largest exporters of higher education in terms of number of IBCs worldwide, the growing multinational involvement of the U.S. higher education system provides a ripe environment for the exploration of the role U.S. H.E. leadership across borders and the factors affecting the institutional sustainability of these IBCs.

The basis for the significance of this study can be found in four key areas, which consequently build upon themselves. These areas include (1) the desire for some American institutions to pursue global ambitions⁴, (2) the increasing need for emerging economies to educate a skilled workforce, (3) the predicted growth of international students who do not want to seek education inside of their home country, and (4) the need for HEIs to understand the mechanisms to manage uncertainty and hence reduce the risk of unplanned closure. A closure of a campus for any reason can compromise both the integrity and reputation of an university (Lane & Kinser, 2011, Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012).

State budgets, which are a significant source of revenue for U.S. public higher education institutions, have recently experienced sizable deficits due to the recession beginning in 2006 (Douglass, 2010). These deficits have resulted in a decreased share of state funds being allotted to higher education (Miller Center, 2010). In 2000, during more favorable economic times, the share of state funds devoted to higher education was roughly 11.4 percent. By 2010, this number had

⁴ These global ambitions can be classified as either monetary gain through revenue generated in an international market and/or increased prestige by having a global presence (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012).
fallen to roughly 10 percent (Miller Center, 2010). In California, for example, a state with one of the largest public university systems, $813 million dollars was cut from the state operating budget in 2010, resulting in a 20 percent cut to the University of California's budget (Douglass, 2010). For the Berkeley campus alone this meant cutting $80 million from the operating budget (Douglass, 2010).

Since 2000, federal spending on higher education has been marked by instability. The pre-recession period of 2000-2005 saw steady growth in federal spending to $38.5 billion in 2005 with a spike upwards to $57.7 billion in 2006, fueled primarily by a sharp rise in funding allocated to federal student loan programs. Federal allocations to higher education fell precipitously in 2007 back to $37.4 billion, only to slowly increase in the ensuing years towards the 2010 number of $47.8 billion. Most of this 2006-2007 decrease is explained by a sudden reduction in federal funding for student loan programs (retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/tables/dt10_382.asp). Even prior to the recession in 2006, the forecast of increasing Medicaid cost and K-12 mandates on state funds and limited federal dollar amounts served as a sign that there was a potential for reductions in both state and federal funding available for higher education (Douglass, 2010, Miller Center, 2010).

As a result, many universities began seeking entrepreneurial endeavors or alternative business models to generate revenue (Collis, 2002). The establishment of an IBC can be viewed as one type of entrepreneurial endeavor to generate revenue from sources outside of the U.S., such as in the case of the agreement between Texas A & M University and the Qatar Foundation. The Qatar foundation
agreed to pay an undisclosed sum to Texas A &M to open and operate an IBC providing programs in selected engineering fields such as petroleum engineering (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012).

IBCs also provide international exposure to the university in hopes of bringing international students to the campus and improving international rankings (Lane & Kinser, 2011). The U.S., holding a 22 percent share of the international student market (representing 4 percent of the total enrollment of students in the U.S.), witnessed a decline of international students enrolling in HEIs in the U.S. in the early part of the 21st century. In looking at the overall growth of international student enrollment as compared to other countries during this period the U.S. experienced a weaker growth at 17 percent as compared to a 29 percent growth in the United Kingdom, 42 percent growth in Australia, and 81 percent in France (Verbik & Lasanowski, 2007). In the U.S., noticeable declines in international student enrollment were from countries such as Indonesia, Japan, Taiwan, and Thailand (Verbik & Lasanowski, 2007). Changing U.S. Department of Education Regulations post 9/11 are partly responsible for the period of declining growth of international students traveling to the U.S. seeking academic degrees during the early part of the 21st century (Verbik & Lasanowski, 2007).

The increasing growth in international students predicted by Knight (2005) is also an opportunity for continued IBC development. Knight (2005) predicted that the demand for international education during the 25 year period between 2000 and 2025 will increase 4 fold from 1.8 million to a staggering number of 7.2 million students. This prediction did not specifically address the proportion of
students who would be seeking degrees at IBCs or more specifically American IBCs. Worldwide, it is estimated that 120,000 students are currently enrolled in IBC’s (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012). Using 3 million students as a rough estimate of the current demand for international education, this would imply that 4% of students internationally are enrolled in IBC’s. If similar patterns hold, it is reasonable to project that 288,000 students will be enrolled in IBC’s by 2025.

Another reason for the demand for American IBCs is the opportunity for the attainment of an American degree for students unable to travel to the U.S. due to economic or cultural reasons (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012). Additionally, the establishment of American IBCs as well as IBCs from other countries may be attractive for countries wanting to augment or expand their HE education system (Knight, 2008, Lane, 2011). This may be especially true in countries that have made efforts to improve their primary and secondary education systems and now are in a position to educate more citizens at the postsecondary level. For example, countries with emerging economies such as Qatar are seeking out universities to open up IBCs. By recruiting and supporting American universities to open IBCs, The Qatar Foundation is attempting to create a diverse HE system for its citizens in hopes of creating more diversity in the labor market (Krieger, 2008). By investing in bringing this diversity to the nation, Qatar is attempting to create future opportunities to compete in economic markets other than oil and natural gas, (Krieger, 2008). These types of educational initiatives provide opportunities for the growth of U.S. HEIs outside of the U.S., as well as for other countries looking to expand HE in a host country.
These opportunities, however, come with an associated risk for both the importing country and the exporting educational entity. Universities that pursue the opening of a branch campus in another country face a myriad of complex organizational obstacles and expose themselves to significant risks that may impact their sustainability (Verbik & Merkle, 2009). IBCs operate in a foreign context with regulations that are often complex and rapidly changing (Becker, 2009, Lane, 2011). Threats, as previously stated, include but are not limited to the political instability of a host country, maintaining quality programs, and the recruitment of an adequate number of qualified candidates for enrollment (Altbach, 2011, OBHE, 2011). OBHE (2011) notes that inattentiveness to these types of threats to an IBC can lead an IBC into closure. Although a definitive understanding of why branch campuses have closed is up for debate, IBC closure is a reality for several institutions. Michigan State University in Dubai and George Mason in Ras Al Khaimah are two examples of American IBC closures. In assessing these closures, George Mason for example, reportedly closed due to threats (factors external to the organization and potentially harmful) such as enrollment numbers and relations with its partner institution (Becker, 2009).

C-BERT (2012) data documents 23 IBC closures, of which 6 were U.S. IBCs (See Figure 1.3).
Figure 1.3 Comparison of the number of IBC closures* and potential openings worldwide to the U.S. *closures do not include HEIs closed in Japan during the 1980s.

As more U.S. institutions consider opening offshore campuses (See Figure 1.3), whether in partnership with another entity or through solo investments, it is important to understand sustainable organizational behavior to reduce financial risk and undesirable closure. As an overall top ten U.S. service industry export, grossing U.S. $20 billion in 2009, offshore education’s impact on the U.S. economy is palpable (Lane, 2011).
Chapter Two

Literature Review

Introduction

This dissertation posits that the networking taking place by individuals holding key administrative roles at IBCs can contribute to the sustainability of the IBC. This argument is predicated on the notion that network ties are a key factor impacting the ability of an IBC to sustain over time (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003).

Research on social networking between key individuals in one organization and other key individuals in another organization has shown it to be a factor not only in the success of an individual organization, but also in the successful development of entire regions such as Silicon Valley, Hollywood, and the Boston beltway (Dyer & Singh, 1998, Porter, 1998).

With this in mind, the core of this literature review focuses on the why and the how multinational firms use inter-organizational networking. The why and the how of inter-organizational networking will be framed by the theoretical concepts of resource dependence theory and social capital theory. Previous research points to networking as an essential element in the success of multinational firms in industries as diverse as automotive, biotechnology, and investment banking (Fleming & Frenken, 2007, Dyer & Nobeoka, 2000, Baker, 1990). In addition, given that IBCs continue to be established and will continue to grow their operations in environments with transitional and emerging economies, the literature review will
pay particular attention to inter-organization networking in these environments, as opposed to environments with advanced or mature economies.

The literature review is broken down into three interrelated sections. The chapter will begin with an overview of the most common IBC business models. The second section highlights the current concerns posited by scholars that are believed to pose the greatest threat to the sustainability of IBCs as organizations operating in a multinational environment. The third section situates the concept of IBC sustainability within the theoretical frameworks of resource dependence theory and social capital theory. This section will also discuss the uniqueness and importance of considering the environment of transitional and emerging economies in regards to the value of inter-organizational networking via social linkages. Examples drawn from research on other industries will be used to illustrate how other multinational firms have benefited from the use of social linkages in the acquisition of key resources needed for organizational sustainability.

**International Branch Campus Models**

Exploration of the literature on IBC arrangements reveals that even though there is considerable variation in the ways in which IBCs are funded, the majority of branch campuses fall into one of three distinct categories. IBCs are categorized by the financial model under which the campus was established and operates. The categories of IBCs include those that are (1) wholly owned and operated by the home campus, (2) joint ventures involving contractual relations with another entity to provide educational services such as curricula support, and (3) strategic alliances
(Verbik & Merkley, 2006, Lane, 2011). However, regardless of the type of financial model there is inevitably some link between the international branch campus, the home campus, and the host country (Kinser, 2010). Kinser, (2010) explains that that the partnership may be a for-profit company, a government linked entity, or a private foundation depending on the politics in a host country.

**Wholly Owned IBCs**

Verbik and Merkley (2006) categorize *wholly owned* IBCs as operations that are exclusively funded and operated by the home campus. In this arrangement the home campus assumes all financial risk as well as all the responsibility for the academic programs and operation of the physical plant (Lane, 2010). This type of funding model is considered to be the most risky and time consuming endeavor for a home campus in that the home campus is responsible for understanding and operating under a host country's idiosyncratic legal and regulatory environment (Verbik & Merkley, 2006, Lane, 2010). Import and export restriction of hard currency, tax regulations, and limits on tuition and fees are examples of local regulatory cited in the literature which may pose challenges to the success of IBCs (Becker, 2009). This type of model relies heavily on enrolling full paying students, a strategy, which will be discussed in further detail as a factor posing a significant threat to the sustainability of IBCs. The advantage of this model is the fact that it does not tie the home campus to a contractual relationship with the host country related to investments, operational responsibilities, and the unfortunate complexities inherent in negotiating repayment of services when a campus fails
(Verbik & Merkley, 2006). Boston University’s branch campus in Brussels is an example of a *wholly owned* and operated IBC.

**Joint Ventures**

*Joint ventures* specifically refer to IBCs that have been established under negotiated agreements between two or more entities (Garrett, 2002). For example an university in one country and a host government in another country, join in a formal partnership with the goal of providing educational provisions within the host country (Garrett, 2002). This type of model is often complex and many details of the arrangements are not fully understood (Kinser, 2010). It is known that on some level the shared ownership includes the sharing of financial risk and rewards, collaboration on curriculum, and sometimes co-management of physical space (Verbik & Merkley, 2006). *Joint ventures* are often found in countries where there is a legal requirement for foreign entities to partner with a host country entity, such as is the case in China (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012, Kinser, 2010). In other instances the university may need the financial support from another entity to both start up and maintain operations (Becker, 2009). Or as Kinser, (2010) points out; some joint ventures are solely revenue seeking endeavors. Under contracts negotiated in *joint ventures* the partners share ownership of the branch campus, while simultaneously retaining separate legal status (Lane, 2010). Monash University Sunway Campus Malaysia is an example of an IBC *joint venture* between Monash University in Australia and the Sunway Corporation in Malaysia (Lane, 2010).


**Strategic Alliances**

Lane (2010) describes *strategic alliances* as a category falling somewhere in
between a *wholly owned* branch campus and a *joint venture*. According to Verbik and
Merkley (2006) IBCs established as *strategic alliances* are funded in one of two
ways. The branch campus is either funded by the host country or from some other
private company or organization in either the home or the host country (Verbik &
Merkley, 2006). In most cases however, initial funding for the IBC comes from
regional or central authorities in a host country via invitation and is linked to “an
overall national strategy for higher education” in a particular region (Verbik &
Merkley, 2006, p.13). The significance of this type of model for the home campus is
that it often alleviates some if not the entire financial burden associated with the
start up cost of an IBC (Lane, 2010). *Strategic alliances* usually involve some sharing
of responsibilities, where the physical space is often provided by the host country,
while the curriculum, the management of the space, as well as the awarding of
academic degrees are provided by the home campus (Verbik & Merkley, 2006).
Qatar and Dubai are regions where *strategic alliances* are more common (Lane
2010). For example, the Qatar Foundation is a private nonprofit organization
created by the Qatari government that extended invitations and monies to six
American universities to establish branch campuses as *strategic alliances*. Carnegie
Mellon and Northwestern University are two of the American universities with
branches operating in Qatar under this funding model.

Lane and Kinser (2011) note that this type of arrangement between a
sponsoring state and a public university illustrates the very complicated and messy
private–public nature of cross-border higher education. Lane and Kinser (2011) illuminated the importance of grasping the relationship between the home and the host country in order to fully understand the dynamics occurring in the establishment of IBCs and their funding models (Lane & Kinser, 2011). In emerging and transitional economies governments are looking for HEIs, regardless of whether they are private or public entities, to complement existing state education systems in providing educational opportunities for its citizens (Lane & Kinser, 2011).

Interestingly, public institutions moving across borders such as Virginia Commonwealth University and Texas A &M in Qatar, operate and are legally recognized in the host country as private nonprofit entities, yet they serve a public purpose (Lane & Kinser, 2011). The movement of the public institution outside of the policy environment of the home country enables public HEIs to escape the regulations tied to public entities within their home country (Lane & Kinser, 2011). These considerations by Lane and Kinser (2011) challenge the broader perspective of cross-border arrangements and suggest that the nature of the cross-border educational arrangements involving IBCs is important.

**Sustainability**

The term “sustainable” is used in a variety of contexts, ranging from the condition of the environment to the feasibility of the day-to-day pace of any given person’s life. It is often used in dialogue to comment on whether some practice or act can continue or endure over a period of time. In other words, something that is sustainable, whether it is a source of water or the number of meetings in one day on
a person’s calendar, refers to the ability to continue on or the act of sustaining. For the purposes of this study, the *sustainability* of an IBC refers to the ability of an IBC to remain in operation (providing educational programs and awarding degrees) by either becoming financially independent or maintaining financial independence whilst providing the quality and likeness of the home campus (Altbach, 2010, Altbach, 2011, Vinen, 2008). There are numerous threats to IBCs impacting the ability of these HE entities to sustain themselves in a foreign environment. Both in speculation and through experience, researchers have explored the potential and real threats to the long term sustainability of IBCs. Due to the variation in business models and the limited length of time that many IBCs have been in existence, it is difficult to determine all of the issues that may compromise the viability of IBCs (Altbach, 2010, Altbach, 2011). However, despite the limitations in understanding all the issues that may compromise IBCs, several credible concerns are worthy of consideration for any one of these given models.

Altbach (2011, 2010), addresses several concerns facing IBCs in terms of their ability to sustain over time. He further notes that although sustainability of IBCs has not been a central concern, it should be due to the recent “boom” in growth. The ability to provide a comparable educational experience at a branch campus versus that offered at the home campus is difficult and requires tremendous time and resources (Wood, 2011, Altbach, 2010, 2011). The potential for financial losses, the damage to academic reputation, and the potential disservice to students by providing poor quality are a few of the reasons cited by Altbach (2011,2010) for the need for increased attention to be paid to the operation of an IBC. Key issues
center around five areas. These areas are in enrollment numbers, funding, availability of faculty, replication of curriculum, and changing local conditions (Altbach 2011, 2010).

**Enrollment**

Enrollment presents one of the most widely raised threats to the sustainability of IBCs. Enrollment of students presents concerns for a variety of reasons. Overall low enrollment numbers is one of the major concerns. Without enough students enrolled in the programs the feasibility of remaining open diminishes. The University of New South Wales was reported to have closed its IBC in Singapore for just this reason (OBHE, 2011). Another concern is with the specific demographics of those who are enrolling or plan to enroll. The actual number of qualified applicants is a concern, especially for some of the more selective HEI opening branches (Altbach, 2011). The students enrolling or planning to enroll need to have both adequate secondary schooling opportunities and proficient English language skills to be successful at these universities (Altbach, 2011). The availability of students meeting the qualification standards for several of the HEIs opening branch campuses, such as Northwestern University and New York University, is debatable and a concern for the long term sustainability of the campus (Altbach, 2010). In terms of enrollment, it is also a concern that as more HEIs enter the market there will be increased competition for those highly qualified students.
Sources of Revenue

The ability to enroll a critical number of students is tied directly to a second area of concern, which is the funding of the IBCs. Enrolled students bring revenue to the campus and in some cases is the only source of revenue for the IBC (Altbach, 2010). Restrictions placed on the use of public funding by the home country limits the ability of universities to financially support the IBCs other than through tuition generated from the enrollees (Altbach, 2011). In other cases where the IBC is given substantial start up funding by either the host country, another institution, or perhaps a property developer, Altbach (2011) states that these campuses are expected to eventually be self sustainable without financial support. There are also other financial concerns raised by Altbach (2011) about the enormity of nonmonetary expenses that accumulate over time in the operation of an IBC. For example, there is a tremendous amount of time put into negotiating with the host country, developing appropriate curricula, developing new personnel policies specific to a host country, and the general time spent by administrators in planning with the various stakeholders invested in the IBC (Harding & Lamney, 2011, Altbach, 2011).

Administrators and Faculty and Curriculum

Finding an adequate number of qualified students to enroll and generating enough revenue are by themselves difficult tasks facing IBCs, however the recruitment of administration, faculty and staff is another source of concern for the sustainability of IBCs (Hughes, 2011, Altbach, 2011,). It has been reported by
Altbach (2011) that luring faculty and administrators from the home campus is an enormously difficult task for many HEIs. He states that senior faculty in particular who are involved with laboratory research are “reluctant to leave their work” and that junior faculty are reluctant to leave the home campus for fear that “overseas teaching will not serve their chances for promotion.” Other concerns faculty and administrators have about serving the university overseas for periods of time include employment of their spouses, their children’s education, and other family issues such as caring for an elderly parent (Altbach, 2011). These strong reluctances even if coupled with substantial financial benefits, reduce the number of qualified personnel able and willing to move abroad for a period of time (Altbach, 2011).

Replicating the home campus in terms of the curriculum offered is another challenge faced by IBCs (Altbach, 2011). The IBC needs to work in concert with the host country to offer a curriculum that is sensitive and pertinent to local needs in order to attract and enroll students while at the same time maintaining the rigor of the home campus. Thus, several stakeholders monitor curriculum offered by IBCs (Kinser, 2011). Curriculum is monitored by the home and host country accrediting agencies, the host country government, the home campus, and by potential families of students or students themselves seeking a similar curricular experience at the IBC as they would have at the home campus (Kinser, 2011, Altbach, 2010, Vinen, 2008). The inability to meet the expectations of any of these stakeholders generates risk and threatens the operation of the IBC.
Changing local conditions

The fifth key challenge facing IBCs noted in the literature is that IBCs are particularly vulnerable to changing local conditions (Lane, 2011, Altbach, 2011). Changing local conditions can affect IBC viability in two primary ways. For example, there may be a change in the HE market in the host country, or there may be an unstable political environment where the IBC is located (Lane, 2011, Altbach, 2011).

The 21st century, while an era of unprecedented technological growth and opportunity, it is also considered an era of political instability. Countries with emerging and transitional economies are undergoing fundamental shifts in ruling political parties, exposures to international competition and markets, and the adoption of new policies (Altbach, 2010, Hoskisson et al., 2000). Many of the countries where IBCs are located have traditionally operated under strong and even oppressive bureaucratic control (Hoskisson et al., 2000). In these environments the governments have had much control if not total control over the allocation of resources for their citizens (Hoskisson et al. 2000).

The post-Communism era (since the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989) has brought tremendous change in regions such as Central and Eastern Europe, resulting in the opening up of a free-market in a previously isolated region (Hoskisson et al., 2000). Currently, regions in the Middle East are undergoing significant "social and political" change, resulting in unrest and an unpredictable environment (Altbach, 2010, p. 8). Such tremendous change or shifts in paradigms of economic and political conditions can often come with conflict and instability (Hoskisson et al., 2000). The instability and conflict in a region can potentially affect
the ability of IBCs to recruit faculty or students, which would compromise both the enrollment numbers and the quality of the programs.

Changing local market conditions can also compromise the long-term viability of IBCs (Altbach 2011). As emerging and transitional economies grow and develop, so too will the market for higher education. Growing competition from both the local entities as well as private HEIs looking to capitalize on the growing HE market could potentially create an over supply of institutions in relation to the available demand. This scenario would compromise enrollment numbers and therefore a predictable revenue stream for the IBC. For example, Altbach (2011) notes that China is increasing its local capacity and offering more opportunities through these local institutions, which could be an unattractive scenario for IBCs looking for students who are willing to pay the high price of tuition at IBCs.

In review of the current issues facing the sustainability of IBCs, the recruitment and enrollment of students is the pinnacle concern and is fraught with uncertainty. IBCs rely on a critical number of enrollees to generate revenue and maintain the ongoing operations of an IBC. In addition, quality of the programs, adequate faculty, curriculum offerings, and local conditions are all distinct issues IBCs grapple with in a foreign environment. Given these realities, it seems plausible to consider ways IBCs are strategically reducing uncertainties to minimize the risk inherent to operating as entities in an unpredictable environment.
Resource Dependence Theory

IBCs are similar in nature to other types of organizations in that the characteristics of the external environment are important to the survival of the IBC (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, Scott & Davis, 2007). Pfeffer and Salancik (2003), the pioneers of resource dependence theory, views organizations as being “constrained and affected” by their environments. Their theoretical model highlights that what happens in and to organizations is more than a function of “its structure, its leadership, its procedures, and its goals” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, p. 3).

Theoretically, according to Pfeffer and Salancik (2003), resource dependence is what happens to an organization as a consequence of its external environment (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). They state that, “organizations are inescapably bound up with the conditions of their environment” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, p. 1). How a particular organization manages these conditions in part may very well determine the fate of the organization. In this respect their theoretical perspective, known as resource dependence theory, is a useful theoretical framework to illuminate the relationship between an IBC and its environment. IBCs as organizations operating in foreign countries with different legal and regulatory frameworks are inescapably bound to the local conditions of their environment in a host country.

According to Scott & Davis (2007) resource dependence theory is useful in illuminating the “give and take of inter-organizational relations” (p.221). It is also useful in understanding the types of tactics or strategies organizations use to manage their relations with others in their environment in order to minimize their dependence and uncertainty (Scott & Davis, 2007). The premise of the theory is that
organizations are in many ways dependent on their environment to survive and the key to survival is the ability to acquire and maintain essential resources (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). In other words, in order to reduce the constraints and uncertainty presented by the environment, organizations need to acquire resources from the environment (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003).

The theoretical framework introduces the tactics organizations use to manage their dependency on other organizations. There are two more commonly tactics utilized by organizations. One commonly used tactic approaches the management of dependency and reducing uncertainty by growing in size to gain power so as to have more leverage in deciding on such as items as pricing and more influence on regulatory policies (Scott & Davis, 2007, Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). The second common tactic is to keep one’s options open to several alternatives, such as when negotiating supplier bids (Scott & Davis, 2007).

The relationship or interdependence between corporate entities and investment banks provides a prime example of resource dependence theory as a concept for viewing organizational behavior in response to their environments (Baker, 1990). In advanced markets, corporations and investment banks are interdependent organizations (Baker, 1990). Corporations need investment banks to gain access to resources such as financial capital, while investment banks need corporations to engage in financial transactions (Baker, 1990). While investment banks wield considerable control by having the financial capital others need, in order for corporations to reduce dependence on any one investment bank, they engage in relationship with several banks (Baker, 1990). Baker (1990) describes
how corporations like General Motors, a large organization, employ this strategy by engaging in exchange relations with several banks such as First Boston, Morgan Stanley, Salomon Brothers, and Merrill Lynch. Baker (1990) also reported that sixty-seven percent of General Motor’s business is conducted with the first three banks listed, in contrast to Ford Motor Company, which conducts 70% of its business with one bank, Goldman Sachs, which is less strategic from a resource dependence theory.

Aside from increasing size and seeking alternates, other strategies organizations use to reduce uncertainty and dependence are what Scott and Davis (2007) call bridging mechanisms. As a response to organizational interdependence with their environment, they strategically attempt to coordinate with other entities to gain access to resources or information. Cooptation, alliances, and mergers are three specific types of bridging mechanisms (Scott & Davis, 2007). Scott and Davis (2007) define cooptation as the “incorporation of representatives of external groups into the decision making process or advisory structure of the organization” (p.235). Director interlocks, as a form of cooptation, are a common approach to linking organizations to their external environment (Scott & Davis, 2007). Alliances are described as coordinated activities between entities in a joint venture for the purpose of knowledge sharing (Scott & Davis, 2007). Mergers are the act of one organization acquiring another organization (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). According to Pfeffer & Salancik (2003) and Scott & Davis (2007), there are three types of mergers. The three types of mergers include vertical integration, horizontal mergers, or diversification.
Cooptation (interlocking directorates) is considered not only the most common way but also the most flexible way in which to manage dependence while maintaining sole ownership of an organization (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). Unlike cooptation, the bridging mechanism of alliances and mergers involve fixed contractual obligations limiting organizational independence such as the sharing of assets (Scott, 2003). Cooptation as the more flexible alternative is a strategic act enabling organizations to acquire resources through relationships that foster communication between an organization and its external environment. In other words, these relationships are linkages between the organization and the necessary resources an organization needs to manage its environmental interdependence and reduce uncertainty (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). Pfeffer & Salancik (2003) note that these linkages provide four benefits to an organization. These benefits include (1) gaining access to information in another organization that directly impacts the “local organization,” (2) acting as a channel for communication between two organizations that depend on each other, (3) enabling an organization to have “exposure” to environmental conditions which cause problems for a focal organization, and (4) serving as a means for legitimizing an organization leading to others viewing the local organization as having value or worth (Pfeffer, & Salancik, 2003, p. 145.).

**Resource dependence in emerging and transitional economies**

An important aspect in understanding linkages necessary to fully gain the aforementioned benefits of social networks is the “psychological role” these linkages
play in reducing uncertainty (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, p. 146). In research conducted by Granovetter (1974) he found that people tend to prefer conducting their business within their social networks (with people familiar to them) and this holds especially true under conditions of uncertainty (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, p.146). Interlocking directorates and other types of social networking offer a means of trust and security, thus acting as a stabilizing mechanism for organizations. “Good relationships with suppliers may help a firm acquire quality materials, good services, and timely delivery. Similar ties with buyers may spur customer loyalty, sales, volume, and reliable payment” (Peng & Luo, 2000, p. 488).

Appreciating the psychological role linkages play is critically important to understanding how IBCs may need to manage their dependencies in foreign environments, especially those with emerging and transitional economies. Network ties have been found to be a necessary mechanism to gain access to valuable resources in emerging and transitional economies due to the characteristics of the cultures, the lack of regulations often seen in advanced markets, and the overall uncertainty of the market in an emerging economy (Peng & Luo, 2000, Hoskisson et al., 2000, Lu & Beamish, 2001, Acquaah, 2007). The “strong collectivistic cultures in emerging economies such as Africa, the Middle East, and Asia” where IBCs are prevalent and growing are also regions brimming with networking activity as a dominant means for conducting business (Acquaah, 2007, p. 1236). Research on organizations in emerging economies found that due to the lack of formal legal and governance infrastructure, the networking in these cultures is used as a means to gain significant competitive advantages. Competitive advantages for organizations
operating in under-regulated markets were gained in large part through network relationships with close business and government ties depending on the specific region (Hoskisson et al., 2000, Peng & Lou, 2000, Acquaah, 2007).

Research conducted on firms in China’s transitional economy by Peng and Lou (2000) found evidence that in the absence of codified laws and regulations, managers used guanxi (interpersonal ties between managers) to facilitate economic exchanges. However, in research conducted by Acquaah (2007) in Ghana where the government wields considerable power and control like that of China’s government, network ties between top managers in other firms (as opposed to government officials) was deemed more beneficial in facilitating valuable economic exchanges. In both cases, network ties are a valuable and significant mechanism for managing dependencies and reducing uncertainty.

Nevertheless, the ability to gain access to resources through networking suggests that a certain level of social capital has been obtained. Resource dependence theory offers a substantial theoretical construct for illuminating the why of inter-organizational networking. Organizations, constrained by their environment, need to acquire resources and manage their dependencies on other organizations in the acquisition of these resources in order to survive. The theory also touches on the how an organization might achieve optimal management of its dependencies in the form of size, alternatives and bridging mechanisms such as developing interpersonal relationships. Given the evidence on the significant value of interpersonal relationships in gaining valuable access to key resources in the types of environments IBCs are more likely to be established in, the following
section will illuminate the importance of building social capital. Social Capital, as a theoretical concept, helps further develop the understanding of how networking between individuals enables access to resources needed by organizations.

Social Capital Theory

Social capital theory emerged from research exploring the mechanisms used by urban communities to adapt and survive (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). Social capital has historically been a theory aimed at individualistic behavior but it has grown to include the study of organizations. Organizations are entities embedded in a social context and the behavior of individuals within the organization has direct and indirect implications for the organization as a whole (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). The relationship between an individual within one organization and an individual of another organization is an example of a behavior engaged in by individuals that may have great implications for a given organization (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998).

The importance of social capital lies in the concept that it is a productive and active mechanism to “achieve certain ends that in its absence would not be possible” (Coleman, 1988). Social capital or the relationship between two actors, as explained by Coleman (1988), is in itself, a resource held by actors. The use of social capital to achieve a certain aim is essentially the act of leveraging one resource in order to acquire other resources. However the ease of being able to acquire another resource is often contingent on the level of trust or previous knowledge two actors have of each other (Porter, 1998). Personal or community ties that nurture trust in others
act as a conduit for the flow of information between people and organizations (Porter, 1998). In other words, the quality of the relationship often matters.

In the book Six Degrees (2003) Duncan Watts discusses the interconnectedness of individuals throughout the world. He points out how networks at one level are highly clustered in specific regions. For example in the U.S, clustered networks exist in North Carolina related to the furniture industry, Hollywood, CA in the film industry, and in Detroit, MI as a result of the auto industry (Porter, 1998). However, at the same time Watts (2003) notes that due to an increasingly globalized society geographic proximity is becoming less of a necessity to establish and maintain network ties. Drawing on research by Milgram (1967), Watts explains that any given individual is separated by no more than six people anywhere in the world. However, as Watts points out, in certain subgroups such as college-educated professionals living in the New York metropolitan area, the degrees of separation shrink considerably (Watts, 2003). The value in this connectedness is that depending on how it is used it gives any individual person access to a wide range of resources through a wide range of networks linked by individuals. These linkages form what are known as social networks (Knoke & Yang, 2008). Knoke & Yang (2008) define social networks as “a structure composed of a set of actors, some of whose members are connected by a set of one or more relations” (p.8). The type of access one is able to achieve is often predicated on the degree of social capital one has been able to establish within a social network (Knoke & Yang, 2008, Watts, 2003, Frank & Yasumoto, 2000).
Coleman (1988) uses the example of the wholesale diamond market in New York City to illustrate the dynamics of trusting relationships acting as a productive and efficient means of negotiating the sale of diamonds. A typical interaction between a buyer and seller involves the exchange of thousands of dollars of diamonds from the seller to the buyer, for the buyer to preview with no formal insurance (Coleman, 1988). The relational ties through family, community, and religious affiliations that have developed in this merchant community have fostered enough trustworthiness between the buyer and seller that the transaction can occur without formal market regulations such as insurance (Coleman, 1988). This particular example resonates with studies previously mentioned by Hoskisson et al., 2000, Peng & Lou, 2000, and Acquaah, 2007 describing how the flow of information and transactions transpire in emerging and transition economies in the absence of formal market regulations.

**Value of network ties: Sharing and Exchanging Resources**

In addition to Coleman (1988), there are several instances where researchers have based their studies on a framework derived from social capital and resource dependence theory to illuminate the value of network ties as a mechanism to exchange resources, share resources, and trade favors (Scott, 2003). Two noteworthy studies illuminating the impact of resource sharing through network ties to gain competitive advantages include one study conducted on the development of Silicon Valley in the United States and another focused on the growth of the Toyota Corporation in Japan. In both cases, organizations benefited
from individuals using network ties to share information and exchange resources through these connections.

**Silicon Valley**

Fleming and Frenken (2007) explored the sudden and dramatic rise of the technology industry in Silicon Valley, and their findings suggested a strong correlation between the use of network ties and the growth of the industry. The networking between postdoctoral researchers was identified as a key linkage facilitating the sharing of information between organizations depending on each other for key resources (Fleming & Frenken, 2007).

In the early stages of development in Silicon Valley IBM supported a program to bring in postdoctoral researchers who were primarily from Stanford University and other surrounding area universities. The intention of the program was to bring in fresh new ideas in a frequent cycle with the intention of keeping some of the postdocs for continued employment and letting others go to find employment elsewhere (Flemings & Frenken, 2007). Two factors were key to understanding what unfolded as a result of this program. First the postdocs who collaborated together in an intense innovative environment developed close social and personal ties (Flemings & Frenken, 2007). Secondly, because the postdocs were recruited from the surrounding area, they had ties to the area, which generated an incentive or desire for those postdocs who left the IBM program to seek employment in close proximity to IBM (Flemings & Frenken, 2007). The combination of fruitful network ties established during the program and the close
proximity in which these postdocs continued to work, albeit for different companies, fostered inter-organizational networking which facilitated the flow of information and resources enabling the production of new technology at a staggering rate (Flemings & Frenken, 2007). It is difficult to speculate on how the rate of growth may have been different without the network ties between postdocs, however Flemings & Frenken (2007) credit the strength of the networks for the sustained growth of Silicon Valley even after the post-doctoral program was discontinued due to IBM’s financial difficulties.

**Toyota Corporation**

The growth and success of Japan’s largest company, Toyota, is another example of the use of network ties to reap competitive advantage through knowledge sharing (Dyer & Nobeoka, 2000). Toyota, a highly successful automotive firm, is noted in the literature for its highly interconnected network ties among its suppliers as being a primary driver of the firm’s competitive advantage in the industry (Dyer & Nobeoka, 2000). The facilitation of inter-firm knowledge sharing through supplier networks enabled Toyota “to continually learn, adapt, and upgrade its capabilities” with such efficiency that the exchanges served as an invaluable mechanism for the corporation. (Dyer & Nobeoka, 2000, p. 345). Dyer & Nobeoka (2000), identified in their research on Toyota’s production network that the supplier associations in Japan are infused with social capital through familiar ties and similar norms which generate the environment for knowledge sharing within this community. In recognizing the value in the social capital and connections
within the associations, Toyota was able to organize the suppliers into teams familiar with each other in order to further maximize the ability of the suppliers to learn from each other through collaboration (Dyer & Nobeoka, 2000). Interestingly, the absence of network ties with suppliers in the U.S. proved to be problematic during the initial stages of Toyota's 1988 start up in Kentucky (Dyer & Nobeoka, 2000). The production efficiencies gained from the supplier networks in Japan were initially unattainable at the Toyota plant in Kentucky (Dyer & Nobeoka, 2000). At this time, the Toyota corporation recognized that similar network ties like those found between suppliers in Japan, needed to be emulated in the U.S. in order for Toyota to sustain as a multinational firm operating on U.S. soil (Dyer & Nobeoka, 2000).

**Network ties in Higher Education**

In addition to the studies conducted on the value of network ties for corporate organizations, scholars have also explored the value of network ties in HE environments. Pusser, Slaughter, and Thomas, (2006), recognized the advantages gained by organizations using social networks as a strategy to trade information, acquire intellectual capital, and develop best practices. The researchers explored the interlocking behavior of members of governing boards at select public and private universities in the U.S. In selecting governing boards as their unit of analysis, they built off the research by Pusser (2003) noting that “trustees serve as links to powerful political and economic interest groups beyond the institution” (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006, p. 749). Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas (2006) further
elaborated and argued that trustees are a significant source of information and policy making for a university, as well as being leaders bringing tremendous influence to a HEI that shapes the structure and behavior of the academic institution.

In their study, they selected 10 public and 10 private leading research universities due to their dependence on both financial and intellectual (knowledge sharing) resources. Their hypothesis was that governing boards at these universities served as catalyst for improving access to these necessary resources, especially during a climate of decreased state and federal funding for research at U.S. research universities (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006).

The findings of the study revealed that both public and private universities had governing boards with considerable interlocking ties to external firms. Through the trustees, universities were linked to firms in sectors including investment banking, computer software, pharmaceuticals, electronics, and general goods and services (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006). There are two key findings of this study. The first notable finding is that the distribution of ties with different sectors differed between the public and private universities. Public universities had a disproportionate number of ties to investment banking firms as compared to private universities, while private universities in contrast had a much wider range of connections to what the researchers called “new-economy” firms (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006, p. 757). The second key finding of this study is that the overlap of university governing board members from private universities members sitting on multiple firm boards was significantly greater than that of public
universities. Put another way, governing board members at private universities displayed more interlocks. For example, JP Morgan had members on its board who were also trustees at the University of Pennsylvania, Harvard University, and Cornell University (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006). In contrast, while public university trustees were frequently connected to private sector firms, the researchers found no overlapping occurrences (linkages) of board members from other universities sitting on similar boards (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006).

While this study illuminates the types of interconnectedness between university trustees and corporate firms that are deemed to facilitate the acquisition of essential resources by research universities, it does not address the level of impact these linkages have in actually acquiring the resources (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006). In other words, the study does not “measure the frequency and strength of the ties” as it relates to the impact of outcomes such as “salaries, extramural grant productivity, and patent revenue” (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006, p. 771). Another critique of this study is that while trustees are undoubtedly key institutional leaders, there is no acknowledgment of the potential influence that administrators of the university have in serving as links to corporate firms and external resources. As was identified in the previous studies mentioned, individual linkages or social ties deemed important in the acquisition of key resources for an organization can occur at differing levels of the organization. In Silicon Valley the ties were found to be between the postdocs at IBM. For Toyota, the crucial ties were between and among the suppliers. In China, the critical social ties were found to be
between managers of firms and government officials, which was in contrast to Ghana where the ties were found between the top managers of different firms.

In all of the examples cited above, network ties or the use of social capital in some form are used by resource dependent industries to gain access to resources such as financial capital, knowledge, or timely supply of goods. In gaining access to these resources organizations are able to achieve competitive advantages through efficiencies and knowledge of the latest innovations. Although not in isolation, the competitive advantage gained from using network ties provides organizational entities a critical advantage to aid in sustaining its operations over time.

Summary

In summary, there are many challenges facing IBCs that can considerably reduce the chances of their long-term survival in a foreign environment. IBCs operate in many different types of political and cultural environments and they are financially supported in several different ways. For these reasons, it would be a mistake to assume that there will be one best way to manage the external environment in which IBCs operate. However, the theoretical concepts of social capital and resource dependence help illuminate factors that may help increase the sustainability of an organization such as an IBC. Network ties as a form of social capital have been shown to help reduce the environmental uncertainty and dependence that organizations are exposed to. It is unclear as to if and how IBCs are managing the uncertainty of their external environment through network ties. Therefore, guided by a framework built from social capital and resource
dependence theory, as well as prior research on the value of networks, it is the intention of this study to determine if administrative leadership at American IBCs is displaying characteristics of inter-connectedness to the host country through network ties.
Chapter Three

Research Methodology

Introduction

In this chapter the design and methodology for this qualitative study are presented. The design of the study is based on three key factors: (1) A void in the current literature on the administrative leadership role at IBCs and on IBCs in general, (2) Prior research conducted on network ties both in the university and other industry settings, and (3) Prior experience from a pilot study on the IBC Joint Advisory Boards of American universities in Qatar. The literature review provides a foundation from which to understand the ways in which network ties have been previously explored and thus guides an adaptation of techniques for this study.

Current studies on U.S. university leadership network ties are primarily confined to institutions within the U.S. borders and conducted using data on members of university boards of trustees (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006). University presidents are also a significant source of current research within the scope of HE governance (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006). Within the context of the international market of HE, this presents a limitation to the research, as it does not adequately reflect the multinational presence of HE leadership. This limitation does not allow for a more comprehensive understanding of the unique role of leadership at university campuses where program delivery is provided outside of the U.S. and in environments that are culturally and politically different than the home campus.
Given the growth of HEIs exploring and providing programs beyond U.S. borders, the lack of a comprehensive body of research on American IBCs is a shortcoming in the current higher education literature. More specifically, the lack of research on factors contributing to the sustainability of American IBCs is a striking shortcoming of the current literature on IBCs. Given that prior research indicates network ties and/or director interlocks are a key means of stabilizing resources and establishing legitimacy for an organization both within and across borders (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006), it is important to gain a better understanding of how IBC network ties within a host country are contributing to the sustainability of IBCs.

This study attempts to address this limitation in the literature in two distinct ways. The study is designed to first capture the types of formal leadership structures at American IBCs, as the individuals comprising these structures are often the ones negotiating resources for the programs. Second, using data found on IBC leadership, the study attempts to identify the types of networks or associations existent between members of IBC leadership and the host country, and to better understand the potential for access to resources an IBC may have within the host country. While it cannot be determined by this study whether particular resources are more valuable than others in ensuring sustainable IBC endeavors, it provides the first comprehensive look at how IBC leadership is structured and in what ways IBC leadership is potentially connected to the host country through networks.
**Conceptual Model**

In order to guide the study design and address the research questions a conceptual model was constructed based on the theoretical framework presented in the literature review. The conceptual model was then utilized in the collection and analysis of data to address the research questions. Envisioning the branch campus as a resource dependent organization, the IBC leadership acts as a conduit between the internal environment of the branch campus and the external environment of the host country to facilitate the acquisition of resources for survival. Based on the literature, IBC leadership networks are a potential mechanism for gaining access to necessary resources in the external environments through their associations. In other words, the social capital and networks of IBC leadership acts as a mechanism to acquire access to resources necessary for the long-term viability of the branch campus.

In the model depicted below, the IBC Administrative Leadership is placed at the center, highlighting its role as the central conduit facilitating access to resources, with the arrows representing it’s role in using networks to connect the internal environment (branch campus) with the external environment and acquire resources for the IBC. The gray circular arrow represents the continual flow of potential access to resources for the IBC through networks established by IBC leadership with the external environment. The external environment has potentially valuable resources needed by branch campuses in a host country that can be accessed through the networks and associations established by IBC leadership. For example, a member of an IBC leadership team may have a connection through prior
employment with the Ministry of Education within the host country. This connection with the Ministry of Education may enable valuable access to or knowledge of quality standards and licensure regulations established by the host country. In this way IBC leadership through its association with the Ministry of Education can use their network to bring the valuable resource of information from
the external environment (host country government agency) to the internal environment of the branch campus.

In order to answer the proposed research questions, the aim in the collection of data was to construct an illustrative structure (concept map) representative of the connections between the IBC leadership and the external environment through networks and associations as depicted in the conceptual model (See figure 3.2).

**Figure 3.2 Concept Map Example**

![Concept Map Example](P 1: IBC Example.pdf)

By constructing these maps it was hoped that the results could be analyzed in terms of the potential access to resources IBC leadership has with the external
environment of the host country. For example in Figure 3.2 the fictional IBC is associated with three onsite administrative leaders (human resource, rector, and student affairs). In this concept map the human resources administrator is identified has having connections or associations with a financial institution, a legal entity, and a political organization. These connections are further identified as being associated with the host country. The arrows highlight the path within the map of connections between the IBC leadership and the host country. In this example 9 potential associations (networks) were found between the IBC leadership and the host country. For each IBC selected in this study, a structure (concept map) representing the associations connecting IBC leadership and the external environment of the host country was constructed with the data collected.

**Methodological Approach**

A qualitative approach using network analysis methods and applications is used for this study. The focus of network analysis is on relationships and on the patterns and implications of these relationships (Wasserman & Faust, 2009, Scott, 2010, Knoke & Yang, 2008). In this way network analysis is much like the theoretical concept of social capital described in chapter II and resonates with the conceptual framework designed for the study. Thus it was deemed to be an appropriate methodological choice for this study given that this study is grounded in a theoretical concept focusing on the importance of relationships between people as being essential to the acquisition of needed resources for organizations. Unlike other studies utilizing network analysis methodology to analyze relational data, this study attempts to move beyond connecting the ties between people. It attempts to
identify the interconnectedness IBCs have to a host country through the relational ties between individuals and their organizational affiliations.

The origins of network analysis as a research method dates back to the 1930s, pioneered by psychiatrist Jacob Moreno (Newman, 2010, Scott, 2010). At a medical conference in New York City, Moreno presented compelling findings on the social networks of school children to depict the patterns of friendships the children engaged in (Newman, 2011). Moreno later expanded his work with the development of a book ironically entitled *Who shall survive*, which is credited with being the “seeds” to the field of sociometry, which is now known as social network analysis (Newman, 2011, p. 37). According to Newman (2011), the important point to take away from Moreno’s original work that has carried through over the years and makes the use of network analysis appealing for the study of relationships “is that there are so many different possible definitions of an edge (associations /links) in any such network” (Newman, 2011, p.37). According to Newman (2011), “edges (associations/links) may represent professional relationships, exchange of goods or money, communication patterns, or sexual relationships, or many other types of connections” (p.37).

As a methodological tool, network analysis enables the researcher to create a structure out of identified relationships or to map a vast landscape of interconnections (Wasserman & Faust, 2009, Knoke & Yang, 2008, Friese, 2012). Network analysis uses the term ‘structure’ to define the patterns found in relationships (Wasserman & Faust, 2009). In other words, the characteristics of the structure in the form of a concept map or network view that is created with the data
can be evaluated to reveal a story (Friese, 2012, Attride-Stirling, 2001). Network analysis relies on the assessment of an illustrative image that is created from data uncovered on the network or associations of the subjects in a study. Information can be extracted from the illustration by assessing the density of the concept map or flow of networks and the overall patterns or themes found from the assessment of the paths from the key nodes to other nodes. Highly dense structures can be an indication of a high level of connectedness (Scott, 2010, Knoke & Yang, 2008, Friese, 2012). A highly dense map/network structure is defined as a structure with multiple paths (nodes and links) (Scott, 2010, Knoke & Yang, 2008, Friese, 2012). The structure may resemble the shape of a young oak tree with a small number of branches or it may resemble that of a mature willow tree with many layers of branches flowing around a central node (Scott, 2010, Knoke & Yang, 2008). In either case a map displaying a number of links connecting nodes is visually dense in appearance, and conversely a map displaying a small number of links connecting nodes is visually sparse in appearance (Scott, 2010, Knoke & Yang, 2008).

In addition to map density, examination of the themes or patterns of the networks or how the paths are connected is an important finding (Scott, 2010, Knoke & Yang, 2008, Attride-Stirling, 2001). In the case where no links (associations) are identified the structure is identified as an isolate and suggests that there is an absence of a network or in the specific case of this study, an absence of interconnectedness between the IBC and the host country (Scott, 2010, Knoke & Yang, 2008). These structures can be used to analyze and make comparisons with the data collected.
Previous research looking at university trustee network ties employed qualitative techniques using secondary sources such as document retrieval, as opposed to interviews or questionnaires, demonstrating the use of these methods as particularly useful in uncovering patterns and themes. This is due primarily to three reasons: 1) it is difficult to contact university board trustees (elites) for interviews or surveys (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006), 2) the use of documents does not limit the identification of relational ties to the bias of the respondent (Marshall & Rossman, 2011), and 3) the sheer number of actors that a researcher would potentially need to interview in a large and global study makes interviewing prohibitive due to the labor intensity and expense of interviewing (Newman, 2011, Marshall & Rossman, 2011). In cases where interviews or surveys have been administered by the researcher, data is bound by both the respondent’s bias and their fixed choice in whom they report as a relational tie (Newman, 2011, Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Given the global nature of this study, the large number of IBCs being researched (n=61), and the unknown number of actors that will be identified holding leadership positions at the IBCs, it was determined that for the purpose of this study, using secondary sources of data (documents) was the most appropriate choice.

Fleming and Frenken (2007) and Pusser, Slaughter, and Thomas (2006) both provided useful methodologies in their studies on networks that helped guide the design of this study. In both of these studies archived documents were used as a source of secondary data to examine the extent of and type of patterns that existed regarding network ties.
Pusser, Slaughter, & Leslie (2006) examined how boards of trustees at leading research universities are linked to networks outside of the university through board interlocks. They chose research universities as their target population due to the fact that the literature they reviewed suggested that research universities are the most likely type of university to engage in entrepreneurial tendencies and therefore are more likely to be dependent on networks to acquire resources for the entrepreneurial activities. Although IBCs are not typically considered research universities, IBCs are similar in this vein in that IBCs themselves are often considered entrepreneurial activities engaged in by multinational universities. In this way, IBCs exhibit similarities in being potentially dependent on networks by virtue of the fact that they are in many cases entrepreneurial entities operating at a great distance from the home campus.

Fleming and Frenken (2007), through extensive document analysis, examined the evolution of networks within a single region. This study is particularly helpful in looking at networks from a regional perspective. IBC are entities often established to meet transnational and trans-regional demand for HE, however in some cases they are also established as entities operating within a confined region to meet the human capital needs in a particular developing region. The study is also helpful in that it focuses on an industry that depends on networks to gain access to cutting edge innovative knowledge in order to achieve success. IBCs are similar in that they are centers of knowledge expected to prepare the citizens of a region to successfully enter a highly competitive labor market. It was unknown at the outset of this study whether network ties found at IBCs would be as
tightly bound to the specific region as the patterns suggested in the study on Silicon Valley. However, the methods Fleming and Franken (2007) used were useful in overall guidance in the techniques used for searching within documents and revealing patterns and themes to uncover network ties within a single region. Other useful techniques used by Fleming and Franken (2007) to verify names, isolate individuals of interest, and code data from a large database were considered in the design of this study.

Drawing from methodological techniques used in the studies described above and from an assessment of qualitative analysis tools available for network analysis, it was determined that Atlas ti. would be utilized for this study. Utilization of Atlas ti, a computer-aide qualitative data analysis software program, enabled the process of converting secondary website documents (hermeneutic units) into a visual illustration of networks or inter-connectedness between IBC leadership and a host country (Friese, 2012). Utilizing the “network view “ function in Atlas ti, the coding and the creation of concept maps(network views) enabled visualization of leadership structures, density of inter-connectedness, and themes or patterns of networks within each IBC (Friese, 2012).

The following sections of this chapter explain how and to what extent qualitative network analysis methods, applications, and tools were utilized to uncover the answers to the research questions posed in this study.
Selection of IBCs

In order to create the concept maps in Atlas ti, data needed to be collected on all of the American IBCs meeting the criteria for the study. Data was collected through extensive website searches. It was then organized by case (IBC) into pdf documents, imported into Atlas ti as a hermeneutic unit, coded, and then analyzed to identify the patterns and themes found between IBC leadership and organizations within the host country. Within case and cross-case comparisons were used to identify similar or dissimilar patterns across the cases based on a number of characteristics, such as type of funding model.

It was the intention of this study to collect data on the entire population, with few exclusions, of U.S. international branch campuses that have a home campus listed as either a public or private nonprofit institution in the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS). The exclusions included medical and dental branch campuses, community colleges, and any school not listed in IPEDS. The IBCs selected were identified by using IBCs listed by both the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT) at the University at Albany and OBHE. 40 institutions were found which met the criteria for this study. For the purposes of this study, the IBCs selected were confirmed as being a private nonprofit or public institution in IPEDS. Of these 40 institutions, 10 of them are public and 30 of them are private nonprofits. The 40 institutions represent 61 campuses in 34 countries and 7 regions. No further institutions were added after the time of the acceptance of this proposal and if a campus closed during the time of this study it was dropped from study. See Table 3.1 for a listing of IBCs identified at the onset of the study.
Table 3.1 List of U.S. International Branch Campuses (C-Bert, 2012)
*Denotes IPEDS listing as a public university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch Campus</th>
<th>Host Country</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College, City University of New York*</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University*</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri State University*</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College, City University of New York*</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah College of Art and Design</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland College</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College, City University of New York*</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary Institute of America</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University Tisch School of Arts</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago Booth Business School</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Las Vegas Nevada*</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College, City University of New York*</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australia/Oceania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Southern University</td>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Marie University Latin America</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Central America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University*</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Central America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City University of Seattle</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College, City University of New York*</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology*</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City University of Seattle</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire State University, SUNY*</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Indianapolis</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDaniel College</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark University</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark University</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City University of Seattle</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berklee College of Music</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City University of Seattle</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Intercontinental University</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago Booth School of Business</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University School of Foreign</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University*</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University*</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Film Academy</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>UAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>UAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>UAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University Fuqua School of Business</td>
<td>Dubai</td>
<td>UAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Silicon Oasis</td>
<td>UAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairleigh Dickinson University</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>N. America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>N. America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potsdam, State University of New York*</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>N. America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliant International University</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>N. America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endicott College</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>N. America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookdale College Ecuador</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>S. America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark University</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to IBC closures, additional grounds for elimination emerged during the study. The elimination of 13 IBCs occurred during the course of the study (See Table 3.2), resulting in data collection on 48 American IBCs from 32 institutions out of the 61 American IBCs from 40 institutions listed in Table 3.1. Table 3.2 highlights the branches that were eliminated as well as the reason they were eliminated. Reasons for elimination included the fact that some websites were not in English, it was discovered that the home campus is a for-profit institution, information was not sufficient on their websites for data collection on IBC leadership, or the campus closed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Host Country</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Reason for Removal from Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City University of Seattle</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Website not in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliant International University</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Language barrier, websites in Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookdale College</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Community college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland College</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Offers 2 year degree at branch site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri State University</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Offers 2 year degree at branch site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College, City University of New York</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Not open at time of data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Closed/Closing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Website in Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Intercontinental</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>For-Profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Only offers Study Abroad programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potsdam College, SUNY</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>No information on website concerning administrative staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah College of Art and Design</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No information on website concerning administrative staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City University of Seattle</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No information on website concerning administrative staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection

In their study on university governance members, Pusser, Slaughter, & Leslie (2006) address the somewhat obvious yet critical starting point to the collection of data for network analysis. First, members of boards needed to be identified, which is also the case in this study, where members of IBC leadership needed to be identified. Pusser, Slaughter, & Leslie (2006) used institutional records to identify members of governance boards, which is a similar technique used for the collection of data in this study.

Secondary data were collected for this study using a variety of Internet websites. Using the Internet as a resource for data is considered an emerging method and one that gives a researcher access to large amounts of data that would potentially not be available by any other means (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, Newman, Barabasi, & Watts, 2006, Ripley, 2007). One of the key advantages of using the Internet to collect data is that it provides access to information to a large number of people, and it does so around the globe (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, Ripley, 2007). This access to information on individuals around the globe is an important aspect of why Internet website searches are the preferred method of data collection for this study, as IBCs are located around the world.

In order to collect data for this study each IBC website, as a form of institutional document, was reviewed for identification of IBC leadership. The onsite administrative staff and boards were almost always listed on IBC website tabs labeled administration, leadership, or about us. All information provided on the websites about the IBC leadership team was cut and pasted directly into Microsoft
Word documents to later be converted into a hermeneutic unit. Similar to other types of data collection techniques, the data collection from websites needs to be highly organized, efficient, and validated for cleanliness (Newman, 2011, Fleming & Frenken, 2007). For the organization of the data, Atlas ti. was used to store, code and manage the networks views developed for this study.

Once the data was collected on who the actual members of the IBC leadership team were, including the types of onsite administrative position listed and any presence of a board supporting the IBC, a Google search was completed to further identify background information on these individuals in an effort to potentially identify connections within the host country. My prior pilot study on board structures in Qatar enabled me to learn by trial and error how to systematically and efficiently find data on individuals. Using items such as a middle initial or searching together their name and the university they attended oftentimes generated more efficient searches. A significant aspect of the web searching is verifying the person you want to collect data on is the person you are collecting data on. During the pilot study verification and accuracy of individuals was done by verifying their information or biographies on multiple websites. Fleming and Frenken (2007) employed a similar verification technique in their study of inventors. They created a list of comparisons such as whole first name, whole middle name, whole last names, home city, home state, and corporation. If an inventor was found to positively match all the criteria then it was deemed a match and cleaned for use (Fleming & Frenken, 2007).
A variety of websites were searched for each individual until it was determined that no new information could be found. Any information suggesting an association linking or connecting the individual of the IBC leadership with an entity external to the IBC but within the host country or region was collected (Newman, 2011). Information about prior employment, family, education background, committees or boards served on, publications, and research interests were some of the types of data collected. Many IBC websites provided background information or resumes on their leadership. Board sites often supplied brief bios on each board member. University online publications also offered a source of information.

Additional sources of data were found in the following websites:

- University and college websites
- Alumni network sites
- Government websites
- Foundation websites
- Publication and research articles
- Biographies from corporate websites
- Biographies from private business sites (such as an attorney who owns her own firm)
- Forbes.com/profile pages
- Linkedin.com
- Businessweek.com
- Google and other search engines
For maintaining accuracy of information, each piece of information on an individual was cut from the website it was found on and pasted into a case file along with the information extracted from IBC websites listing the IBC administrative staff and board members. For each of the 48 IBCs a case file was created of secondary documents directly cut and pasted from websites. The case files were then imported into Atlas ti. for primary coding and the creation of concept maps or network views of each case.

**Document Coding**

Once data was completed on each IBC or case, the documents were coded in Atlas ti., so that further analysis of the documents could take place with visualization of graphic illustrations. Primary coding of the cases was done with ‘in vivo’ coding. In vivo coding refers to the actual or verbatim language used in the documents and is considered ideal for use in qualitative studies attempting to unearth typologies (Salana, 2009). In vivo coding entailed highlighting the text verbatim so that the highlighted text acted as the actual code name (Friese, 2012, Saldana, 2009). Using the code manager in Atlas ti., the quotation code tab was applied to any information in the text deemed important to understanding the case in terms of the overall administrative structure or interconnections with the host country. Highlighted text or in vivo codes were minimized to under 40 characters and no more than 120 in vivo codes were created in each case (Friese, 2012). These codes were later directly imported into the network view function in Atlas ti.. These in vivo codes served as the nodes within the network view (Friese, 2012). Within the network view function
the nodes were digitally connected using the link function to draw associations between nodes (Friese, 2012). The end result was an illustrative view of all the onsite administrative positions listed on each IBC website and the listing of the number of board members identified. The network view also contains all of the possible associations that were found between each individual and the host country or region where the IBC is located. See Appendices A-F for a sample of the network views created for select cases.

After the initial cycle of primary coding was completed using in vivo coding, second cycle pattern coding was applied to the network views. Pattern coding is considered an appropriate method for the examination of networks and human relationships (Saldana, 2009, Miles & Huberman 1994). The network views were subjected to pattern coding in order to identify the themes of interconnectedness emerging from the data (Saldana, 2009, Attride-Stirling, 2001). Through the examination of the network views within and among the 48 cases a large number of associations were grouped into a smaller set of themes (Saldana, 2009). The combination of first cycle in vivo coding of the website generated documents and second cycle pattern coding of the network views enabled an in depth analysis of both the formal structures of IBC leadership and the interconnectedness between IBC leadership and the host country.

**Data analysis**

Analysis of the data collected and coded occurred within and across the cases. The first aspect of the analysis was within case assessment of the data for
each of the 48 IBCs (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The analysis of each case (IBC) was done with the intent to generate individual descriptions of the administrative leadership structures and to identify the types of associations between the IBC leadership and the host country for each of the IBCs. Guided by the conceptual model designed for this study, the network views were examined to determine the types of associations that might facilitate access to the type of resources an IBC operating in a host country might need. Access to resources in areas such as a host country's cultural familiarity, language, finance, legal, real estate, regional labor markets, and government regulation were identified in the literature review as being important for the sustainability of organizations operating across geo-political borders.

The second phase of the analysis was a cross-case assessment of the data to identify similarities and differences among the cases (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Another intent of the analysis was to identify outliers or data that did not fit a pattern or appeared to display unique characteristics (Rapley, 2007). Cross-case analysis was used to develop a typology of IBC leadership structures and to assess the similarities and differences across the IBCs based on a number of factors such as:

- Geographic region where each IBC is located
- Funding model
- Private versus Public institution
- Numbers of years of operation in the host country
The exploration of these factors within and across cases was guided by the research questions and hypotheses for this study.

**Limitations**

At the outset of this study several notable limitations were identified that could potentially impact both data collection and the ability to include all of the identified IBCs. Limitations were anticipated to exist in four key areas: data accuracy, missing data, causality, and language barriers.

- **Data Accuracy**: Limitations in data accuracy are twofold. The first limitation in data accuracy occurs during the initial stage of the study in the identification of IBC leadership. Since institutional websites were used to extract data on individuals working in administrative leadership positions at the IBC, the study is limited by the accuracy of the IBC websites and the ability to find information on the websites. It is not always evident how up to date websites are kept. The study was also limited by only knowing about those individuals listed on a particular IBC website. The second limitation in data accuracy lies in the second stage of the study in the identification of the networks. The study was limited due to the accuracy of the data collected on the networks between IBC leadership and the external environment. The study involved multiple Google searches of individuals and although attempts at verification were made, there is no guarantee as to the level of accuracy of the information found within secondary sources.
- **Missing Data:** Although the aim of the study was to identify all possible networks that IBC leadership may be associated with, in reality it is impossible for several reasons to identify all of the networks, relationships, or ties that IBC leadership may have with the host country through website searchers. The network views made up of nodes and links for each IBC were confined to those associations identified through websites. Therefore the network view that was constructed from data collected may not represent a complete picture of the phenomenon.

- **Causality:** The intent of the study was to identify where possible connections exist between a particular IBC and the external environment. Theoretically networks increase access to resources, however this study is not designed to establish whether the networks found actually increased access to resources. The study is limited in that it cannot determine whether networks increased access to resources. It is also limited in establishing whether or not networks actually increase sustainability of an IBC. The study is not intended to measure the quality or strength of the networks found nor is the intention of the study to identify whether the connections actually resulted in the acquisition of resources for an IBC. In other words, the study is not designed to confirm that if the networks did indeed produce access to resources, that these resources would then lead to a more sustainable organization had the networks not existed. The study is purely focused on identifying if
connections exist regardless of their strength or whether they resulted in resource acquisition.

- **Language Barriers**: Through prior work collecting data for C-BERT and my pilot study, it was discovered that many of the IBC websites are available in English. However, on occasion IBC websites are not available in English, such as Clark University’s website for their branch in Russia. These types of cases present limitations to the study in that the collection of data was limited to websites with information presented in English. This limitation also held true for website searches on individuals that lead to sites unavailable in English.

**Summary**

In summary, a qualitative web based study was undertaken to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the administrative structures that exist at 48 American IBCs chosen from lists compiled and maintained by C-BERT and OBHE. Once the administrative structures and individuals holding administrative positions had been identified, the study sought to identify patterns in the connections between these individuals and the host country. Data collected was imported into Atlas ti. in order to facilitate the application of qualitative network analysis methods to the posed research questions regarding IBC leadership and interconnectedness to the host country.
Chapter Four

Findings and Analysis

Introduction

This chapter will present the findings and the analysis of the data using both descriptive findings and illustrative findings using graphical concept maps. As outlined in the previous chapter, graphical concept maps are utilized as a qualitative method for connecting links (associations) to nodes (IBC leadership and their connections with a host country) in order to identify density of connections and themes of networks (Friese, 2012, Attrides-Stirling, 2001). The creation of concept maps (network views) are derived from the coding and analysis of a collection of website documents for each IBC (Friese, 2012). IBC leadership was identified on the respective IBC homepage websites. Additional information found on individual IBC leadership members was identified through extensive Google searches. The creation of the concept graphs (network views) produced an illustrative picture that enabled a visual representation of the existing administrative structures at each IBC. The concept map also enabled the visualization of the themes of interconnectedness that were found between administrative leadership at the respective IBCs and the host country. The findings and analysis reflect the case-by-case analysis of each IBC arrangement, as well as a collective review of the American IBCs as a cohort of institutions providing cross-border education, bounded by the definition of an IBC from Chapter 1.

Interconnectedness was established by identifying potential network ties (associations) between members of IBC leadership and the host country. The
network ties or associations represent potential relationships that may result in access to resources or information important to the sustainability of an IBC (Newman, 2011, Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). The terms interconnectedness, network ties, and associations are used interchangeably in the literature and in this chapter to describe these type of relationships, with the understanding that the associations may or may not lead to the actual access or acquisition of information or resources in any given case. Having said this, networks can be a source of valuable information for an organization to manage its dependence on the external environment (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, Scott & Davis, 2007).

The chapter is guided by the proposed research questions and theoretical concepts presented in the preceding chapters 1 and 2. Each research question and hypothesis is individually examined and answered by analyzing the descriptive findings and submitting of the data to graphical analysis. Three key areas of findings addressed in this chapter are 1) the description of the differing administrative structures found within the IBCs, 2) the themes of interconnectedness found between IBC leadership and the host country in which the branch campus operates, and 3) how the source of funding may or may not relate to the administrative structures of the IBC or the types of interconnectedness found between IBC leadership and the host country.

From the descriptive findings of administrative structures a typology was created as a means for organizing the IBCs based on their similar characteristics or patterns. The data produced a typology with 6 types of differing administrative structural arrangements. With the use of the created typology, along with the
concept maps (network views) created in Atlas ti, the answers to the research questions regarding variations in source of funding and interconnectedness were then assessed for the emergence of patterns.

The following section describes the typology created from my data collection. More specifically, the section discusses how the typology was created from the patterns that emerged through data collection and the quotation coding of website documents. It also discusses group by group the placement of IBCs into each of the 6 administrative categories. The use of the typology is then used to answer the proposed research questions and to address the posed hypotheses related to the research question.

**American International Branch Campus Leadership Structure Typology**

Data obtained on 48 American IBCs located in 7 geographic regions was used to create the *American International Branch Campus Leadership Typology (American IBC- LST)*. The institutions studied were a variety of private nonprofit and public institutions offering a range of differing types of degree programs such as business, engineering, communication, international relations, culinary, education, and computer science. Graphical concept maps of each IBC as described in chapter III were analyzed to identify the members of leadership at each institution. The concept maps also were utilized to assess the types of network themes or interconnectedness between IBC leadership and the host country in which the IBC operates. The analysis of patterns across the 48 IBCs, led to a classification system of 6 different categories of formal leadership structures.
The IBCs were organized into categories based on 5 distinct criteria which were derived from patterns that emerged from analysis of the concept maps (See Table 4.1). The patterns derived from the assessment and coding of Internet based documents are 1) the size of the onsite administrative staff, 2) the presence or absence of a board structure, 3) the arrangement of a partnership with a host country postsecondary institution or partnership with an educational consulting group in the delivery of a program, 4) the interconnectedness between the members of onsite administrative leadership and the host country, and 5) the interconnectedness between members of an IBC board members and the host country.

**Table 4.1 Typology Classification of American IBC Administrative Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Onsite Administrative Staff Size</th>
<th>Board Structure</th>
<th>Density of onsite Administrative network links*</th>
<th>Density of Board Member network links*</th>
<th>Host Country University or Educational Consulting Group Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category Ia.</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category Ib.</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category Ic.</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category II.</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0-27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category III.</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category IV.</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This category represents the total number of potential interconnected links found between an administrator or board member (nodes) associated with a branch
campus and the host country (node) in which the branch campus is located. Interconnectedness was identified through coding open access documents in Atlas Ti. and analysis of graphical concept maps for each IBC.

Table 4.1 displays how the categories are distinguished based on the above criteria. The 6 categories of IBC leadership structure are labeled Category Ia, Category Ib, Category Ic, Category II, Category III, and Category IV. It should be noted that the categories are not in any way a measurement of function, quality, or effectiveness of any particular IBC. The categories were established based on the direct representation of leadership structures as they were presented on the respective IBC websites.

Criteria of the Typology

Onsite administrative staff

Although an analysis of the IBCs revealed a range of onsite administrative structures, the number of individuals listed fell into two distinct criteria based on the number of staff members they listed as working at the branch campus. The two criteria consisted of branches with the identification of 0 to 5 onsite administrative staff members (small) listed on their webpages or those with greater than 5 onsite administrative staff members (large) listed. The IBCs that demonstrated a pattern of having administrative structures with greater than 5 members were placed into either Category Ia (Table 4.3), the Category Ib (Table 4.4), or Category Ic (Table 4.5). Category Ib and Category Ic were created for 5 IBCs that were similar to IBCs in Category Ia in terms of having large administrative structures, but could not be definitively placed with other institutions displaying similar patterns of having large
onsite administrative staff. They were dissimilar in two different ways. In the case of IBCs meeting Category Ib criteria, they had a large onsite administrative staff and a board structure but no network information could be found. In the case of IBCs meeting the Category Ic criteria, these institutions also had a large onsite administrative staff but did not have a board structure. IBCs that listed a range of 0-5 onsite administrative staff members were classified as Category II (See Table 4.6), Category III (See Table 4.7), or a Category IV (See Table 4.8).

**Board Structure**

The presence of a board structure on the IBC websites was also a pattern that led to the second criteria in the typology. In combination with the size of the onsite administrative staff, an IBC was considered for a category in the *American IBC-LST* based on whether there was the presence of a board structure supporting the IBC as listed on their website. Category Ia, and Ib, and Category II are all IBCs having a board structure, as opposed to IBCs classified as Category Ic, III, and IV, which do not have any board structures listed on their websites. Board members are generally defined on the IBC websites as individuals who guide or oversee direction of the branch campus, but are not part of the onsite administrative or leadership site. The University of Chicago Booth School of Business defines the mission of their Global Advisory Board as a structure, “created to leverage Chicago Booth’s many extraordinary assets to increase our global visibility and strengthen our relationships with the worldwide corporate and entrepreneurial communities.” (University of Chicago, Booth School of Business, 2012).
The composition of the varying boards was found to range in size, titles, and arrangements. Board structures were found in a variety of regions and in both public and private institutions. For example, Texas A&M, a public institution delivering engineering programs in Qatar lists a *Joint Advisory Board*. This board structure is made up of 6 individuals representing both the home campus and the host country (Texas A&M-Qatar, 2012). In contrast, the University of Chicago Booth School of Business in London, *Global Advisory Board* which is made up of three regional cabinets covering the Americas, Europe/Middle East/Africa, and Asia (University of Chicago, Booth School of Business, 2012). Each regional cabinet is represented by a number of individuals (20 or more) working in industries within the respective region they represent (University of Chicago, Booth School of Business, 2012).

Some samples of board titles and the IBCs using them included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint Advisory Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Texas A&amp;M, Qatar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University, Qatar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Advisory Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago, Booth School of Business, London &amp; Singapore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisory Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endicott College, Mexico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke University, Fuqua School of Business, Dubai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Density of Interconnections

The third and fourth criterions that emerged and guided the classification of IBC leadership structures are the theme of networks or interconnectedness found between IBC leadership and the host country. The density of these interconnections as visualized within the concept maps was evaluated case by case to help determine IBC category. During the coding of web-based documents, grounded by the conceptual model (pg. 62) designed for this study, 6 patterns or themes of interconnectedness between IBC leadership and the IBC host country emerged. Patterns were found during the identification and coding of associations (social capital) between a member of IBC leadership and the host country. The networks were coded based on the theoretical premises found in social capital theory and resource dependence theory, that these associations could lead to valuable resources for the sustainability of an IBC operating in a host country (Coleman 1988, Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). The 6 network themes are included in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2 Network Themes**

| 1. | An onsite IBC administrator at some previous point was employed by an organization based in the host country. |

---

Board of Trustees

| Culinary Institute of America, Singapore |

Board of Directors

| Rochester Institute of Technology, Dubai |
2. An onsite IBC administrator at some previous point was employed by a host country post-secondary institution.

3. An onsite IBC administrator attained an undergraduate or graduate degree in the host country.

4. An onsite administrator is native to or has familial relations in the host country or region.

5. The IBC was part of a partnership with a host country university or with an educational consulting company.

6. IBC board members worked for industries in the host country directly related to the types of programs offered by the IBC.

The density or number of connections found between IBC leadership and the host country among the 48 IBCs varied. No patterns based on density or number of connections found emerged based on geographic region, age of the IBC, or whether the institution was a private nonprofit or public. However, that being said, patterns in the types of network themes as listed above did emerge within the IBC groupings
Partnerships

A fifth criterion and pattern revealed during analysis of the data was a predominate presence of a partnership existing between an IBC and a host country postsecondary institution or a partnership between an educational consulting company and a home campus. The uniqueness of this type of partnership is that it is found in IBCs where there is a small administrative staff and no board structure. The purpose of these partnerships is to enable the delivery of a home campus program at an international site. In some cases the partnership was a co-locating sharing arrangement or it was a collaboration of program delivery. Category IV (See Table 4.8) of the typology was created for IBCs that were identified as having one of these two partnership arrangements, either with a host country institution or a private outsourced educational consulting company. For example, in the case of institutions delivering programs in China, due to policy requirements of the host country, an IBC operating in China is co-located and partnered with a host country institution. New York Institute of Technology, Nanjing is partnered with Jiangxi University of Finance & Economics, as well as, Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications. Johns Hopkins University works in collaboration with Nanjing University, and Webster University is partnered with Shanghai University of Economics & Finance. Partnerships were not exclusive to IBCs operating in China. Other IBCs and regions with the presence of a partnership include Clark University, Russia co-locating and working collaboratively with Astrakhan State University and Webster University, London with Regent’s College London. IBCs found to have partnerships with educational consulting groups to assist in the delivery of their international
programs include relationships such as the one between Baruch College School of Business, Singapore and the Parson’s Group or Baruch College School of Business Taiwan, with Chief Academy Education Group. Table 4.8 contains a list of the Category IV IBCs with their corresponding partnership institutions and or consulting groups.

IBCs with partnerships with Foundations such as the IBCs in Qatar that have partnerships with the nonprofit Qatar Foundation did not fall into a Category IV since these institutions also had a large onsite administrative staff and a board structure. which made them more suitable for Category Ia. Nor does it include partnerships IBCs’ have with Technology parks as part of host country economic initiatives such as Stevens Institute of Technology located in Santo Domingo’s Cyber Park or New York Institute of Technology Abu Dhabi. In the case of the IBCs as part of a technology park it was difficult due to the methodology used in this study to isolate the exact origin of the partnerships and or funding for these campuses, if any partnership existed at all. It is plausible that they may just be co-located in the park without a formal partnership.

Typology of American IBCs

Category Ia. IBCs

Table 4.3 lists the 6 IBCs that met the criteria or displayed similar patterns in the structure of their administrative leadership and board structure. All of these IBCs listed greater than 5 administrative onsite staff and a board structure. Inter-connectedness between leadership and the host country was found. With the
exception of Temple University, Japan, 5 out of the 6 IBCs are located in Doha, Qatar. The similarities between the 5 are representative of the arrangement the Qatar Foundation has with each of the institutions. The board structures are similar in that they have almost equal representation on the boards of members from the home campus and that of the host country. Each of the onsite administrative staff has a variation of personnel listed as dean, associate dean, student affairs, admissions, research, or chief operating officer. Temple University, Japan, despite being a much older (30 years) post WWII branch campus, also had a large onsite administrative staff and an extensive Board of Overseers. The onsite administrative staff listed a similar structural arrangement of dean, associate dean, communications, finance, academic affairs, and human resource personnel, as compared to the IBC institutions in Qatar. In both the case of the IBCs in Qatar and with the Temple IBC in Japan, the onsite administrative structure resembles a scaled down version of the home campus administrative structure. It seems likely that when moving from one locale to another, it is natural for an organization to continue with an organizational structure that is both successful and familiar or at least until it is discovered that what worked in one locale may not necessarily work in another locale. In this situation adaptation may need to take place.

Themes of interconnectedness were found within these IBCs between the onsite administrative staff and the host country and between the boards and the host country. In all but one IBC in Category Ia, a connection between at least one member of the onsite administration and the host country could be identified. In all cases multiple connections could be identified between board members and the
host country. Temple University, Japan’s 13 member Board of Overseers all had connections to the host country through their employers, such as Amazon Japan, American Express International, GE Healthcare Asia Pacific, and Hyponex Japan Corporation (See Appendix A. for Temple University network map).

Table 4.3 Category 1a. IBCs

- Large onsite administrative staff
- Board structure with large membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Host Country</th>
<th>Home country Funding</th>
<th>Host Country Funding</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas A&amp;M</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category 1b. Institutions

Table 4.4 includes 2 IBCs identified as having large onsite administrative staff and a board structure similar to the institutions in Category 1a, but few (0-2) associations were found between the IBC leadership and the host country. This is not to say that associations do not exist. However in both cases, a search for information and identification of the onsite administrative staff produced no usable data, therefore placing them in a Category I variant. For example, Berklee College of Music, Spain lists 11 members of their Advisory Board but no information was available on the members or their onsite administrative staff except the Executive Director (See Appendix B. for Berklee College network map). In the case of UNLV,
Singapore, the IBC website listed a number of onsite administrative staff but no information was found on their backgrounds or that of the Board of Directors.

Table 4.4 Category Ib. IBCs
-Large onsite administrative staff*
- Board structure*
*Unable to identify network ties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Host Country</th>
<th>Home Country Funding</th>
<th>Host Country Funding</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Las Vegas Nevada</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berklee College of Music</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category Ic. Institutions

Table 4.5 is also a variant category of Category I. in that these 3 institutions are similar by way of have a large administrative onsite staff. The difference between these institutions and those found in the Category Ia and Category Ib classifications, is that this group of IBCs does not have a board structure listed on their website. These institutions were also similar in that they are private nonprofit institutions. One out of the 3 receiving funding from the host country.

This group has a divergent pattern of density of interconnectedness between the onsite administrative staff and the host country. In particular, a number of associations were identified between the onsite administrative staff and the host country at Fairleigh Dickinson University, Canada (See Appendix C. for Fairleigh Dickinson network map). Network Themes found included the attainment of higher education degrees in Canada, as well as previous employment in the host country,
both in postsecondary institutions as well as other industries. No interconnections
could be found between the onsite administrative staff at New York University, Abu
Dhabi and the host country.

Table 4.5 Category Ic. IBCs
- Large onsite administrative staff
- No board structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Host Country</th>
<th>Home Country Funding Source</th>
<th>Host Country Funding</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairleigh Dickinson University</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates, Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Indianapolis</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category II. Institutions

The 9 IBCs placed into Category II display a number of similar characteristics
or patterns. All the IBCs in this grouping list less than 5 onsite administrative staff
members on their websites. Onsite administrative staff titles include some
combination of a rector, dean, campus chancellor, and perhaps an assistant dean,
rector, etc., and in some cases student affairs, academic affairs, or institutional
research. None of these institutions list a board structure and all of these
institutions are private nonprofit entities. The IBCs ranged in age, in their
geographic location, and in program offerings. This grouping contains an eclectic
mix of program offerings in business, arts, culinary, engineering, technology,
international affairs, and education. About half of them received some form of funding from the host country.

Another similarity found within this group was the interconnectedness between IBC leadership and the host country. The interconnectedness identified is almost exclusively found between that of the board members and the host country. The multiple connections found are a representation of a variety of industries that reflects the range of program offerings in this group of IBCs. For example, The University of Chicago’s Booth School of Business has 9 board members who represent the United Kingdom region and come from industries such as investment banking, real estate, petroleum, and the education sector based in the United Kingdom (See Appendix D. for Chicago Booth, London network map).

### Table 4.6 Category II. IBCs

- Small onsite administrative staff
- Board structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Host Country</th>
<th>Home Country Funding Source</th>
<th>Host Country Funding</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates, Silicon Oasis</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary Institute of America</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates, Dubai</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endicott College</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University Tisch School of Arts</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category III. Institutions**

Similar to the onsite administrative staff structures of Category II IBCs, all the IBCs in Category III meet similar criterion of listing less than 5 onsite administrative staff members. However, the main difference between the Category II and the Category III IBCs is that the Category III IBCs do not have board structures listed on their IBC websites (See Table 4.7). Of the 10 IBCs in Category III, most of them are more than 10 years old and they are mostly private nonprofit institutions. Funding by the host country could only be identified for 2 of the 10 IBCs in this category. In the case of Stevens Institute of Technology, Dominican Republic funding was part of an economic development initiative by the host country for the growth of a technology park (Stevens Institute of Technology-Dominican Republic, 2012). New York Institute of Technology, Abu Dhabi is also part of a technology park development but no information could be identified to confirm whether the host country provided any funding or resources for the endeavor (New York Institute of Technology, Abu Dhabi, 2012).

In contrast to the Category II IBCs, where few associations were identified between the onsite administrative staff and the host country, multiple associations
were found between the Category III IBCs onsite administrative staff and the host country. This finding is notable in that in the absence of a board structure with representatives from the host country, the IBCs displayed more associations or themes of networks via the onsite administrative staff than those IBCs that have board structures. The number of IBCs with a significant amount of longevity within the host country may also be an indicator as to the number of associations found.

Multiple associations were made during coding for network themes due to number of onsite administrative staff found to have had prior employment in the host country, prior employment at a postsecondary institution in the host country, being native to or related by familial relations to someone in the host country, and attainment of a postsecondary degree from a host country institution. Georgia Tech University, France is an IBC that displayed all of these network themes among its onsite administrative staff (See Appendix E. for the Georgia Tech network map).

**Table 4.7 Category III. IBCs**
- Small administrative onsite staff
- No board structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Host Country</th>
<th>Home Country Funding Source</th>
<th>Host Country Funding</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Indianapolis</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDaniel College</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maria University</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates, Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category IV IBCs**

The grouping of the 19 IBCs in the Category IV is due primarily to the finding that each of these institutions were identified as having a partnership with a postsecondary host country institution or with an educational consulting group. This distinction of having one of these types of partnerships made this group of IBC uniquely different than the IBC listed in all of the other categories. As was expected, all of the American IBCs with branches located in China are listed in the same category, Category IV. The policies established by the Chinese government require foreign educational entities to partner with a Chinese entity in the delivery of programs. Chinese institutions in China host four out of the 19 IBCs listed in Category IV (See Appendix F. for New York Institute of Technology, Nanjing network map).

The Category IV IBCs shares the similar characteristic of listing an onsite administrative staff of less than 5 members like that of those IBCs in categories of Category II, Category III. In the case of IBCs in the Category IV almost all of them
were found to have 0-3 onsite administrative staff members listed. The onsite administrative staff listed often included a single Director, Campus Dean, President, Academic Dean, or Co-director. Category IV IBCs also shares the similar criteria of Category III and Category Ic of not having a board structure listed on their website, with the exception of Baruch College, City University of New York, France. Baruch College, France listed a 9 member Board of Advisors. However, the branch website listed a collaboration/partnership with the School of Business and Economics in France and their website listed no administrative staff, which made placement of Baruch College, France IBC more similar to other IBCs in Category IV than that of the other categories. The 19 IBCs are a mix of public and private nonprofit institutions like that of some of the other categories. The Category IV IBCs displayed a range of operational longevity in their respective host country as well as variety in regional locations. The 6 out of the 19 IBCs that are public institutions are institutions with their home campuses in the state of New York. 5 out of those 6 IBCs are branches from the same home campus of Baruch College School of Business, City University of New York. The primary difference between Category IV IBCs and that of all of the other categories is the presence of a specific type of partnership.
Table 4.8 Category IV. IBCs

- Small administrative staff
- No board structure**
- Partnership between either a host country university and/or educational consulting group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Host Country</th>
<th>Home Country</th>
<th>Host Country Funding Source</th>
<th>Host Country Funding</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Host Country Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>International University Precinct*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jordan University of Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire State University</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>New York College Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City University of Seattle</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Switzerland University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City University of Seattle</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>City Unity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark University</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>University of Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark University</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Astrakhan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Regent’s College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Shanghai University of Finance and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bangkok Academic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College, City University of New York</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Parson’s Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College, City</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Coleman International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Universities and their locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of New York</th>
<th>Business School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College, City University of New York</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College, City University of New York**</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College, City University of New York</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Film Academy</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates, Abu Dhabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional institution partners listed reported on the Carnegie Mellon University branch campus website include the Australian Centre for Social innovation and the Torrens Resilience Institute.** Baruch College, City University of New York, France does list a board structure on their website. It is the one exception on this list.

Research Questions and Hypotheses Findings

Main Research Question A.

A. In addition to Joint Advisory Boards, what other types of administrative leadership structures exist within American International Branch Campuses?
Using the newly created *American IBC-LST*, findings from this study suggest that there are several types of administrative structures within the American IBCs. The structures include different sizes of onsite administrative staff, the presence or absence of a board structure, and partnership arrangements.

The number of onsite administrative staff listed on the 48 IBC websites revealed a range of zero to upwards of 8 members. The smaller onsite administrative staff usually consists of a dean or rector with one to two other administrators with the title of assistant director or a title including academic affairs, student affairs, legal or human resources. In some cases there is one director or dean listed on the website for the IBC without any other administrative staff listed. IBCs with large onsite administrative staff listed similar staff titles as the smaller group but with entire combinations of the titles listed above. For example, a small onsite administrative staff would include a director and an assistant director, but a large administrative staff would include both of these plus different individuals responsible for student affairs, human resources, academic advising, a chief operating officer, an director institutional research, and a director of recruitment.

Both IBCs with smaller and larger onsite administrative staff are paired with and without a board structure. In other words, findings revealed IBCs with small onsite administrative staff operate with and without board structures, and IBCs with large onsite administrative staff operate with and without a board structure. In the cases where no onsite administrative staff was listed it is plausible that they are
actually present but not listed on the IBC website, or the administrative staff in charge of administering the branch campus programs works out of the home campus, or the administrative staff is part of the host country partnered institution, or the administration of the programs occurs through the educational consulting groups.

The presence of board structures varied as much as the onsite administrative staff structures did. Some board structures consisted of 6-8 members and others consisted of more than 20. In all cases, members of board structures associated with a respective IBC were in some way connected to the host country. This connection will be discussed in detail in the following sections regarding the interconnectedness between IBC leadership and host countries. Board structures were identified in a variety of regions, in public and private nonprofit institutions, and in IBCs in a range of ages, and in IBCs offering a range of programs. For example, board structures were found in IBCs operating in England, Singapore, Japan, Mexico and Qatar. Board structures were present in public institutions such as Texas A&M, Qatar and in private nonprofit institutions such as Duke University, Dubai. And board structures were found in young IBCs such as the Culinary Institute of America, Singapore, age 1, and in older institutions like Temple University, Japan age 30.

It appears that a variety of reasons drive the formation of different combinations of onsite administrative and board structures. Some of the structural formations appear to be driven by the host country’s policies, such as the IBCs in China. In other cases, it appears to take shape based on the arrangement or contract
between the inviting host country entity and the home campus, such as the IBCs operating in Qatar. In some cases it appears to be driven by the home campus, where you see similar structural arrangements in IBCs from the same home campus but operating in different regions and/or countries within a region, such as Webster University in England and Thailand. With respect to board structures treated independently from onsite administrative structures, the tremendous variation in presence or absence of a board structure suggests that the presence of a board structure may more likely be driven by the requirements of the home campus establishing an IBC rather than based on policies established within a host country. For example Chicago University’s Booth School has a central Global Advisory Board that is established from the home campus but oversees the branch sites with representation through its regional cabinets for each of the regions they have a branch.

**Hypothesis for the study of research question A**

*The administrative leadership structures within an IBC will differ depending on the source of funding for the IBC (Lane 2010, Verbik & Merkley, 2006).*

Different sources of funding were found within IBC’s among the different leadership structures. The differences can be clarified with the help of the *American IBC- LST*. According to OBHE (2012) 17 out of 48 IBCs received funding from the host country (See Table 4.9).
Table 4.9 American IBCs that received funding from host country compared with the *American IBC LST*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Host Country</th>
<th>Home Country Funding Source</th>
<th>Host Country Funding</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category Ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category Ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas A&amp;M</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category Ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category Ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category Ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Las Vegas Nevada</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category Ib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates, Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category Ic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates, Silicon Oasis</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates, Dubai</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Film Academy</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates, Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Category IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Category Ia IBCs:

In the Category Ia (See Table 4.3), all of the IBCs received funding from the host country except Temple University, Japan. However, it is possible that Temple University received funding for the establishment of the IBC in Japan, but no documentation of the financial arrangement could be identified. IBCs in Category Ia utilize a leadership structure using a combination of both a large onsite administrative staff and a board structure.

Category Ib & Category Ic IBCs:

Category Ib and Ic (See Tables 4.4 & 4.5) also listed a large onsite administrative staff on their website, but only 2 out of the 5 IBCs within the categories combined received funding from the host country, New York University Abu Dhabi and University of Las Vegas Nevada, Singapore. Only 1 out of these 2 IBCs with funding listed a board structure.

Category II IBCs:

Four out of the 9 IBCs in Category II (See Table 4.6) received funding from the host country. All IBCs in Category II were IBCs of private nonprofit institutions with a board structure and a small onsite administrative staff varying in age and geographic location.

Category III IBCs:

In Category III (See table 4.7), 2 out of the 8 IBCs received funding from the host country. These IBCs all listed less than 5 onsite administrative staff members and no board structure. Both IBCs that received funding are private nonprofit institutions.
Type IV IBCs:

Four out of the 18 IBCs in Category IV (See Table 4.8) received funding from the host country. These IBCs all listed less than 5 onsite administrative staff members and no board structure. All of the IBCs listed in this category that received funding were private nonprofit institutions.

Summary

Of the 17 IBCs found to have funding from the host country, slightly more than half, 10 out of 17, of these IBCs have board structures listed on their websites, IBCs in Categories Ia, Ib, and III. In other words, 59% of the IBCs with a board structure received funding. However, out of the IBCs who don’t have a board structure, only 7 out of 30 received funding. In the analysis of IBC funding and administrative leadership it is found that it is 1.4 times more likely to find a board structure in an IBC that receives funding. In addition, if the IBC was funded by the host country and has a board structure, it is almost twice as likely that an IBC has an onsite administrative staff with greater than members, 7 out of 17 with large administrative staffs versus 4 out of 17 with small administrative staffs. These types of IBCs were found in the Type I categories.

Another finding in the assessment of host country funding and IBC leadership structure is the likelihood of host country funding in private nonprofit versus public institutions. 2 out of 9 public institutions received funding from the host country while 15 out of 39 private institutions received funding from the host country. Home campuses that are identified as private nonprofit institutions in
their home country are almost more than twice as likely to receive funding from the host country for their IBC than IBCs whose home campus is identified as a public institution.

**Main research question B.**

*B. Are individuals who hold administrative leadership positions at American IBCs displaying a characteristic of interconnectedness to the host country environment through network ties external to the branch campus?*

Findings suggest that administrative leadership at American IBCs does display characteristics of interconnectedness to the host country. In the coding and analysis of the graphical concept maps for each IBC, interconnectedness was found to exist in every leadership structure category (Categories, Ia, Ib, Ic, II, III, and IV). However, it was found that within each category of IBC leadership structure, different patterns of thematic networks emerged. As previously presented in this chapter in Table 4.2, the key network themes fell into 6 categories. Within each leadership structure category similar patterns of network themes emerged.

**Category Ia**

In Category Ia, 5 out of the 6 network themes were identified, with only network theme #5 missing (a partnership with a host country postsecondary institution or consulting group). The board structures in these IBCs contributed to an increased density of associations being identified within the concept maps between the IBC and the host country governments and industries. In this category,
network theme #6 appeared in each IBC concept maps, and at least one of the other network themes appeared in each case (See Table 4.10).

**Category Ib**

In Category Ib very little data was found regarding associations between the IBC leadership and the host country. This is not to say that more associations do not exist, only that in using the same data collection technique used to collect information on other IBCs, very little data was retrieved for this group of 2 IBCs. Of the data that was collected, Category Ib IBCs included network themes #2, #3, and #6 (See Table 4.10).

**Category Ic**

In Category Ic, where there is the presence of a small onsite administrative staff and no evidence of a board structure, 4 of the 6 network themes are identified which included themes #1, #2, #3, and #4. In each case, except for one, the onsite administrative staff displayed multiple themes of interconnectedness with the host country (See Table 4.10).

**Category II**

In Category II, IBCs with small onsite administrative staff and a board structure, interconnectedness of IBC leadership is found almost exclusively through the board members in each of the respective IBCs. The one exception in this group is Webster University, Austria. This IBC has onsite administrative staff who are native to the host country and have been previously employed by a host country postsecondary institution. The network theme most characteristic of the IBCs in Category II is theme #6 (See Table 4.10).
Category III

In Category III, network themes are found exclusively through the onsite administrative staff. No board structures were found among this group of IBCs, therefore eliminating network theme #6. Network theme #5 also did not exist among this group, as the IBC’s in this category do not have partnerships with host country postsecondary institutions or education consulting groups. However unlike the Category I IBCs, more than one or multiple associations were found between the onsite administrative staff and the host country. Network themes found in Category III include themes #1, #2, #3, and #4 (See Table 4.10).

Table 4.10  Network Themes per American IBC-LST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes by Type</th>
<th>Ia</th>
<th>Ib</th>
<th>Ic</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) An onsite IBC administrator at some previous point was employed by an organization based in the host country.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) An onsite IBC administrator at some previous point was employed by a host country postsecondary institution.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) An onsite IBC administrator attained an undergraduate or graduate degree in the host country.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) An onsite administrator is native to or has familial relations in the host country or region.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) The IBC was part of a partnership with a host country university or with an educational consulting company.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) IBC board members worked for industries in or governments of the host country directly related to the types of programs offered by the IBC.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category IV**

The distinctive network theme unique to IBCs in Category IV is that of a partnership arrangement between a host country postsecondary institution and the IBC or an IBC working with an educational consulting company to support the delivery of the program in a host country. However, although network theme #6 is the predominate avenue of inter-connectedness found, other themes were also found within this group regarding the onsite administrative staff. Although few in number, in some cases interconnectedness is identified between the onsite administrative staff and the host country. Themes found in the Category IV include #1, #3, #4, and #5 (See Table 4.10).
Summary:

Although a number of network themes are found among all of the IBC leadership structure typology categories, the presence of a board structure contributed to an increased number of associations being found between the host country and the IBC. However, in situations where an IBC has an administrative staff without a formal board structure (with the exception of the Category IV), the administrative staff displayed a greater density of interconnectedness with the host country than if a board was also present. Lastly, in Category IV, network themes were predominantly associations between the IBC and the host country through their relationship or partnership with a host country postsecondary institution.

Hypotheses for the study of research question B

Hypothesis 1.

*There will be no difference between the types of network ties established by public universities as compared to the network ties established by private nonprofit university branch campuses within their respective host countries, because public institutions behave much like private entities when moving across borders to establish branch campuses (Lane & Kinser, 2011, Knight, 2008).*

Following the findings from Research Question A., there were more similarities than differences between the types of network ties established by public university IBCs versus those of private nonprofit university IBCs. The difference
that emerged is that public universities were more likely to display a level of interconnectedness with the host country through their partnerships (network theme #5) as opposed to through a board structure or the onsite administrative staff. 5 out of the 8 public universities with IBCs fell into the Category IV leadership classification. The network theme that emerged out of the IBCs in Category IV is that of an interconnectedness found almost exclusively based on the partnership between a host country postsecondary institution or through an educational consulting group familiar with the host country in which the IBC is providing a program of study. In the cases where one public university IBCs is found in each of Category Ia, Ib, and III, the pattern of interconnectedness resembles that of the other private university IBC in the category, as is the case with the public universities in Category IV. In other words an IBC, whether public or private, displays similar themes of interconnectedness within their leadership structure category. No public university IBCs were found to fall into Category II where the interconnectedness displayed exclusively through board members.

**Hypothesis 2.**

2. *The types of network ties found between IBC administrative leadership and their external environment will be different depending on the source of funding for the IBC, as some IBCs are more dependent on the host country as a source of funding (Lane, 2010, Verbik & Merkley, 2006).*
An IBC funded by the host country can be found in all leadership structure categories (See Table 4.9) as presented in the *American IBC- LST*. Having established that similar patterns of network ties emerged within IBC leadership categories and differences were found among the leadership categories, findings for the patterns of funding in relationship to interconnectedness reflect the earlier findings. Variation of the 6 network themes or the type of interconnectedness varies within the group of IBCs funded by the host country. However, host country funded IBCs found in the same leadership structure category display similar patterns of interconnectedness.

In addition, previous findings suggest that it is more likely for an IBC to have a board structure if it also received funding from the host country, and so it follows that it is also more likely to find an IBC that receives funding from the host country to display a theme of interconnectedness between the host country and members of an IBC board structure. In short, although there is variation in the types of networks found among IBCs receiving host country funding, findings suggest that it is more likely to find associations between an IBC and the host country government or industry in an IBC that receives host country funding but also has a board structure. This makes sense in that it is logical for a host country who has made an investment in an endeavor, to want a to provide oversight or direction of the venture through membership on a board.

**Summary**

In conclusion, American IBCs display differing leadership structures and IBC leadership structures display different patterns of interconnectedness with the host
country. Significant findings identified in Chapter 4 include the fact that IBCs with host country funding are more likely to have board structures and a higher density of associations between the host country government and industry than those IBCs without a board structure and funding. It is also more likely to find an IBC that receives or received host country funding to be a branch of a home campus that is designated as a private nonprofit institution in the home country. It is also more likely, that is the absence of a board structure, a higher density of associations between the onsite administrative staff and the host country will be found as compared to the onsite administrative staff at IBC with a board structure. In the following chapter, theoretical considerations and discussion of these findings ensue.
Chapter Five

Interpretation of Findings, Future Considerations, and Conclusions

Importance of the study

This study grew out of a need for a greater understanding of ways in which IBCs were harnessing sustainable organizational practices to minimize risks such as significant financial losses, unplanned closures, and damage to the home campus’ academic reputation. IBCs are entrepreneurial endeavors pursued by HEIs in environments that are rapidly changing and sometimes politically unstable. While the establishment of IBCs represents an opportunity to deliver much needed HE to many parts of the world, it is critical to remain mindful that HE is also being delivered in countries that are geographically thousands of miles from the home campus and culturally different from the home campus. As was pointed out in Chapter 1 and compounding the issue of sustainability, the strategic planning by the home campus and the host country are not always aligned. In addition, the obstacles faced by the home campus in setting up a branch campus are not always foreseen. Researchers in this field have also pointed out that the process of adaptation by the branch campus and adoption by the home country can be a rocky one.

Organizational behavior literature suggests that social networks can act as a bridging mechanism for resource dependent organizations such as IBCs to overcome the challenges associated with understanding and adapting to a host environment and thus mitigating the risk associated with the endeavor. Therefore this study attempted to better understand and define the level of interconnectedness through the identification of IBC leadership networks. With the
growing presence of U.S. branch campuses around the globe, this study sought to contribute to the body of research addressing the role IBC leadership plays in the sustainability of these IBCs.

Organizations moving and operating across geopolitical borders face unique obstacles. Identifying and managing these obstacles is critical for organizations to survive, especially when moving across borders (Altbach, 2010, 2011, Lane, 2011, Kinser, 2011, Hughes, 2011, Knight, 2006). While the international business journal literature is replete with research on multinational enterprises (MNEs) moving across geopolitical borders over the last several decades, the literature is much less robust in the discussion of multinational universities moving across borders.

Reasons for this divergence in attention to cross border activity when comparing MNEs to HE entities can be explained in part by both the relative newness of international branch campuses and the relatively few international branch campus ventures present at this time. In contrast Li (2008) reported that China alone, by the end of 2007, had 286,200 foreign firms (MNEs) registered to do business in China for a total foreign investment of $2.11 trillion US dollars. Of the countries moving and operating firms in China through the end of 2007, investment by US companies was among the top five (Li, 2008). Although US HE entities are not moving operations across borders at a similar rate or with the same financial investment levels as are MNEs, HE entities are moving across borders like MNEs to increase the diversity of their offerings and to gain greater access to international markets. This study aimed to broaden the discussion in the literature regarding the obstacles and challenges faced by multinational universities moving across borders.
Even though HE entities and corporate enterprises are vastly different on many counts, they do share a similar interest in advancing their international ventures in a sustainable fashion, or at least in a manner allowing them to achieve their goals. In the same vein they also share a similar exposure to social, political, economic, and cultural differences between those of the home site and those of the host country. In order for either of these types of organizations to sustain their operations across borders they must be able to manage their dependency on the foreign external environment in which they choose to relocate their operations (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, Scott & Davis, 2007). This remains the case whether it is McDonalds in China or Georgia Tech in France (Li, 2008, Wilken & Sinclair, 2011).

One way in which organizations manage their dependency on a foreign external environment within a host country is through the network ties or social capital individuals within the organizations have with the external environment (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, Scott & Davis, 2007, Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1989). Networks enable individuals within an organization to gain valuable knowledge and resources needed by the organization to survive (Scott & Davis, 2007). These network ties or social capital held by individuals can be a valuable tool to help organizations connect with and understand the host country in which they are operating (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1989).

The importance of this study lies in the findings that IBC leadership at many IBCs was found to have a significant amount of connections to the host country, therefore placing IBCs in a position to reduce risk and maintain a sustainable endeavor until their goals are met. It was unknown at the outset of this study as to
what types of leadership structures existed at these IBCs. It was also unknown in what ways if any IBC leadership was connected to the host country. However, findings from this study suggest that interconnectedness is evident at a significant number of IBCs. It was found that IBCs employ individuals in leadership positions who have connections to the host countries and/or engage in partnerships with host country institutions. These findings are important in that they contribute to the discussion of ways in which IBCs as organizations can strategize more effectively and efficiently to operate a sustainable international branch campus for the delivery of programs and degrees in a geopolitically different environment than the home campus.

Additionally, this study is important in that it contributes a comprehensive look at the different models of formal leadership structures among the US IBCs. While US HE entities are not new to the international landscape of offering some variety of educational programs, the concept of an IBC is a relatively new organizational structure delivering educational programs and offering degrees. It is unknown if one type of organizational leadership structure is more suited to achieving particular goals over another, however the data in this research suggests that the type of formal leadership structure seems to be aligned with the type of funding an IBC received or did not receive in moving its operations across-borders.

Situated within the context of social capital theory and resource dependence theory this study unearthed formal IBC leadership structures, informal networks of IBC leadership, and identified ways in which IBC leaderships is connected to the host country. Documents gathered from IBC websites and other Internet sources
through Google searches were compiled and analyzed for 1) formal organizational structures and 2) informal networks between IBC leadership and the host country. Guided by qualitative network analysis as a methodology as well as the theoretical lenses of organizational social capital and resource dependence theory, evidence of formal organizational leadership structures and informal networks were mapped in the form of a concept map (Friese, 2012).

Using the concept maps to visualize the data collected allowed for the unfolding of evidence supporting the variation in formal IBC leadership structures and the themes of interconnectedness found among the US IBCs. The construction of the concept maps enabled the development of a typology to help better understand the differing formal IBC leadership structures. The typology in particular further enhanced the examination of the similarities and differences between public institutions and private nonprofit institutions. The concept maps also helped to better understand the interconnectedness of IBC leadership to the host country. A comparative analysis was undertaken to explore the similarities and differences found between the informal network ties connecting the IBCs’ formal leadership with the host country. Similarities and differences were examined based on geographic locale of the branches and the type of funding they received or did not receive. These analyses provided a view of the organizational arrangements of IBCs in terms of the types of formal leadership structures they set up at international branch sites as well as how IBC leadership is connected to the host country.

This chapter provides an overall summary of six significant findings found from this study, the interpretations of the findings, considerations for further
research, and thoughts on the future of IBC developments based on the findings in this study.

**Significant Key Findings and Interpretation**

Guided by two primary research questions and three corresponding hypotheses, this study examined IBC leadership structure and interconnectedness of the IBC leadership with the host country. It also examined the influences of funding, private versus public entities, and partnerships as they related to both leadership structure and interconnectedness. Six significant findings were identified.

**Research finding 1.**

1. Leadership structures at US IBCs fall into one of six categories based on the size of the onsite administrative staff, the presence of a board or not, density of network connections, and whether the IBC is part of a partnership with a post secondary institution in the host country.

**Interpretation of research finding 1.**

The findings from this study enabled the generation of the *American IBC-LST*. Through the identification of the formal IBC leadership structures at 48 IBCs and then the creation of a typology, the data collected revealed 6 categories of administrative structures. The IBCs were placed into the categories based on 5 distinct criteria, summarized in chapter 4. The findings suggest that there are multiple ways to structure leadership at an IBC. While there appeared to be
similarities within each IBC category based on criteria such as having a board structure and a large onsite administrative staff, there was variation across the categories. Arrangement of leadership structures appeared to be driven by a combination of home campus and host country requirements. For example, business schools such as Duke and the University of Chicago have boards which are a structural component of the home campus but oversee the international aspect of their endeavors. The US institutions supported by the Qatar Foundation also have boards but the membership is an amalgamation of both the home campus and the host country. This combination of participants in governance suggests that it is a collaborative leadership arrangement. Other institutions have small onsite staff but are partnered with a postsecondary institution in the host country which enables some sharing of services, suggesting that there is a reduced need for a large number of onsite staff employed by the home campus. Rather than simply attempting to duplicate their home campus programs, HEIs seeking to open an IBC will need to weigh multiple factors. These factors might include the type of program being offered, the policies of the host country, options for collaboration with the host country in terms of financial commitment and research endeavors, and commitment to oversight from the home campus, and general comfort with operating an entity at a great distance from the home campus. Based on the findings from this study, each of these factors appear to in some way influence the leadership structure arrangements at IBCs.
Research findings 2 & 3.

2. IBCs that receive funding are more likely than those without funding to have a board structure. In addition, if the IBC is funded and has a board structure it is almost twice as likely to have a large onsite administrative staff as compared to having a small onsite administrative staff.

3. IBCs of private nonprofit institutions are almost twice as likely to receive funding from the host country for their IBC than IBCs established by public institutions.

Interpretation of research findings 2 & 3.

It was hypothesized that administrative structures and the types of administrative network ties would differ depending on the source of funding (Lane, 2012, Verbik & Merkley, 2006). The study found that although host country funding exists across all types of leadership structure, those IBCs with leadership structures that involve boards were more likely to receive host country funding. Variation in administrative network ties also varied among the IBCs, however it was more likely to find a theme of network ties between IBC leadership and the host country government and industry in cases where the IBC is funded by the host country.

As was previously stated in chapter 4, this makes sense in that governments or industries that have made an investment in a branch campus would want to be
more intimately involved with the ongoing operations and ultimate success of the branch. Many of the branch campuses are one part of a larger economic development initiative by the host country (Lane & Kinser, 2013). It also makes sense that IBCs that are funded are more likely to have board structures, as boards provide a means to provide oversight guidance or governance of a campus or organization without being directly involved in the day to day operations of the organization (Keller, 2001). Boards are an opportunity to supply the branches with an enormous amount of information necessary for a sustainable organization in a host country while at the same time ensuring that the branch campus is meeting the economic development needs of the host country. While members of a board may not have knowledge directly related to the nuances of HE programs and degree delivery, boards with knowledge of local Ministry of Education requirements, local legal and real estate regulations, or specific demands of the local labor market offer a valuable and diverse source of information for an IBC. Boards with networks within the host country are also a prime opportunity for developing a positive working relationship with individuals in the host country committed to the success of the branch campus and those individuals representing the home campus who are also committed to the success of the branch campus.

Another possible benefit of a board structure with network ties to the host country is access to funding for not only the set up and daily management of the IBC but also for research endeavors. Boards with representation of members from industries in the host country as well as the greater region surrounding the host country may have access to funds from companies willing to contribute research
dollars to the IBCs. Predicted trends for IBCs envision a greater link between research and economic development occurring at branch campuses (Lane & Kinser, 2013). In order for this to evolve, a greater collaboration between academic research and industry will need to occur, particularly in the area of attracting funds to support the research and development within the universities. Board members tied to industries looking for a laboratory for research and development purposes might provide a great opportunity to build these research and development relationships while at the same time bringing external funding to IBCs. In this way IBCs will be more likely to behave like U.S. private nonprofit universities in that in the absence of public or government funding, they need to generate external funding to sustain their mission (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006). It is similar to the rationale for explaining the large board structures with extensive network ties found at private universities versus smaller board structures at public universities, in that private universities in the absence of state funding need to utilize their network ties to help harness research and development funding from private investors and donors (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2006). Implications of this finding suggest that U.S. HEIs venturing into host countries interested in incorporating research and development into the IBCs should consider a form of leadership such as a board structure where members of the board are connected in some way to the local/regional industries, have potential access to research and development funds, and are in some way vested in the success of the IBC. As fewer governments will be able to sustain funding for IBCs, another opportunity for sustainable funding is through the industry sector. Networks between the IBC and
the host country will be critical for IBCs seeking to develop more research based programs.

IBCs receiving funding appear more likely to model their administrative staff and board structure after that of the home campus, albeit in a scaled down version. While it appears that this structural arrangement may be driven by the home campus, this may not entirely be the case. Governments and private foundations are interested in recruiting or funding a model of HE that has been successful for generations in the US. It seems reasonable that the administrative structure that has successfully supported the delivery of HE at the home campus should potentially be duplicated at the branch campus for the attainment of similar outcomes or successes. While the data showed that many IBCs attempt to recreate a successful home campus administrative structure, alternative models may generate more sustainable institutions when operating overseas.

**Research findings 4 & 5.**

4. IBCs with similar leadership structure types displayed similar thematic patterns of interconnectedness.

5. Public university IBCs were more likely to display interconnectedness through their host country partnership institutions than private nonprofits, which were more likely to display interconnectedness through board structures and/or their onsite administrative leadership.
**Interpretation of research findings 4 & 5**

It was hypothesized at the outset of this study that no difference would be found among the types of network ties identified in IBCs established by public universities as compared to those found in IBCs established by private nonprofit universities (Lane & Kinser, 2011, Knight, 2008). The creation of the American IBC-LST served as an useful tool for examining this hypothesis. This study found that differences in network ties existed among the different leadership category types, but within each leadership structure category, there were no differences found in the types of network ties identified at public versus private nonprofit institutions. This finding is interesting in that it suggests that IBC interconnectedness with the host country is not a consequence of an IBC being established by a public versus private nonprofit, but more likely as a consequence of the arrangement or contract the IBC has with the host country. In other words regardless of whether an IBC is established by a public university or a private nonprofit, the associations identified between IBC leadership and the host country are similar based on the leadership structure of the IBC. IBCs having partnerships with postsecondary institutions within a host country display interconnections primarily through their associations with these institutions. IBCs having board structures primarily have associations connected with industry or governments in the host country. IBCs without board structures or partnerships with postsecondary institutions in the host country primarily have associations identified between the onsite administrative leaders and the host country. These findings support the prior work conducted by Lane & Kinser (2011) and Knight (2008) on the organizational behavior of IBCs. Network
ties identified at IBCs with similar IBC leadership structure types were similar in their network characteristics regardless as to whether the home campus is a public or private nonprofit entity.

Curiously though, IBCs with publically funded home campuses were more likely to be of a certain leadership category, Category IV, based on the American IBC-LST. In this way private nonprofits and public universities are behaving differently. Public universities are more likely to have IBCs with partnership with a host country postsecondary institution or educational consulting firm. Other types of partnerships were found during this study such as partnerships with foundations or host country economic developments which included both public and private nonprofit entities, but partnerships specifically between a host country postsecondary institution or educational consulting firm were more commonly found among IBCs established by public universities. This finding may be indicative of the fact that perhaps public universities are receiving less funding or incentives to move across borders than their private counterparts and in order to maintain sustaining programs, they more readily partner with postsecondary organizations in the host country to minimize their operating expenses by using already established resources (Verbik & Merkley, 2006).

The implications of this finding with regards to IBC sustainability are twofold. From a benefits perspective, one way to view this arrangement is that of efficiency in the absence of outside funding. In the absence of outside funding this arrangement can be viewed as practical means to operate an IBC given the challenges in making an IBC self-sustaining. By sharing resources, cost can be
potentially reduced, especially if there is a sharing of facilities. Aside from financial implications, it also has an added benefit of helping to expose a host country institution to different methods of program delivery. This can be beneficial in that it helps the host country HEIs grow and learn, even to the point of helping foreign institutions in the long term become capable of delivering HE programs without the partnership. It also offers the potential for greater cross-national collaboration of research by the mere fact that proximity brings people and hence ideas closer together. From a student perspective, the arrangement could be protective in the instance that the IBC needed to close. The students would be familiar to and associated with a host country HEI even in the event that the IBC left.

Another way to view this arrangement from a less beneficial perspective is that the partnerships may be constrictive and offer less autonomy for the IBC in the delivery of their programs or future direction of growth. In other words the home campus and thus the IBC may have less control of the endeavor making management of the branch more difficult and less likely to sustain, especially if the relationship became unworkable due to divergent interests.

**Research Finding 6.**

6. In the absence of a board structure associated with an IBC, the onsite administrative staff displayed a greater number of associations with the host country than did the onsite administrative staff at IBCs with a board structure.
Interpretation of research finding 6.

For IBCs that did not have board structures, it appears that these IBCs are also connected to the host country, but in a different way than IBCs with boards or even postsecondary partnerships. In the cases where there was not a board structure, the IBC onsite administrative staff displayed a number of associations with the host country or region. Interestingly, these administrative onsite leadership associations were found in greater number than in IBCs with a board structure. The difference in where the connections were found points to the conclusion that there are at least two ways for an IBC to manage its dependency on the external environment through IBC leadership interconnections.

One way is through board structures with ties to the host region and the other is through employment of onsite administrators with associations with the host region. Patterns of associations found amongst onsite administrators include prior employment in the host country, the attainment of both graduate and undergraduate degrees in the host country/region, and through familial relations or being native to the host country/region. This was particularly evident with the IBCs in Category III of the typology. The IBCs in this category also had in general greater longevity, as the majority of them were more than 14 years old with half of them over 20 years old and the youngest at 5 years old. These types of associations enable access to different types of knowledge about the local environment that may be of great importance to the survival of an IBC (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, Scott & Davis, 2007). Individuals who have attended university in the host country have direct knowledge of important characteristics of student culture, expectations of
quality, and local recruitment practices. Administrators who have been previously employed in the host country and now work for an IBC may have tremendous insight into human resource policies and practices, or cultural management styles unique to the host region. Individuals who have worked for other universities in particular may have insight into essential policies and practice related to accreditation. Knowledge of any or all of these types of issues within a host region can lead to a more sustainable organization, especially because they may not be the same as those at the home campus.

In the absence of a board structure or a sizable administrative staff, connections could also be found between an IBC and a host country through their partnerships with universities within the host country. A number of IBCs have partnerships in the host country with a host country institution (See Table 4.8 Type IV IBC). This finding was expected based on the prior examination of IBC models and their establishment of various joint ventures and strategic alliances (Lane, 2010, Verbik & Merkley, 2006, Kinser, 2010, Garrett, 2002). While these connections found within IBCs that have partnerships were not between onsite administrators or boards and the host country, they do offer an alternative strategic mechanism for an IBC to gain access to knowledge and resources within the host country. These connections are however different than those derived through boards or directly through onsite administrative leadership networks within the host country. As is found in this study and by Verbik & Merkley (2006), these partnerships often involve the sharing of campus facilities, faculty, administrative personnel, and even students. Ideally these partnerships, especially if they were initiated by an
invitation, can act as a valuable resource for IBCs establishing their programs in the host country. The host country institution as a known quantity within the local environment may help to legitimize the foreign program through their acceptance of the program within their facilities. Operating with or within a host country HE entity may more readily allow access to information and guidance on student affairs, admissions procedures, human resources, financial, and academic curricula concerns related to the host country environment that are different than those experienced by university administration in the home country. The invitation being offered by a host country or host country university can act as a message that a branch is desired by the host country to serve a particular need for that host country. The branch being a desirable and needed entity to fill a void in the host country opens avenues for mutual interest in the success of the branch. This mutual interest may generate resources that might otherwise not be as easily accessible to an IBC outside of a partnership. These resources may include but are not limited to such areas as technology support, assistance with local student recruitment practices, drafting of labor contracts, or legal representation. In other words the partnership itself, as opposed to individuals, acts as the network or social capital needed for the IBC as an organization to sustain in a foreign environment (Lane, 2010, Verbik & Merkley, 2006, Kinser, 2010, Garrett, 2002).

While this study did accomplish an examination of the avenues of interconnectedness between US IBCs and their host countries, the study was unable to unearth the relative effectiveness of one avenue of interconnectedness versus another. It raises the question though of whether certain advantages exist in
utilizing one avenue over an alternative in respect to sustainability. Given the longevity of the IBCs in category III that have significant interconnections between the onsite leadership and the host country, it leads to the plausible conclusion that for these institutions it is at least one factor contributing to their sustainability.

**Conceptual Model Revisited**

The premise of this study was that IBCs are resource dependent organizations operating in a foreign environment. In order to sustain organizations need to find ways in which to manage their dependencies. The conceptual model developed for this study served as a useful tool to help understand how the theoretical concept of a resource dependent organization such as an IBC can utilize networks (social capital) as a strategy to manage its dependence on the external environment (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, Scott & Davis, 2007). This study focused on identifying types of networks found between IBC leadership and the host country.

The study revealed several themes of interconnectedness between IBC leadership and the host country, providing evidence that administrative leadership at IBCs has potential opportunities to utilize these networks in order to acquire and manage resources on behalf of their respective IBC. This evidence is particularly important to consider given an increasing focus on IBCs as entities contributing to the economic development of the countries in which they are located (Going Global 2013, Lane & Kinser, 2013). Educational and government leaders at the Going Global 2013 conference in Dubai (March 4-6, 2013) stressed that governments are not going to be able to fund IBCs at the current levels long-term and that funding
will need to shift from that of the government to that of the private sector, both in the form of contributions from industries and foundations. Acknowledging the difficulty in getting capital from the private sector, expert panelists at the Going Global 2013 conference (March 4, 2013) emphasized that 1) networks/relationships between the IBC and the private sector will need to be nurtured and 2) IBCs will need to deliver programs and research that are relevant and meaningful. By relevant and meaningful, experts stated IBCs will need to provide students educational programs and/or skills that will allow them to be innovative and productive in a knowledge economy. In order to attract funds from the private sector, research initiatives will also have to be meaningful and relevant to potential investors. The private sector is more willing to financially back research and development if they can identify the benefits or added value associated with the outcomes of the research and development (Going Global 2013). This discourse highlighted the growing importance of interconnectedness between IBCs and the external environment. Sustainability of IBCs in part hinges on their success in nurturing the types of relationships that connect the IBC with collaborative partnerships that provide funding and opportunity for research and development.

Figure 5.1 below is a revised version of the original conceptual model (figure 3.1) presented in chapter 3, which now takes into account the importance of IBC leadership networking for the purpose of acquiring research and development opportunities. The revisited conceptual model is identical except for the insertion of ‘research and development’, which is placed in both the internal and external environment bubbles. The revised model identifies the additional role of IBC
leadership as being a central linkage connecting the internal environment of the IBC to the external environments (resources) for the purpose of fostering research and development.

**Figure 5.1 Conceptual model revisited**
While this study found a density of networks between IBCs and industry, the future and sustainability of IBCs will most likely need a higher density of highly nurtured networks between these entities. Host country governments and IBCs will need to build and maintain connections on a multi-sector scale to both attract funds for research and financial stability, but also to build research teams that produce innovations that are relevant and meaningful in a global market but also address the needs of a host country. In particular, networks that enable a global perspective within a local context will continue to be of primary importance to the sustainability of IBCs. This focus will require IBC leadership that is cognizant of the economic development needs of the host country and the demands of the global economy without losing sight of the mission of the home campus while simultaneously tapping into networks enabling fruitful collaborations and funding.

**Future Considerations**

Findings from this study lead to additional considerations in the examination of interconnectedness of an IBC and a host country. One of the obvious questions that follows from this study is to what extent do other individuals within an IBC, such as IBC faculty, play a role as a means for an IBC to gain access to valuable resources in their foreign environment. The social capital or associations among faculty working within the IBCs is a potential source of valuable information about the external environment. Not all, but many IBCs advertised on their websites that they use faculty from both the home campus and faculty from the host country. In some regions like Belgium, for example, they are known to have a population of
nomadic faculty that piece together positions at a variety of institutions. Faculty who have worked at other institutions or who are native to the host country could be a tremendous reservoir of knowledge for an IBC. Faculty working closely with students may have insights not otherwise identified concerning the obstacles students face, such as family dynamics or financial considerations, that impact their ability to complete programs. They may also have insight into particular contractual language necessary to recruit and retain stellar faculty. And they may also have insight into cultural concerns or obstacles in the transfer of a curriculum from one country to another. Other areas include access to ongoing research within the host country or specifics related to ongoing changes in the labor market. In the movement of a degree program from one geopolitical area to another, faculty, in addition to onsite administrative leadership staff and boards, are another potential source of interconnectedness between an IBC and the host country.

Another consideration for future research is to take a further in depth examination of the specific ways in which the associations found in this study between IBC leadership and the host country actually act as a tool to reduce an IBC’s dependence on the external environment. This study used secondary document analysis to determine associations between IBC leadership and the host country. Future studies utilizing survey or interview methodologies could provide additional insight into the usefulness of an onsite administrator’s sources of social capital within the host country, and how an organization as an entity makes use of leadership’s social capital. Does the association between an administrator and prior employment at a host country institution actually provide valuable information for
an IBC and it what ways? Are there other themes of interconnectedness between an IBC and a host country that did not emerge in this study that would emerge through a study involving interviews and surveys? In addition to the document analysis completed in this study, the use of interview and survey data would provide a triangulation effect to augment the current findings.

The final consideration for future research is to compare over time whether certain types of leadership structures and types of interconnectedness support the sustainability of IBCs. As was suggested by the results, there are 6 variations in leadership structures among the US branch campuses in this study. A plausible question to pursue over time is whether one variation versus another has any beneficial characteristics or more sustainable properties. In other words, does the presence of a board or host country funding for example have any impact on the sustainability of an IBC in a foreign country relative to those IBCs without funding or a board structure in order to achieve their goals? In regards to interconnectedness, future research to consider over time could include an examination of whether the types of interconnections an IBC develops with a host country make a difference in the ability of an IBC to sustain over time. The results from this study suggest that IBCs, depending on their leadership structures, have different avenues of interconnectedness with the host country. Thus an examination of the variation in these interconnections overtime might lead to a valuable insight into whether particular interconnections would be more critical to have within a host country for the sustainability of an IBC.
Conclusions

Due to the limited research on IBCs it is unclear at this point which factors will prove most influential in the sustainability of IBCs. However, like other organizations such as MNEs, multinational universities will need to seek ways to manage their dependency on the external environments through strategies such as utilizing networks and network ties within the host country. Due to the number of IBCs with interconnections found between IBC leadership and the host country, multinational universities are readily positioned to respond to their external environment with a strategy used by MNEs known as “glocalization” (Wilken & Sinclair, 2011).

During the 1990’s the concept of “glocalization” grew out of MNEs learning that to be “globally” minded in their pursuit of global ventures, they also need to be “locally” minded within the region they wished to operate (Wilkins & Sinclair, 2011). Wilken & Sinclair (2011), in their examination of a decade of trade literature, noted that for organizations such as MNEs to survive in a global market they must seek to “think local and act local” as opposed to earlier strategies at the onset of globalization to “think global, act global” which had been embraced by the likes of Levitt (1983), declaring that the globalization of markets would be a movement of global standardization (Wilken & Sinclair, 2011, p. 4). Coca-Cola is one such example of a company which embraced the importance of local adaptation to respond with greater speed and efficiency to the “culture, infrastructure, and competition” in emerging markets (Wilken & Sinclair, 2011, Melewar & Vemmervik, 2004, p.868). While a certain level of standardization can be accomplished, MNEs like Sony,
McDonald’s, and Colgate-Palmolive have had to “develop adaptive or “localizing” strategies to cope with market by market variation” (Wilken & Sinclair, 2011, p.3, Herbig, 1998). Wilken & Sinclair (2011) further noted that “an amalgamation of global, regional, and local strategies, with an emphasis of the sharing of ideas” evolved (p.9). It is this “sharing of ideas” that will most benefit multinational universities operating IBCs, as host countries seek to gain the benefits of American style HE. IBC leadership must keep in mind that regional and local cultural and political preferences also play an enormous role in the success of an organization moving across borders. IBC leadership with connections and network ties to a host country provides an avenue to “think locally” and benefit from the “sharing of ideas” to forecast effective sustainable strategies with individuals intimately familiar with the local and regional nuances. In other words, fostering and encouraging the interconnectedness found among IBCs can be utilized as a strategy for IBCs to also embrace “glocalization” to manage their dependencies on the external environment in a host country.

The discourse on the sustainability of IBCs has been and will continue to be a key topic concerning the movement of HE entities across borders to offer degrees and programs to students in their home countries. Even during the course of the research for this study two American IBCs have decided not to continue the operation of their programs. The University of Las Vegas, Singapore and New York University Tisch School of Art, Singapore have made recent announcements that they will no longer be offering their current programs in Singapore (Redden, 2013, Reisberg, 2013). In both cases it was noted that a factor in the decision to cease
operations is that the current arrangements are financially unsustainable (Redden, 2013, Reisberg, 2013). According to Redden (2013), the University of Las Vegas Nevada, Singapore, an IBC that began as a stand-alone institution in 2006, eventually partnered with the Singapore Institute of Technology and received funds from Singapore’s Economic Development Board. However, Redden (2013) noted that recent developments have left UNLV unable to reach an agreement on tuition rates and the academic direction of the program, leaving UNLV a pay back loan of three million US dollars to the Singapore Economic Development Board. This is not a financial position many public or private American universities would want to find themselves in.

A position that American universities and host countries do want to be in is one that fosters financial stability and mutual collaboration to enhance the economic development and overall elevation of education levels in a host country. The interest in the sustainability of these IBC stems from not only preventing the demise of these branches, but in a bigger endgame of improving the economic development and overall quality of life in the host countries. In order to achieve these ambitious goals, key players internal and external to the branches will need to align their strategy. In particular, the projected growth needed in the area of research and development will require robust networking between IBCs and the private sector. Balancing competition with collaboration will undoubtedly be a challenge in building networks between the various research and development initiatives. For example, the issue of intellectual property rights is one such issue that will need to be addressed as IBCs and industries in host countries move
forward with research and development initiatives. Taking into account the
experiences of countless multinational companies that ventured into and operate in
foreign countries, the manner in which a multinational university manages its
dependency on the external environment in a host country through
interconnectedness while at the same time balancing its ability to remain true to its
core mission and the mission of the host country will continue to be a key factor in
the sustainability of American IBCs.
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