# THE INTERNATIONAL CO-FOUNDED/CO-DEVELOPED UNIVERSITY MODEL: CONSIDERATIONS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION PROVIDERS

**Kik Yenmee[1]**
**Jomphong Mongkhonvanit[2]**

**Abstract:** This case study explores the essential considerations for decision-makers investigating the establishment of co-founded/co-developed universities, including the factors supporting and hindering these decisions. The study also investigates the decision-making phases undergone by higher learning institutions when exploring the potential to establish an international co-founded or co-developed university. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with university leaders, faculty members, and key experts to gain more insights into this decision-making process. A total of 13 participants from three institutions were interviewed. Data analysis guided by the research objectives used the Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-step coding process for thematic analysis. The findings reveal the following decision-making phases: (1) Considerations, goals, and motivations; (2) Support Collection; (3) Opportunity recognition; (4) Screening, decision-making, and planning; and (5) Operationalization (including finalizing academic programs, selecting faculty and staff, and preparation of buildings and support structures). The findings also reveal that the primary considerations during the decision-making process are issues of finance and quality. Other considerations were around ancillary factors, including political stability, market demand, protection of reputation, and staff safety. Other concerns included support availability, the current position of the institution, government regulations, infrastructure, economic issues, business environment, and the corporate culture of the host nation.

**Keywords:** Internationalization; Co-founded University; Co-developed University

---

[1] Ph.D. Candidate, Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education Administration, Siam University, Thailand. yenmeekik@gmail.com

[2] Ph.D. Associate Professor, Graduate School of Education, Siam University, Thailand. jomphong@gmail.com.

**Introduction**
Education is the primary means of achieving intellectual and social development and advancing one's social status, career opportunities, and earnings. The American Council on Education (ACE, 2012) states that a country's economic success and competitiveness depends upon its higher-education system. Furthermore, ACE (2012) suggests a need for educational opportunities that support a rapidly evolving global workforce and prepare graduates to live and work in a globalized economic environment. In the context of global education, these transitions have included the introduction of new study abroad destinations, increasing numbers of international students, and the introduction of more innovative techniques, such as the development of joint- degree and transnational dual programs, massive open online courses (MOOCs), and international branch campuses. According to Knight (2008), institutions take part in internationalization for three reasons, including:

1. The desire to enhance research opportunities and academic programs
2. To compete with peer institutions
3. To improve in the rankings to increase revenue

Though a relatively recent development in global internationalized education, the co-founded model is already widely used. Examples include the Singapore University of Technology and Design, Yale-NUS, the Nazarbayev University in Kazakhstan, the German University of Technology in Oman, and both the Sino-British University and the Xi'an Jiaotong Liverpool University in China. Since 2001, a dozen co-developed international universities have opened worldwide, with the parentage of the new institutions being fairly consistent: an Asian host institution coupled with either an American or European spouse (Helms, 2008). Despite its significant growth, the phenomenon is relatively unexplored in the scholarly literature on internationalization, and there is thus a need for additional research. The current study seeks to determine the key factors institutions consider when deciding whether to establish new co-founded universities.

**Research Background**
Administrators in higher education are continually working on expanding their institutions' global reach. They actively pursue engagement with other institutions and students in other countries (ACE, 2012). International co-founded, or co-developed universities are one type of overseas academic engagement. Expanding academic operations overseas is a high-risk growth strategy, and unsuccessful ventures can lead to substantial financial losses and reputational consequences (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). Lane (2011)

acknowledged that no agency had collected data on enrolled or graduated students of co-founded universities or the number or qualifications of such institutions' faculty or staff. Although these universities continue to grow in number, Wilkins and Huisman (2012) suggests a limited understanding of the successes and failures of the educational model.

Clifford and Montgomery (2015) argue that these international universities benefit the host and source organizations, their students, and the host country in various ways. The host organization is seen to be meeting the needs of a globalized society while enhancing the source organization's brand and global reputation. Additionally, these universities are for-profit endeavors that bring financial rewards. More significant revenue is generated because students are willing to pay higher tuition fees to avoid incurring relocation costs. The students also benefit because they can meet their family commitments while achieving recognized foreign credentials. The host country is rewarded, as the university is recognized for developing and retaining local talent, contributing to knowledge development and economic growth.

Higher education institutions worldwide are increasingly engaging in internationalizing efforts (Altbach et al., 2009). Ellingboe (1998) describes internationalization as an evolving, multi-dimensional, future-oriented, multidisciplinary, and leadership-based project, with multiple stakeholders collaborating to transform an institution's internal structure and respond to an increasingly complex, internationally focused, and dynamically changing external environment.

While research into co-founded or co-developed universities has increased, the establishment procedure that these universities undergo remains under-investigated and little understood. This may result from the phenomenon being relatively new – leaving us with few reports of effective and efficient operations and prompting questions about their sustainability (Altbach, 2012). Several U.K. and U.S. universities have questioned the motives of other institutions in establishing these universities and publicly declared negative stances on the practice (Crook, 2014).

Nations promote internationalization on the state level to create human capital, establish universal strategic coalitions, and promote trade (Knight, 2008). In response to growing demand, a new multi-national collaborative approach is emerging, with universities seeking to innovate in the global educational market and earn reputations as world-class hubs of higher education. The collaborating institutions often share or combine names to

create an entirely new university, which appears as a distinct campus in the source university's country of origin.

Professor Jane Knight from the Ontario Institution of Education of the University of Toronto named this new type of collaborative international university a "co-founded international university," in which she meant it was merely co-developed or the co-founded framework of intercontinental institutions (Knight, 2014b). Suppose the actions of some of the world's premier institutions are any indication. In that case, this co-founded model might very well be the future of internationalization in global education.

Some aspects of the models mentioned earlier and approaches to internationalization might initially appear very similar to the co-founded model. However, upon further examination, the differences become apparent. The international branch campus model, for example, differs significantly from the co-founded model in ways that illustrate both the uniqueness and forward-thinking nature of the co-developed model. Unlike the international branch campus, the co-founded international university is not merely a satellite operation of a source institution, but rather a self-governing, internationally co-developed institution, accredited by the host nation and established through an intercontinental alliance (Knight, 2014b).

Even though the co-developed model is a relatively recent development in global internationalized education trends, various examples have already been operating. Since 2001, various co-founded have been established across the globe, with the parentage of the new universities being fairly consistent (Helms, 2008). Despite its continued growth, the co-founded international university phenomenon is relatively unexplored in the scholarly literature on internationalization. As such, there is a need for additional research.

**Research Problem**
This study addressed the following two key research questions.
1. What are the phases of the decision-making procedure that higher education institutions undergo when exploring the potential to establish an international co-founded or co-developed university?
2. What key factors do higher education institutions consider when evaluating the potential for an international co-founded or co-developed university?

**Objectives of the Study**
This study addressed the following research objectives:

1. To describe the model of the international co-developed or co-founded university.
2. To identify the motivations for establishing international co-developed or co-founded campuses and the managerial challenges for such institutions.
3. To provide a useful basis for future research concerning the process of decision-making in international co-founded or co-developed universities.
4. To determine the key influences on the decision to launch international co-founded or co-developed universities.

**Scope of the Study**
This project explored the factors that universities consider when deciding whether to establish co-founded universities. The study adopted a case-study method, which is a descriptive and context-specific tool. The case study covered four years, from pre-establishment through to post-establishment of an institution, which created limitations. Specifically, access to organizational documents was limited by the unwillingness of the site coordinator to share archived material. In addition, there were difficulties locating potential subjects willing to take part in the study.

**Research Significance**
This study is intended to contribute to the body of literature on administrator decisions to establish co-founded or co-developed universities. Currently, little is known about this decision-making process. When administrators make these operational choices, complex trade-offs directly affect the host organizations' performance and the source organizations' value. Therefore, a better understanding of the administrators' decisions will provide a valuable contribution to future decision-making. Informed decision-making by administrators may support business strategies for the source and host organizations and the achievement of operational goals.

Furthermore, it may help the institutions avoid financial losses and reputational damage, as well as the threats to morale, confidence, and trust associated with a failed venture. Additionally, there are benefits for the host countries, most of which are developing countries that cannot afford to waste public funds. Finally, the model serves the students at the universities by enabling undisrupted and high-quality education.

**Theoretical Framework**
Kinser and Lane (2014) describe five international university ownership models that educational administrators use to meet the needs of the various markets. This kind of ownership model can include different forms of model

partnership. Besides, they can promote partnerships in a bid to meet the needs of varying markets. In addition to these five partnership models, co-founded or co-developed colleges may be classified based on the type of programs they offer or the credentials they award. Helms (2008) distinguishes these classifications based on the following characteristics: (a) the type of credential awarded (e.g., degree or nondegree, credit or noncredit); (b) funding model (for profit or not for profit); (c) tax status (referred to as public/private organizations, or a combination, referred to as a public-private partnership); and (d) student/client demographic (e.g., traditional learner, adult learner, or executive/professional).

**Hypotheses**

H1: The decision-making procedure that higher education institutions undergo when deciding whether to establish an international co-founded or co-developed university comprises various phases.

H2: There are essential factors for higher education institutions to consider when evaluating a proposed international co-founded or co-developed university.

**Proposed Conceptual Framework**

This study's conceptual framework significantly relied on the internationalization sequence by Knight (1994)**,** which includes (1) awareness of the need, purpose**,** and benefits of internationalization for students, staff, faculty**,** and society; (2) Commitment by senior administration, Board of Governors, faculty and staff, students; (3) Planning which involves identifying needs and resources, purpose and objectives, priorities, strategies; (4) Operationalization of academic activities and services, organizational factors, use guiding principles; (5) Review which involves assessing and enhancing quality and impact of initiatives and progress of strategy; (6) Reinforcement which involves developing incentive, recognition and rewards for faculty, staff and student participation. The conceptual framework differs from Knight's internationalization cycle in that it was devised concentrating on the developmental stage of the internationalization practice and categorizes the decision-making process into the six stages of *consideration and reflection, gathering support, opportunity identification, screening, final selection,* and *operationalization*.

According to the proposed conceptual framework**,** the *consideration and reflection* step where organizational leaders consider the goals as effective in achieving international co-founded university (Altbach, & Knight, 2007). The second step is *gathering support* where higher education institutions leaders

should be dedicated to establishing the international co-developed university, demonstrate commitment to the international co-developed university activities, budget allocation, and written procedures, and make efforts to increase stakeholder engagement and acquisition. The third step is *opportunity identification*, *which involves identifying possible opportunities for establishing* the international co-developed university and interaction with potential partners to determine the prospects of contributions from each partner in terms of finance, infrastructure, academics, staff, and other resources.

The fourth step is *screening* which involves conducting an in-depth analysis of the social, cultural, political, economic, and educational factors for the source university, source country, host country, partners, and their interactions, and making the final decision as to whether the international co-developed university meets the universities and fully utilizes its available resources, objectives of both universities and fully utilizes its available resources. The fifth step is *final selection* which involves final examination of the information uncovered in stage four and determining which option best meets the institution's objectives and leverages its available resources. The last step of the proposed conceptual framework is *operationalization* which involves selecting, developing, and adapting educational programs at the international co-developed university, recruiting faculty, staff, and students, and constructing and preparing auxiliary structures.

**Literature Review**

The literature review in this section discusses the various international education delivery models, including co-founded or co-developed universities. There is then an overview of the history of these universities, their rationale, and the essential considerations in place when establishing them. The third section examines the co-founded or co-developed university model and its benchmarks for success. The final section reviews the literature on the decision-making process underpinning the establishment of these institutions.

**Models of Delivery in International Education**

International co-founded or co-developed universities differ from other transnational education models in that they offer more extensive face-to-face programs than virtual learning options. The scale and scope of providers of higher education, who move overseas to provide academic programs and qualifications in foreign nations, have continued to evolve (Knight, 2015). The various definitions can be categorized based on the degree of collaboration (if any) between the source and host location, the responsibility

for conferring the credential, and the extent of staff or curriculum mobility. For example, the general international education models include joint programs supported through articulation agreements, online distance education, study-abroad opportunities, franchising, international branch campuses, and co-founded universities (Alam et al., 2013).

Another model of delivery in international education is articulation. With an articulation agreement, two educational organizations recognize the other's course or program requirements and award partial credits towards the same (Alam et al., 2013). This enables the students to transfer between the two institutions (Alam et al., 2013; Knight, 2005).

Distant online learning is another model. This approach uses technology to remove the traditional barriers of classroom learning by transferring the experience to an online platform.

Study-abroad opportunities are an alternative form of international education. The student completes a course or obtains a degree at an institution located in another country (Alam et al., 2013).

An additional example is franchising, in which the source organization sells the rights to an educational brand (Altbach, 2012). This business arrangement allows an independent partner organization to sell and distribute its brand of education.

The final international education delivery mode discussed here is the international co-founded university and transnational education ventures such as international co-founded universities whose characteristics in the broader typology reflect the degree of mobility, partnership agreement, and scale of educational services available (Knight, 2014a).

**Rationale for International Co-Founded or Co-Developed University Engagement**
There are various reasons that an administrator may decide to launch a co-founded or co-developed university, and it is essential to be clear about the rationale and guiding principles, as this clarity will contribute to the venture's success. First, the attraction of the universities as a developmental activity is due to their potential to strengthen academic standards and increase access to education (Clifford & Montgomery, 2015). Furthermore, the immersion of faculty and students in a foreign context enhances learning opportunities and increases the potential for research and development (McNamara & Knight, 2014).

According to Wilkins and Huisman (2012), the appeal of the co-founded or co-developed university as an entrepreneurial activity is organizational market positioning and revenue generation. Similarly, as Wilkins and Huisman note, such universities can strengthen a source organization's domestic and international market position, contributing to enhanced profile and prestige.

**The International Co-Founded or Co-Developed University Model**
In developing economies, the need for higher education is being met through various forms of transnational education. According to Alam et al. (2013, p. 870), the global demand for higher education is growing exponentially, triggered by the economic progress of third world countries, demographic trends, and increased globalization of societies and economies. When one is looking to meet the educational needs of a developing economy by establishing a co-founded university, there are various considerations. Depending on the partnership model, these considerations may include funding, governance structure, operational capability and requirements, quality-assurance requirements, and sustainability mechanisms.

**Research Methodology**
*Data Collection*
A case-study approach was used in this research to enhance understanding of this establishment process. Knight reveals that "The case study is applied in most analysis, aimed at expounding our knowledge of organizational, individual, social, group utilized in numerous circumstances, to add to our individual, organizational, political, group, organizational, social, and interrelated phenomena" (Knight, 2013, p. 4). The case study explored leaders' perceptions of the decision-making process and factors the they considered when investigating the potential for a new venture.

The investigation identified three international co-developed or co-founded universities in Southeast Asia, based on six main elements, including the source-host organization type (public, for-profit, private), the age of the university (planned, well-established, new, established, closed), the institution's academic rank (top 100, 101-500, 501 and above, or unranked), the size of the student body, the instruction level, and the nation or area. The study employed a semi-structured method to collect data, including direct interviews of a total of 13 participants. The investigation uses a semi-structured interviews protocol – as opposed to a structured or unstructured form – to gather richer and more detailed information while ensuring that specific topics and questions were adequately covered and allowing some discretion on the precise question selection. A semi-structured interviews

protocol allowed asking follow-up questions, which were especially valuable due to the research's exploratory nature.

Since the participants were busy, high-level administrators and leaders, the face-to-face dialogue was the most suitable way to obtain the data required while efficiently using their time. Initial considerations looked towards organizing focus groups because of their ability to yield rich and intricate figures. However, some participants indicated that they would not feel comfortable sharing their thoughts and experiences in a group comprising their colleagues and leaders. Because of the sensitivity of the projects and the differing views, the interviewees were separated to ensure their comfort and to create an environment conducive to honest conversation.

The study involved a comprehensive literature review in identifying the most influential factors in launching international co-developed or co-founded universities. As the literature on this topic is limited, the focus was placed on the organizational field, looking at tactical decision-making in international and transnational firms. To analyze these decision-making processes, this study took two key information sources and sequentially collected data from these: (a) documents and (b) leader interviews. The documents used were organizational and public. Organizational documents included host university archived records such as collaboration agreements, meeting minutes, and correspondence outlining the evolution of universities' operations from the establishment to the initial operation years. Public documents sourced from government websites included (i) annual reports highlighting historical activities and the institution's evolution and engagement in transnational education; (ii) and associated financial statements.

When selecting companies and individuals for an interview, the research sought the widest possible variety of participants. One of the models used for selecting companies and individuals for interviews is the variation model. This model is intended to increase the approach's variety to the area of interest by choosing as many different entities as possible. Models with high variation are appropriate for obtaining information from different organizations and identifying shared patterns that have been truncated. The interviewees each held high-ranking jobs in their respective organizations. To protect the anonymity of the organizations and participants, all identifiers were removed from the transcriptions, and the files were recorded through audios, and pseudonyms were assigned.

**Data Analysis**

The purpose of the analysis was to explore the decision-making process at institutions with an existing co-founded university, acquire insight into the process, and ultimately construct a conceptual framework for the decision-making process. Guided by these objectives, the analysis used the Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-step coding process for thematic analysis. The collected documents helped in the identification of phases associated with the decision-making process. The analysis explored these decision-making processes and included obtaining awareness of the process and ultimately providing a theoretical basis.

The six steps followed in the coding process are: (1) familiarization with data which was achieved through transcription of the interview data and severally reading through the transcripts; (2) generating initial codes following Ryan and Bernard (2003) thematic hints of repetition, indigenous typologies/categories, analogies and metaphors, transitions, constant comparison/similarities and differences, linguistic connectors, and silence/missing data; (3) searching for themes among codes (4) reviewing themes, (5) defining and naming themes, (6) and producing the final report. The investigation identified eight parent codes, including *identification, motivation, academic programs, support selection, quality control, screening, and staff/faculty*. These parent themes were then sub-coded into smaller themes discussed in the findings and discussion section.

**Findings and Discussion**

This case study sought to understand the perceptions of participants in the decision-making process and the factors that influence these decisions. The discussion compares the conceptual framework to the reality of the process as described by the interviewees to address the first research question- What are the phases of the decision-making procedure that higher education institutions undergo when exploring the potential to establish an international co-founded or co-developed university? The discussions regarding the individual themes address the second research question- What key factors do higher education institutions consider when evaluating the potential for an international co-founded or co-developed university?

*Considerations, Motivation, and Goals*

Data analysis from all 13 interviewees' responses shows *considerations, motivations, and goals* as a significant step in establishing an international co-founded university. This step involves discovering positive and negative outcomes associated with the establishment of an international co-developed university. This step also considers the organizations' objectives and discusses

how the international co-developed university may or may not achieve these goals. Data analysis confirmed that the primary considerations during the decision-making process are issues of

- **Financial Considerations** where the respondents highlighted financial issues such as foreign exchange to foreign debt collection, equity investment, partner finances, and sovereign risk. One respondent said that monetary value fluctuations likely influenced total contract value and Return on Investments. Another participant added that although organizations employed hedging to minimize financial risk, the risks have not entirely been mitigated. Respondents included Overseas Debt Collection in decision making because of the difficulties posed by money collection in various legal jurisdictions and potentially high legal bills resulting from seeking restitution. One of the respondents set out three financial considerations: (a) the ability to manage and fulfill the international conditions of the jurisdiction (where the decision is made to invest in ownership), (b) the partner(s)' financial management effect and (c) the fact that the government infringed financial obligations. The participants recognized that the financial concerns needed to maintain operations had to be addressed since the objective of the international co-funded institution is income creation.

- **Quality Considerations** where respondents cited credibility, relevance, and reputation issues. All 13 respondents listed credibility as among the most significant concern. However, even in their assumption that international co-founded universities would boost their credibility, these higher education institutions' leaders differed on the elemental basis such as rank, mission, revenue sources, and study efficiency. The idea underpinning this assumption is that co-founded universities would inevitably lead to the global growth of the university's position and focused on an increasingly globalized society to maintain quality and relevance in education. Accordingly, to maintain or promote the reputation of their institution for quality research and training, they considered increased internationalization necessary. However, while all 13 respondents cited reputation as a critical motivating element, they varied views on how international co-founded universities would boost their organization's credibility. Some felt that a foreign presence was necessary to retain an organization's elite standards, others felt an international presence would help their organizations in competing for students and faculty with other high-ranking universities, others believed that international co-founded universities would help create international

opportunities for research hence attracting and maintaining top-level students and teachers.

Responses from the interviewees identified three main reasons for establishing the universities as (1) enhancing the source and host institutions' competitive positions by improving academics, (2) improving research opportunities, and (3) enhancing accessibility to a wider student population. Additionally, responses from the participants also highlighted ancillary factors, such as political stability, market demand, protection of reputation, and staff safety.

*Gathering Support*
The availability of support also affected the decision to establish an international co- developed university. Each participant from the different universities outlined that a co-founded university cannot be developed without institutional leaders' support. Respondents said the leaders should be visionary, strong, powerful, and committed to establishing the co-founded university even when facing opposition from other people courageous and entrepreneurial because co-founded universities are uncertain to some degree. Additionally, all 13 respondents revealed that leaders need to demonstrate their support for the co-founded university in both words and actions. The leaders did so in four main ways: (1) engaging, facilitating, fostering, and promoting stakeholder buy-ins including staff and students (2) allocating funds and staff to support the co-founded university (3) strengthening ties with potential host countries (4) rearticulating the source-host institution's mission.

*Opportunity Identification*
The responses indicated that the next phase of development involves identifying potentially viable opportunities to establish a co-founded university. These include invitations to the host countries, private institutions, and new educational hubs to compete for space. In some cases, existing relationships and experiences abroad have provided such opportunities. The respondents showed that opportunity identification included negotiations with potential partners regarding what each part would be expected to contribute in terms of finances, infrastructure, academic, personal, and other resources.

*Screening, Decision-making, and Planning*
One significant consideration in the decision to join an educational hub is the position of the respective institutions. The participants reported that

government guidelines, laws, and legislation (both official and non-official) are also essential elements to consider when deciding whether to establish an institution in a given country.

The interviewees revealed that various factors relating to the corporate host nation culture are also important considerations. They cited the complexities of working with multi-national governments and the capacity to manage companies' environments as crucial factors. The individuals' connections and practical leadership skills also played a substantial role when choosing between one specific nation and another.

Various factors supporting or impeding the establishment of international universities were identified. One such factor was the desire to enhance the source-host institution's reputation to increase its international influence and identity. Another factor was the demand for academic or research opportunities. Participants cited access to student markets, financial gains, stakeholder buy-in, and allocation of funds and staff. Other factors included strengthening ties with the host nations, rearticulating the mission of the source institution, identifying opportunities, and evaluating both potential and existing education hubs. The host country's government regulations, infrastructure, economic issues, and business environment were also influential. Other key factors included sustainable academic programs, additional courses and programs, sourcing, and faculty and staff quality enhancement.

This fourth phase in decision-making, in summary, involved the in-depth analysis of social, cultural, political, economic, and academic factors for the parent institution and parent country, host institution, and host country, and their interaction. This phase also involved the final decision regarding whether the co-founded university meets the host institution's objectives and best leverages its available resources.

*Operationalization*
The co-founded university required a combination of significant and minor instructions to become fully operational. The three most critical initiatives mentioned by the respondents were (1) finalizing on selection, development, and adaption of academic programs at the co-founded institution; (2) recruiting students, faculty, and staff including local recruits, international recruits, and seconded and 'fly-in faculty' (so named because of their short and occasional stays overseas); (3) Preparation of buildings and support structures. According to all 13 respondents, operationalization also involves attracting and retaining faculty and staff in ways such as pay, remunerations,

and benefits, cultural environment and research, offering career advancement opportunities such as advancing from lecturer to professor, and appointment to head departments in the co-founded university. Finalizing academic programs included level of study, program structure, adaptation to the local context, and course scheduling.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

The discussion from the comparison of the proposed conceptual framework and the interviewees' responses reveals that higher education institutions undergo several decision-making phases when deciding whether to establish an international co-developed university. Thus, the decision-making process comprises various collaborative decisions in the entire process of developing an international co-founded university. The findings reveal the following decision-making phases: (1) Considerations, goals, and motivations; (2) Support Collection; (3) Opportunity recognition; (4) Screening, decision-making, and planning; and (5) Operationalization (including finalizing academic programs, selecting faculty and staff, and preparation of buildings and support structures). Therefore, the findings affirm the first hypothesis *H1: The decision-making procedure that higher education institutions undergo when deciding whether to establish an international co-founded or co-developed university comprises various phases*.

Findings from the study also revealed that the primary considerations during the decision-making process are finance and quality issues. The participants also highlighted ancillary factors, such as political stability, market demand, protection of reputation, and staff safety. These findings affirm the second hypothesis *H2: There are essential factors for higher education institutions to consider when evaluating a proposed international co-founded or co-developed university.*

This research focused on administrators and leaders at institutions seeking to establish international co-founded universities. Therefore, future researchers should concentrate on other stakeholder groups, such as students at such institutions, foreign co-founded university sources, and the resources of the host country. This would be valuable for enhancing the understanding of the process.

Further quantitative studies would also be helpful. Proper international co-founded university result presentation and data collection procedures should be developed to enable researchers to evaluate the progress and results of these universities. The rate and longevity of student enrolment are two significant data points that are not regularly or widely discussed. There

should be a more significant collection of information on outcomes, including graduation levels, job statistics, and research productivity.

The lack of a substantial margin defined by institutions that chose not to create an international co-founded University is another major limitation of this research. The characteristics of those universities that choose to establish international co-founded institutions are likely to vary substantially from other providers. As such, future research should focus on the difference between these two institutions.

Future research should also seek to clarify the positive, long-term effects of various source bodies, host countries, and experiences on international co-founded universities.

## REFERENCES

Alam, F., Alam, Q., Chowdhury, H., & Steiner, T. (2013). Transnational education: Benefits, threats and challenges. Procedia Engineering, 56, 870–874.

Altbach, P. (2012, Winter). Franchising-the McDonaldization of higher education. International Higher Education, 66, 7–8.

Altbach, P., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. Journal of Studies in International Education, 11(3–4), 290–305.

Altbach, P., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. (2009). Trends in global higher education: tracking an academic revolution.  A Report Prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education. Available from: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001831/183168e.pdf [Accessed 20 December 2012].

American Council on Education (ACE). (2012). Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses. Washington, DC: Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative research in psychology, 3(2), 77-101.

Clifford, V., & Montgomery, C. (2015). Transformative learning through internationalization of the curriculum in higher education. Journal of Transformative Education, 13(1), 46-64.

Crook, R. (2014). The 100 most international universities in the world 2014. Retrieved from http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/news/the-25-most-international-universities-in- the-world/2010783.article

Ellingboe, B. J. (1998). Divisional strategies to internationalize a campus portrait: Results, resistance, and recommendations from a case study at a US university. Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus, 1998, 198-228.

Helms, R. (2008). Transnational education in China: Key challenges, critical issues, and strategies for success. London, England: The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.

Kinser, K., & Lane, J. (2014). Managing the oversight of international branch campuses in higher education. Higher Education Management and Policy, 24(3), 161–176.

Knight, J. (1994). Internationalization: Elements and Checkpoints. CBIE Research No. 7. Canadian Bureau for International Education. 220 Laurier Avenue West, Suite 1550, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5Z9.

Knight, J. (2005). "Borderless, offshore, transnational and cross-border education: Definition and data dilemmas," Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, London, U.K., 2005.

Knight, J. (2008). Higher education in turmoil: The changing world of internationalization.

Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers. International Universities

Knight, J. (2013, Fall). From Multi-national universities to Education Hubs to Edu-glomerates? IIENetworker Magazine, p.42.

Knight, J. (2014a). International education hubs: Student, talent, knowledge models. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Knight, J. (2014b). What is an international university. In A. Glass (Ed.), The state of higher education 2014 (pp. 139-143). Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Knight, J. (2015). International Universities: Misunderstandings and Emerging Models? Journal of Studies in International Education 2015, Vol. 19(2) 107 –121.

Lane, J. (2011). Global expansion of international branch campuses: Managerial and leadership challenges. New Directions for Higher Education, 155, 5–17.

McNamara, J., & Knight, J. (2014). Impacts of transnational education on host countries: Academic, social/cultural, economic and skills impacts and implications of program and provider mobility. London, England: British Council/German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD).

Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2003). Techniques to identify themes. Retrieved from: http://nersp.nerdc.ufl.edu/~ufruss/documents/ryan%20and%20bernard%20themes.%20FM%2015(1).pdf

Wilkins, S., & Huisman, J. (2012). The international branch campus as transnational strategy in higher education. Higher education, 64(5), 627-645.