International Branch Campuses:

Reviewing the Literature through Tierney's Organizational Cultural Framework

Jayson J. Deese, Esen Gokpinar-Shelton, & Lauren A. Wendling

Much has been written about international branch campuses (IBCs), but a gap in the literature exists in the application of a cultural framework to understand the organizational culture of IBCs. This paper advances the study of IBCs by analyzing the current literature utilizing Tierney's (1988) framework of organizational culture. Applying Tierney's (1988) framework can assist in addressing conflicting influences, powers, and symbolic dimensions and improve performance within institutions of higher education, both locally and globally.

Institutions across the world have had an interest in branching out to other countries for several decades. In the 1970s, a first wave of institutions from the United States (U.S.) opened campuses abroad, and a second wave of growth occurred in the 1990s when institutions in Australia, Mexico, Chile, Ireland, Canada, Italy, the United Kingdom (U.K.), and Sweden began opening branch campuses in foreign countries (Lane, 2011). International branch campuses, or IBCs, as they are most commonly referred to in the literature, are defined by Lane (2011) as:

> an entity that is owned, at least in part, by a foreign education provider; operated in the name of the foreign education provider; engages in at least some face-to-face teaching; and provides access to an entire academic program that leads to a credential awarded by the foreign education provider. (p. 5)

Since 2006, the number of IBCs worldwide has increased by 43%, and it is estimated that there are nearly 250 IBCs across the world today, with many in development (Becker, 2015; Garrett, 2017; Healey, 2016). One main reason behind this increase is to take advantage of the international demand for small, specialized academic programs, most of which are offered in business management and information technology (Altbach, 2010). Low setup costs, significant international student demand, the emergence of mass access to channels of information, and the desire to build an increasingly diversified knowledge economy are among reasons that have led to the increase of IBC campuses in countries such as the United Arab Emirates (UAE), China, Singapore, and Qatar (Altbach, 2010; Becker, 2015; Girdzijauskaite & Radzeviciene, 2014). Further, proposals for the creation of new IBCs are no longer strictly originated by the home country, as has traditionally been the case (Becker, 2015). In the 21st century IBCs are increasingly being initiated from host countries that see the need to financially and politically support the growth of a knowledge-based economy. Evidence of this can be seen in the UAE, where its oil wealth and tax exemptions make UAE an attractive location for IBCs (Becker, 2015).

While the demand for IBCs increases worldwide, much attention is paid to the economic and reputational effect of the

branch campuses. Recent scholarly attempts, however, account for important consideration about how these institutions integrate with and serve the local environment. Gomez (2015) asserts that home institutions do not often acknowledge the local cultures and customs of host countries and this lack of acknowledgement often disrupts the function and success of IBCs. In addition, many researchers study the ways branch campuses compare to the home campus in terms of quality of academic offerings and write about the challenges of opening and managing IBCs focusing on the management of staff, students, and the curriculum, all of which raise significant issues in assessing such institutions (Altbach, 2010; Girdzijauskaite & Radzeviciene, 2014; Healey, 2016).

Due to the increasing pressure of environmental, cultural, and financial concerns, a growing body of research suggests there is a need for home and host institutions to understand the various difficulties and challenges of establishing IBCs. According to Bess and Dee (2013), the implementation of an organizational cultural framework can offer administrators, faculty, and researchers a way to study the challenges and complexities of higher education institutions, while informing them how their institutions can function effectively. IBCs are complex systems that are influenced by both internal and external forces, including conflicting power, symbolic dimensions, and perceptions of the IBC between the home institution and the host country. Therefore, in order to move the needle forward on IBC research and pedagogy, a comprehensive review of the literature with a focus on the role of organizational culture is needed. Noting the importance of studying IBCs through a cultural lens, the authors searched within the ERIC database for articles examining IBCs in order to construct a literature review. Though the IBC field of literature is growing, the authors found a limited number of articles studying the cultural components of IBCs. Adopting Tierney's (1988) seminal framework of organizational culture, the authors examined the current body of IBC literature, exploring how a cultural framework can be used to understand and advance the study of IBCs.

Tierney's (1988) cultural framework is adopted because it comprehensively grounds the understanding of relationships between actors and the environments in which they operate. The framework also helps administrators, faculty, and researchers to understand how meaning is made within multiple and overlapping contexts. Tierney (1988) asserts that a framework for organizational culture can serve as an effective tool to address global and local controversies and improve performance at higher education institutions. As IBCs continue to grow, it is important that IBC administrators understand their organizational culture and performance to better address potential conflict (Gomez, 2015; Kinser & Lane, 2014). In other words, an administrator is better equipped to address problems and improve performance when he or she has a clear interpretation of the organization's culture. This is particularly important because cultures that are congruent with organizational structures and goals are more effective than incongruent ones (Tierney, 1988). Further, because the expansion of IBCs has been historically from West to East, when employing Tierney's (1988) framework, it is important to take into consideration the possibility of perceived power differences between institutions and their home and host countries.

To effectively analyze IBCs in light of Tierney's (1988) organizational framework, this paper is divided into three main sections. First, Tierney's organizational

framework and its six cultural components are introduced and reviewed via their complex, multidirectional set of interactions. The current literature of IBCs is then synthesized in light of Tierney's (1988) six concepts of organizational culture. Finally, this paper summarizes the current state of IBC literature and discusses limitations of the cultural organizational framework.

Theoretical Framework: Tierney's Organizational Culture

Tierney (1988) defines organizational culture as the result of the dynamics within an organization that derive from "the values, processes, and goals held by those most intimately involved in the organization's workings" (p. 3). Organizational culture is shared and co-constructed by the participation of individuals through shared assumptions and interpretations of historical and symbolic forms of the institutions (Tierney, 1988). Understanding an organization's culture is mandatory in addressing administrative problems that may occur at multiple institutions but might be addressed in different ways based on the local context (Tierney, 1988). An administrator's inability to understand an organization's culture may lead to challenges in making decisions that are well-articulated and appropriate for the institution and its stakeholders. By understanding the culture, one is able to "minimize the occurrence and consequences of cultural conflict and help foster the development of shared goals" (Tierney, 1988, p. 5). This also allows for a welcoming culture in which administrators may be supportive, effective, and efficient in their management.

According to Tierney (1988), organizational culture within institutions of higher education differs in terms of six cultural concepts. These concepts form the basis of his organizational cultural framework: environment, mission, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership (Tierney, 1988; 2008). Adopting multiplicity and dynamism, these six concepts are developed to recognize that organizational processes and interactions constantly renegotiate relationships between people and the organization itself (Tierney, 1988; 2008). The six concepts of Tierney's organizational framework help institutions discover strategies, tools, attitudes, and values that contribute to building an organizational culture for success. The authors use these six concepts to better understand IBCs and common problems identified within the literature.

Environment

Tierney's (1988) framework of organizational culture defines the institutional environment as one characterized by the higher education organization and people within it. Tierney (1988) acknowledges that the organizational culture of an institution cannot be understood without knowing how the institution defines its environment or the attitude people hold towards it (hostility, friendship, etc.). The environmental characteristics of IBCs are specifically important to study in terms of understanding whether home countries' higher education services, resources, and equipment—including curriculum, staff, faculty, and social and recreational offerings—can be replicated in host countries effectively (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012).

Existing research within IBCs notes two distinct environmental factors of host countries with which home institutions must coordinate: the host government and the host regulatory body, both at the institutional level and at the ministry level (Farrugia & Lane, 2013; Gomez, 2015; Healey, 2016). Healey (2016) notes that institutions in Malaysia, China, Qatar, and the UAE—

countries that host more branch campuses than any other country worldwide—are highly regulated by their national governments and can only operate with the consent of the host country.

While IBCs are expected to maintain the policies and regulations of their home campus, in many cases the host regulators require significant changes to the degree of localization of IBC curricula, course offerings, academic staff, pedagogy, language, and assessment (Egege & Kutieleh, 2009; Willis, 2004). As one IBC administrator in China bluntly states, "We are not permitted under the terms of our license to offer courses that we don't offer in [the home university]. However, the Chinese Ministry of Education mandates their students enroll in a range of 'patriotic education' courses" (Healey, 2016, p. 67). While an IBC often makes curricular changes regarding the requirements of its home campus, the host government regulatory body can also mandate change if the curriculum of the home campus is considered socially or culturally inappropriate by the host government (Rhee & Sagaria, 2004).

In addition to the curriculum, the pedagogical approach may be problematic in IBCs due to various environmental factors. Mahrous and Ahmed (2010) note that education in state schools across Malaysia, Qatar, and the UAE depend almost entirely on lectures, dictation, memorization, textbook reading, and rote learning, with assessment relying primarily on traditional examinations. Likewise, in countries such as China, Korea, and Singapore, the Confucian model generally molds higher education systems, which encourages moral values and maintains a strict top-down hierarchy, shaping executive agendas, educational priorities, and research creativity (Gomez, 2015). Therefore, discrepancies frequently exist between the liberal arts pedagogical perspective of Western higher education and the expectations of host countries for transnational providers (Gomez, 2015).

The local environmental parameters also strongly affect the development of comparable extracurricular and cocurricular experiences for students in IBCs, such as organizing athletic events and/or inviting students to participate in learning activities outside the classroom (e.g., internships, service learning, and student organizations; Lane, 2011). Extracurricular and cocurricular activities are systemized learning experiences that supplement the academic curriculum and are often considered as one of the core components of higher education, especially in the context of U.S. colleges and universities. However, in some cases, the host country prevents the home university from implementing their unique extracurricular and cocurricular activities, while in other cases such activities are cherished but adjusted based on the local culture. For instance, Howman Wood (2011) notes that Texas A&M University in the U.S., with a rich history of college athletics, is able to continue its commitment to the academic and personal development of all student athletes by translating this tradition to its branch campus in Doha, Qatar. However, in order to fit in the cultural context, the university had to make adjustments in its approach to develop its sports teams. While having a successful football team has always been a significant part of the Texas A&M culture, the IBC campus in Doha prioritizes soccer and basketball teams rather than football. The celebration rituals during the games are also tailored in a way that cultivates the local spirit and culture. Students bring along to the games traditional Arab drums and have developed their own local celebration activities (Howman Wood, 2011).

While these changes are considered small adjustments and may not have a

deteriorating impact on extracurricular and cocurricular activities that are equivalent to those in the home campus, the IBCs must sometimes deal with greater ethical issues. The customs and cultures of various Middle Eastern and South Asian communities are found to deter female students from participating in extracurricular and cocurricular activities, particularly those that may involve interaction with males, due to the host country's more conservative culture (Wilkins & Balakrishnan, 2012). Although the literature is limited on how ideological differences may impact student participation and the subsequent outcomes of extracurricular and cocurricular activities, issues such as inequality and the unequal treatment of females are highly criticized by home campus administrators, due to their detrimental impact on the values of home campuses (Wilkins & Balakrishnan, 2012). Therefore, it is important for IBC administrators to understand how the environments of home and host countries differ in regards to student participation and cultural values as well as the possible tension such differences may cause (Gomez, 2015).

Restrictions on freedom of speech among foreign faculty and administrators are also quite common in IBCs (Gomez, 2015). A teacher at the UAE George Mason IBC reports that she must tailor her language because the word "homosexual" can be offensive to her students and the government could arrest her (Gomez, 2015, p. 46). In another study, the director of graduate programs at the University of Nottingham's campus in Malaysia proclaims that there is a specific provision in his contract that states he cannot say anything offensive about the host government (Healey, 2016). Healey (2016) notes the issue of academic freedom is a "hugely complicated situation" at many IBCs (p. 28).

Due to a lack of academic freedom and the limits of free speech, the attitudes faculty and administrators hold regarding the environment of IBCs is a concern for home institutions (Gomez, 2015; Healey, 2016). Compared to western countries such as the U.S. and U.K., where the governance of institutions traditionally has been a responsibility shared by faculty, administrators, and trustees, strong government regulatory forces in host countries often lead to dissatisfaction among foreign administrators and faculty (Ennew & Fujia, 2009; Gomez, 2015). For example, New York University's (NYU) home campus supports an environment of shared governance that runs counter to governance expectations in Abu Dhabi where NYU has a branch campus (Ennew & Fujia, 2009). Many Westerners who work at NYU's branch campus in Abu Dhabi complain of limitations imposed from government entities, shifting expectations, and top-down management (Ennew & Fujia 2009; Fazackerley & Worthington 2007; Tierney & Lanford, 2015). To prevent such conflicts and move from a volatile mode of management into a mode of rational reflection and change, it is imperative for IBCs to interpret their environments effectively and understand the power culture has in influencing organizational decisions.

Mission

The mission component of Tierney's (1988) framework of organizational culture denotes how actors within an institution understand the overarching ideology of their university. Informed by the history of the institution, a mission offers meaning, direction, and purpose to institutional actors (Tierney, 2008). Because organizations are social institutions that exist within specific environments, the mission of an organization is socially constructed and is continuously redefined and reinterpreted by

institutional actors within a cultural framework (Tierney, 2008).

Morphew and Hartley (2006) describe the mission of an IBC as a legitimizing function that justifies a university's existence to key internal and external stakeholders. Zimmerman and Zeitz (2002) explain that to attain resources that can help sustain or grow IBCs, it is necessary to build branch campus legitimacy. For an organization to establish legitimacy, the mission of a branch campus must address the differing cultural beliefs between the home country and the foreign entity, have long-term goals, and see the necessity for continuous reinterpretation (Tierney & Lanford, 2015). This is significant because the campus environment, professoriate, home culture, and foreign entity's culture often vary from one country to another (Tierney & Lanford, 2015). The greater the legitimacy held by a branch campus, the more easily it can obtain the resources required to operate. Such resources include student enrollment, the support of local officials, and the goodwill of the general public in the host country (Tierney & Lanford, 2015).

The literature on IBCs, and in particular Tierney and Lanford (2015), shows that the mission of an IBC is described from one of the three angles: (a) orientation to the global environment, (b) commitment to the home country, or (c) orientation to the regional/host country (Farrugia & Lane, 2013; Schoepp, 2009). Farrugia and Lane (2013) note that universities seeking to create a global identity and embrace global perspectives must work to convey to home campus stakeholders that the branch campus is a legitimate extension of the home university's mission and identity. While this sends an important message to the home university in terms of its internationalization efforts, it also serves as a positive legitimization process in the host country (Farrugia & Lane, 2013).

Although establishing a global identity is significant, most IBCs are still largely bound, ideologically and culturally, to their home country (Farrugia & Lane, 2013). For example, Farrugia and Lane (2013) studied 45 branch campus mission statements and found that, compared to European and Australian IBCs, American and Canadian IBCs express higher commitment to the global environment, but they are also more closely tied to their home country's environment. By invoking their home countries in their mission statements, American and Canadian IBCs offer a style of education particular to their home country (Farrugia & Lane, 2013). While this could be used as brand legitimization, Schoepp (2009) notes that institutions which simply transplant their programs into another country are often not well received. Without careful planning, the internationalization attempts and the international identity these branch campuses try to establish can backfire, especially if they undermine the local academic experience and social integration. When the home university is heavily emphasized in the mission statement, there is generally little autonomy at the branch campus level and little room for creativity or adaptation to the local community (Gomez, 2015). Therefore, the literature suggests that IBCs consider how deeply the global rhetoric within their mission statements is integrated into their organizational practices (Farrugia & Lane, 2013; Gomez, 2015).

Socialization

Tierney's (1988) framework of organizational culture refers to socialization as the process in which members become socialized to their environment. Actors learn what values and personal qualities are considered important within an academic

organization through the process of socialization (Tierney, 1988). Socialization within IBCs is highly complex. Due to obligations for both home and host countries, IBC socialization exhibits different socially legitimate structures such as norms, values, roles, customs, laws, regulations, practices and procedures, routines, rituals, codes and agreements (Tierney & Lanford, 2015).

One way to understand these different structures and their impact on socialization at IBCs is from the perspective of those who are already familiar with socialization patterns at the home university. The faculty and the administrators that come from the home university incorporate new members, especially local members, into the branch campus by teaching and socializing new members into the organization's norms, values, and culture (Gomez, 2015). A major concern, however, is the way local culture and customs may be ignored during this socialization process. Gomez (2015) argues that faculty members are often not sufficiently trained by their home institutions to work with students, faculty, or administrators from different backgrounds. In a study of lecturers from three North American universities, Gomez (2015) identifies that none of the study's participants were involved in pre-departure intercultural communication competency training for transnational teaching. When training was provided, it was often basic, generalized, and dealt with student learning styles, rather than helping faculty members gain the competencies needed to negotiate other cultures (Gomez, 2015). According to Tierney and Lanford (2015), socialization at IBCs should embolden an understanding of humanity and difference and the failure to acknowledge these components often creates controversies within IBCs.

Information

Tierney (1988) describes information as the process by which knowledge is disseminated within institutions, as well as the ways leaders communicate with their internal constituencies. IBC literature examining what constitutes information, who has it, and how it is disseminated is limited. However, the available literature addresses two primary concerns: (a) how and what type of information is disseminated to students by means of an institutional curriculum, and (b) the negative effects of siloing information (Kinser & Lane, 2014; Lane, 2011; Tierney & Lanford, 2015). These issues often result in a lack of clearly understood rules, regulations, and procedures between the home and host campuses (Kinser & Lane, 2014; Lane, 2011; Tierney & Lanford, 2015).

Kinser and Lane (2014) note that the dissemination of information to students via the curriculum should include participation by both the home and host campuses. Initial approval of the curriculum typically comes from the home campus faculty. After approval by the home institution, the IBC as well as any quality assurance agencies in the home and/or host country must give their approval (Kinser & Lane, 2014). Following approval by all interested parties, oversight of the curriculum should be maintained by both the home and host campuses, ensuring that quality is equivalent across all locations (Kinser & Lane, 2014). Such oversight is typically transferred to administrative offices within both the home and host countries or managed entirely by administrators located at the branch campus (Kinser & Lane, 2014).

In addition to the dissemination and oversight of the curriculum, home and host campuses must identify ways to share administrative power and information. Lane (2011) notes the most challenging issue when sharing information between campuses is the difference in time zones and

work days between the two institutions. Since many IBCs are located across several time zones, there is often little overlap in the work hours of the two campuses, making it difficult to coordinate group decision-making processes and share information (Lane, 2011). Time constraints and difficulties in sharing information often further reinforce the administrative siloing of information at both the home campus and IBC (Lane, 2011).

Lastly, power dynamics between campus decision-makers on the home and host campuses, as well as with foreign governments, can negatively affect the dissemination of information and increase tension (Tierney & Lanford, 2015). Procedures for publicly sharing information regarding IBCs often differ between the cultural and social environments of the home and host campuses. As noted earlier, different cultural and social environments often further convolute how individuals understand and share information (Tierney & Lanford, 2015).

For example, Aviv (2013) notes that tensions between decision-makers regarding the sharing of information were heightened during the initial negotiations of the establishment of the NYU Abu Dhabi branch campus. The Crown Prince of Abu Dhabi requested that the NYU president keep discussions of an IBC private, a typical request for all high-ranking negotiations in Abu Dhabi (Aviv, 2013). This enraged NYU faculty who demanded all information be shared. NYU's president faced backlash from both NYU faculty and Abu Dhabi officials for the initial secrecy and then divulgence of information, complicating negotiations of establishing an NYU IBC in Abu Dhabi (Tierney & Lanford, 2015).

Strategy

Strategy, as understood by Tierney's (1988) cultural framework, focuses on how institutional leaders make decisions and respond to environmental pressures. The literature regarding IBC strategic decision-making is rich in the areas of IBC establishment, institutional status, risk-taking, and risk-avoidance (Healey, 2015; Lane, 2011; Tierney & Lanford, 2015). For institutions to achieve legitimacy with stakeholders and manage the macro social forces that influence the strategic decision-making of home and host campuses, institutions must consider: (a) motivations and concerns, (b) what type of strategies are employed, (c) who is making decisions, and (d) the penalties for bad decisions (Healey, 2015; Tierney, 1988; Wilkins & Huisman, 2012).

Most prominent in the literature of IBC strategic decision-making is the process of establishing branch campuses. Common reasons institutions establish IBCs are to increase revenue streams, advance institutional prestige, and to fulfill a demand from foreign educational sectors (Kinser & Lane, 2014; Lane, 2011; Tierney & Lanford, 2015). Girdzijauskaite and Radzeviciene (2014) note that establishing an IBC is a highly entrepreneurial endeavor. Income generated from international activities allows for the financial diversification of an institution, thereby lessening the institution's dependency on government funding (Girdzijauskaite & Radzeviciene, 2014). For example, the decrease in public funding for institutions in the U.S., U.K., and Australia has pressured institutions in these countries to become more entrepreneurial and seek additional sources of revenue by establishing IBCs (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). Financial gain also pushes host countries to be more receptive to welcoming branch campuses, as IBCs help reduce "brain drain," support income generation, and increase the growth of technology in host countries (Girdzijauskaite & Radzeviciene, 2014).

Although financial concerns often guide the strategic decision-making when opening IBCs, Tierney and Lanford (2015) are skeptical that IBCs are solely entrepreneurial endeavors. They argue that the establishment of IBCs is in large part strategically guided by the challenges internationalization has placed on institutions. Institutions seek not only to diversify income, but also to capitalize on developing an international workforce and "nurture global networks" (Tierney & Lanford, 2015, p. 288). As the global nature of higher education expands, institutional decision-makers continue to strategize how to effectively enter the global market through the establishment of IBCs.

In countries where internationalization efforts are emerging, there is more uncertainty about the organizational structure of IBCs, which can undermine decision-making (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). Because rules and cultural norms in host countries are often quite different than those at home institutions, decision-makers must strategically assess how the international context affects administrative power and decision-making (Kinser & Lane, 2014). Aversion to the potential loss of power and institutional prestige helps explain the strategic choices of institutions like Cambridge, Yale, and St. Andrews who have chosen not to establish IBCs attempting to avoid loss of their elite status and legitimacy (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012).

While financial opportunity and prestige are lucrative motivations, decision-makers must be mindful of a broad spectrum of associated risks when establishing IBCs. Such risks include environmental and cultural differences, financial and political regulations, and institutional uncertainty (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). Home institutions must strategize how their institution and its systems, processes, and cultural norms will enter the international landscape (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). When establishing IBCs, institutions often follow one of three strategic plans: (a) *adapting* their home structures and processes to suit the international context, (b) *transferring* their home structures and processes directly to the IBC with little change, or (c) *creating* mutually designed structures and processes with input from each partner (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). Regardless of which strategy is employed, it is imperative that the issues of university mission, information sharing, environment, and institutional leadership are considered in order to achieve legitimacy among stakeholders both within the home institution and the host country.

Leadership

Tierney (1988) notes that leadership is the process of identifying formal and informal institutional leaders and what an institution expects from its leaders. As institutions search for legitimacy at home and abroad, many have taken an isomorphic approach to IBC management (Kinser & Lane, 2014; Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). Most IBCs choose to adopt one of three leadership structures (Kinser & Lane, 2014, p. 171).

- A home campus administrator located in the home country leads all oversight of the IBC as a separate academic or administrative unit.
- Management is split between home and host campus administrators. The home campus maintains control over all academic endeavors, while the host campus and international partners manage finances.
- The home campus utilizes its structures and processes to manage the IBC entirely from the host country location.

While the specific style of leadership depends on the environmental and

institutional context, it has been found that the greater the physical and cultural differences between the home campus and the IBC, the greater the potential for miscommunication and distrust (Healey, 2015).

IBCs are complex enterprises. They require leaders with academic and political skills who can balance the requirements of the home and host campuses and operate in different environments simultaneously (Lane, 2011). Wilkins and Huisman (2012) note that individual leaders process information, assess risk, and interpret environmental pressures in many ways. Three primary qualities of successful IBC leaders within the home and host countries are cited throughout the literature (Healey, 2016; Kinser & Lane, 2014; Lane, 2011; Lane, 2014; Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). Successful IBC leaders effectively span boundaries, coordinate academic and faculty needs, and act as liaisons between home and host countries (Healey, 2016; Kinser & Lane, 2014; Lane, 2011). Successful boundary spanners work on behalf of all invested parties and engender trust from all groups. Successful IBC leaders also understand how local conditions differ from those of the home campus and identify ways to adapt policies and structures to meet demands of the home and host institutions (Lane, 2011). Leaders must also work to maintain consistency among home and host campuses. Successful leaders act as liaisons to all invested groups by coordinating faculty, academic, and curricular needs, adapting policies, and allowing for flexibility when appropriate (Healey, 2016; Kinser & Lane, 2014).

The most fundamental challenge for IBC leaders is balancing the competing demands of internal and external stakeholders, including governmental regulators, faculty, staff, students, and local and international financial partners (Ahmad, 2015; Healey, 2015; Healey, 2016). Challenges for IBC leaders arise when communication between partners is stifled, either by cultural differences, diverse management styles, or administrative silos (Lane, 2011; Tierney & Lanford, 2015). Although the challenges associated with IBC leadership can be daunting, a foreign context and unconventional management structures enable leaders to work in creative and transformational ways. In certain environments, powerful leaders can forego traditional structures and processes in lieu of more innovative actions (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). If successful, leaders can help conceptualize what is acceptable, efficient, and effective for their IBCs.

Limitations

Because the number of IBCs throughout the world will likely continue to rise in response to increased efforts for internationalization, it is crucial for institutions to be prepared for the challenges and difficulties of opening and managing IBCs. This includes understanding the limitations of frameworks, such as Tierney's (1988) organizational culture. One ongoing limitation is the response to cultural change over time. Cultures, including institutional and departmental cultures, are never static. IBCs must acknowledge the fluidity of host and home-campus cultures at their various levels (e.g., regional, national, departmental, organizational, etc.) as they evolve.

It is also important to address the positionality of the researchers and administrators who utilize Tierney's (1988) framework. Though international education is of interest to the research team, the researchers have primarily studied and worked at institutions in the U.S. Therefore, the researchers are more familiar with higher education institutions within the Western

culture. Using this framework, practitioners should be mindful of all cultures.

Conclusion

Understanding environmental differences between the IBC and home institution is an important consideration for the success of IBCs. National regulations of host countries have an impact on curricula, pedagogical practices, course content, student activities, residence halls, and extracurricular and cocurricular student opportunities. The curriculum, for example, plays an important role in Tierney's (1988) concept of information. The dissemination of information, such as the curriculum, must comply with the host country's quality assurance agencies while remaining true to the information of the home campus (Kinser & Lane, 2014; Lane, 2011; Tierney & Lanford, 2015). Tierney's framework provides practitioners a lens to better understand how both home and host campuses disseminate information and reduce the likelihood for tension, work towards shared goals, and avoid the siloing of information.

Along with long-term goals, overarching ideologies are driving forces behind an institution's mission. IBC administrators can implement Tierney's component of mission by ensuring the mission is integrated into the organizational practices between the two campuses (Farrugia & Lane, 2013; Tierney & Lanford, 2015). More specifically, an IBC's mission may require being rewritten and reinterpreted based on the evolving nature, goals, beliefs, and assumptions of the two campuses. This interdependence is strengthened through socialization, as values and qualities are passed on to new members of the organization. It is imperative that administrators, staff, and faculty receive pre-departure training, intercultural training and competency, and are open and flexible for the success of the IBC. In short, strategic implementation of the goals and values of the IBC, along with the appropriate socialization of its agents, is crucial.

The creation of any IBC depends heavily on the strategy employed during its formation. Much of the decision making regarding the establishment of IBCs is a response to increasing revenue, advancing institutional prestige, or fulfilling a demand from foreign educational sectors (Kinser & Lane, 2014; Lane, 2011; Tierney & Lanford, 2015). Institutions must be strategic in regard to these efforts. For a strategy to be effective, it must be successfully implemented by leadership at both the home and host campuses (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). Furthermore, the quality of leaders and their ability to balance internal and external demands is essential for the success of the IBC.

To successfully utilize Tierney's cultural framework as a means to improve IBCs, practitioners must be strategic, efficient, and purposeful with their use of the six cultural lenses. As Kezar and Eckel (2002) note, Tierney's framework may be difficult to be readily used by practitioners. Thus, it is imperative practitioners fully understand the six cultural concepts in addition to what they mean in regard to their specific organizational cultures. This paper serves as a starting point for IBC practitioners and administrators.

Frameworks, such as Tierney's (1988) organizational culture, provide institutions key opportunities for improvement and overall understanding of IBCs (Becker, 2015). More specifically, Tierney's (1988) framework can be used to diagnose and manage the culture of IBCs while attempting to solve issues and problems that arise. Because the organizational cultures of institutions are different and will be met with a different culture in a host country, the researchers strongly suggest that institutions,

administrators, and practitioners use this framework to understand organizational culture. As Tierney and Lanford (2015) state, “If administrators and other stakeholders do not make the culture of the organization a primary consideration, the implications for the health of the organization can be significant, and the sustainability of a branch campus likely to be in question” (p. 295). Successful implementation of the six organizational concepts might make IBCs the model of international cooperation that the world needs.

Jayson J. Deese is a Ph.D. student in the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Department at IU with a major in Higher Education and a minor in International and Comparative Education. His interests include international education, student affairs, and language program administration.

Esen Gokpinar-Shelton is a Ph.D. student in the Educational Leadership Policy Studies Department at IU with a major in Higher Education and a minor in International and Comparative Education Policies. Esen's research interests lie in the realm of international education and policy-making decisions at the global, national, and institutional level.

Lauren A. Wendling is a doctoral student in the Higher Education and Student Affairs program at Indiana University. She has professional experience in nonprofit management and higher education administration. Her research interests include the institutionalization of community engagement within institutions of higher education.

References

Ahmad, S. Z. (2015). Evaluating student satisfaction of quality at international branch campuses. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *40*(4), 488-507.

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

Aviv, R. (2013, September 9). The imperial presidency. *The New Yorker, 89*, 60–86.

Becker, R. (2015). International branch campuses: New trends and directions. *International Higher Education*, 3-5.

Bess, J. L., & Dee, J. R. (2008). *Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Egege S., & Kutieleh S. (2009). Dimming down difference. In L. Dunn & M. Wallace (Eds.), *Teaching in transnational higher education: Enhancing learning for offshore international students*. London: Routledge.

Ennew, C. T., & Fujia, Y. (2009). Foreign universities in China: A case study. *European Journal of Education*, *44*(1), 21–36.

Farrugia, C., & Lane, J., (2013). Legitimacy in cross-border higher education: Identifying stakeholders of international branch campuses. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *17*(4), 414–432.

Fazackerley, A., & Worthington, P. (2007). British universities in China: The reality beyond the rhetoric. *Agora*. Retrieved from https://academiccouncil.duke.edu/sites/default/files/u6/A C-pdfs/09-10/11-19-09/Agora-China-Report1.pdf

Garrett, R. (2017). International branch campuses: Curiosity or important trend? *International Higher Education*, (90), 7-8.

Girdzijauskaite, E., & Radzeviciene, A. (2014). International branch campus: Framework and strategy. *Contemporary Issues in Business, Management and Education*, *110*, 301-308.

Gomez, N. (2015). *International branch campuses* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from CUNY Academic Works.

Healey, N. (2015). Managing international branch campuses: What do we know? *Higher Education Quality*, *69*(4), 386-409.

Healey, N. (2016). The challenges of leading an international branch campus: The "lived experience" of in-country senior managers. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *20*(1), 61-78.

Howman Wood, C. (2011). Institutional ethos: Replicating the student experience. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *155*, 29-39.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2002). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: Universal principles or culturally responsive concepts? *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(4), 435-560.

Kinser, K., & Lane, J. E. (2014). Managing the oversight of international branch campuses in higher education. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, *24*(3), 161-173.

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

Mahrous, A. A., & Ahmed, A. A. (2010). A cross-cultural investigation of students' perceptions of the effectiveness of pedagogical tools. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 14*(3), 289-306.

Morphew, C. C., & Hartley, M. (2006). Mission statements: A thematic analysis of rhetoric across institutional type. *Journal of Higher Education, 77*(3), 456-471.

Rhee, J., & Sagaria, M. A. D. (2004). International students: Constructions of imperialism in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. *The Review of Higher Education, 28* (1), 77-96.

Schoepp, K. (2009). The United Arab Emirates and the branch campus gold rush. *International Higher Education*, 56, 22-23.

Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. *Journal of Higher Education*, *59*(1), 2-19.

Tierney, W. G. (2008). *The impact of culture on organizational decision making*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Tierney, W. G., & Lanford, M. (2015). An investigation of the impact of international branch campuses on organizational culture. *Higher Education*, *70*, 283-298.

Willis, M. (2004). An evaluation of levels of adaptation used in the teaching of foreign university degree programs in China. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, *16*(2), 27-49.

Wilkins, S., & Balakrishnan, M. S. (2012). Student perception of study at international branch campuses: Implication for educators and college managers. *Research Online*, 1-16.

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

Zimmerman, M. A., & Zeitz, G. J. (2002). Beyond survival: Achieving new venture growth by building legitimacy. *Academy of Management Review*, *27*(3), 414-431.