Towards post-colonial management of transnational education

Peter Ling

Victoria University & Swinburne University

Margaret Mazzolini

Victoria University

Beena Giridharan

Curtin University, Sarawak

Increasingly, universities in developed countries are engaging in transnational education. Responsibilities and opportunities to exercise management and leadership in the provision of transnational education depend on the organisational model adopted and whether the academics involved are on home or international campuses. Models range from neocolonial control to transnational partnerships. In the Australian Office for Learning and Teaching study that informs this paper, good practice in allocation and exercise of management and leadership responsibilities was identified and recommendations developed. A balance was struck between the home institution's quality assurance obligations, which imply a high level of home-based control, and the value of a degree of local control to the commitment of local academics involved, to their career opportunities, and to the educational experiences of their students.

Introduction

More and more universities in developed countries are engaging in international partnerships (Warwick, 2014), including transnational education (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007). Transnational education here refers to an arrangement in which a student studies for an award granted by a university based in a country other than the country the student is studying in (Global Alliance for Transnational Education, 1997). Numerous organisational arrangements for transnational education are possible, from branch campuses to partnerships, franchises and mutual recognition of awards.

The study on which this paper is based was a part of a project entitled Learning Without Borders, which focused on branch campuses. The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education has defined a branch campus 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, 2012, p.7)

The branch campuses in this study were substantial physical entities, employing hundreds of academics to offer multiple undergraduate and postgraduate pro-

grams of the home institution to thousands of students. The campuses offer programs in business, engineering, science, information technology and design. The project was funded by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council in the category of leadership and reported to the Australian national Office for Learning and Teaching. The Australian Learning and Teaching Council and the Office for Learning and Teaching are Australian government agencies established to advance learning and teaching in the higher education sector. This paper provides a review based on one element of the project – good practice in recognition, reward, development and support of people with management and leadership roles in transnational education, both those based at home campuses and those in international locations. In the case of the branch campuses investigated here the bulk of academics employed are employed by the branch campus at local rates of pay and under local conditions, which are inferior to those that apply to academics on Australian campuses.

It was found that responsibilities and opportunities to exercise leadership in the provision of transnational education depends on the model adopted and whether the academic managers and leaders involved are on home or international campuses.

Questions addressed

This paper is, then, concerned with academic management and leadership in transnational education. Consequences for students are tangential to the central question here, which is: Are some models of transnational education preferable to others from the point of view of recognition, reward and support of academic managers and leaders involved at home and abroad? The answer may vary by the criteria employed, so there are a number of secondary questions that need to be addressed. These include: What are the organisational features of the various models transnational education encountered? Do some involve a set of unequal relationships between local academics and home campus academics? What are the consequences of adopting a particular model for the home-based and local academics involved? Can best practice be identified?

Key concepts and related literature

The term 'postcolonial' has been used in the title of this paper because the management of transnational education involves balances in decision making between the foreign institution making an academic award and the

local agent. This can have shades of colonialism about it in the sense that colonialism involves a set of unequal relationships between a foreign power and the local population. As Osterhammel (2005) demonstrates, colonialism does not imply total imposition of foreign ways but involves a blend between the societies of the colonised and the colonialists. The authors explore here whether some arrangements for transnational education might meet the requirements for an academic award of the home institution but operate with a more equal balance of decision making, whether some arrangements for transnational education are not only postcolonial in a temporal sense (Gilbert & Tompkins, 2002) but also come closer to being postcolonial in terms of balance of power and decision making.

The concern in this paper is with management and leadership of transnational education. Management here is taken to refer to managing people and other resources to get results, where managers 'are accountable for attaining goals, having been given authority over those working in their unit or department' (Armstrong, 2012, p. 24). 'Leadership can be described as the ability to persuade other people willingly to behave differently. It is the process of influencing people – getting them to do their best to achieve a desired result' (Armstrong, 2012, p. 4). Both are pertinent to this study as there are university goals, strategies and resources applied to transnational education that must be managed and people who need to be led in the endeavour to attain desired ends.

This raises the question of underlying assumptions about the nature of management and leadership within an organisation – in this case a university. The understanding of organisations employed here is informed by the writings of Thomas Greenfield and Anthony Giddens. Greenfield rejects the dualism that separates people and organisations (Lane, 2007). Giddens' writing is consistent with Greenfield's in the sense that organisations for Giddens are constituted by people, that is, they are framed by the perceptions of people who see themselves as interacting with organisations. Giddens accommodates a duality of structure to the extent that people have an understanding of organisations as structures comprising rules and resources (Craib, 1992). These theories remind us that goals, policies, procedures and organisational roles are not impersonally determined by an institution but are determined by those who constitute the organisation and can be 'instruments of power which some people can control and use to attain ends which seem good to them' (Lane, 2007, p. 6). These concepts lead to probing participants' understandings of the rules and resources that relate to

activities in the organisation and their sense of enablement and constraint in pursuit of activities.

In this paper, being concerned with transnational operations, the authors confront a further dimension – organisational relationships – or, more precisely, the relationships between people in organisations. Giddens observes that in the modern era there are complex relationships between local involvement and interaction across distance where relations become stretched (Giddens, 1991). In these circumstances 'we see the strengthening pressure for local autonomy and regional cultural identity' (Giddens, 1991, p. 65). The transnational education setting raises questions about the appropriateness of management – the exercise of power – by people based at a home campus in the endeavour to achieve the purposes of the enterprise at a transnational campus, which operates in a foreign context, an exercise of power that can be styled 'colonial'. In reviewing the data obtained in the present study, attention is paid to the understandings of respondents at the home campus and at transnational locations about the organisations in which they are employed, their roles, and their agency and authority in decision making about curriculum, learning and teaching activities, design of learning resources and assessment of student work.

The project on which this paper is based was funded as a study of distributed leadership. Pertinent literature includes that relating to management and leadership of academic programs and literature relating to provision of programs through transnational education. The first category included the role of unit coordinators within universities (Cohen & Bunker, 2007), developing and valuing the role of unit coordinators as informal leaders of learning in higher education (Roberts, Butcher & Brooker, 2010) and distributed leadership in higher education (Jones, Applebee, Harvey & Lefoe, 2010). In the latter category, most writing focused on arrangements for teaching offshore rather than on management and leadership issues. This literature includes articles related to the challenge of sustaining academics teaching offshore (Debowski, 2003); predeparture training for lecturers in transnational programs (Gribble & Ziguras, 2003), reconstructing the offshore teaching team to enhance internationalisation (Leask, 2004) and the preparedness and experiences of Australian academics engaged in transnational teaching (Dunn & Wallace, 2006).

There are also articles that address cultural issues in transnational education operations with consequences for management and leadership. Lane observes that the current growth of transnational activity by educational institutions 'appears more akin to international business than traditional academic expansion' (Lane, 2007, p. 119). While this development can be seen as a response of educational institutions to doing business in the contemporary globalised environment, arrangements for the local management of the enterprise may share features of a colonial past. One element addressed in the present paper, concerned as it is with the balance of educational decision making between home institutions and local providers, is whether the arrangements are perceived as neocolonialism by those engaged at the local level.

This is an issue implicit in Leask's (2004) critique of fly in/fly out provision of transnational education. Leask discusses a model in which Australian staff provide intensive face-to-face blocks of teaching time and local staff act as tutors, a 'ground force' who 'finish off and clean up' (Leask, 2004, p. 3). Leask notes that under this arrangement power relationships do not allow for local tutors to take on more equal roles. Leask argues for the integration of local academics as 'full members of the teaching team, fully and equally engaged in curriculum planning and delivery' (Leask, 2004, p. 5). Eldridge and Cranston (2009) examined the effect of national culture upon the management of Australia's provision of transnational higher education in Thailand. Their findings suggest that, in the case of transnational education partnerships between Australian and Thai universities, both Thai and Australian managers believe 'national culture affects both the academic and operational management of their transnational higher education programmes' (Eldridge & Cranston, 2009, p. 67). They point to differences between Thai and Australian approaches to hierarchy, spiritual concerns, competition, procedures and regulations, and face and feelings in communication (Eldridge & Cranston, 2009).

A further study, which related to British transnational education in China, also concluded that 'managers of a Sino-UK transnational education partnership on both sides need to be open about the language and culture

> ... many Australian universities have entered transnational education arrangements with Chinese universities paying too little attention to cultural differences... 'to administer these programmes better academics need to understand the differences'.

Table 1: Models for control of transnational education decisions

1. Home campus control	2. Limited transnational campus control	3. Distributed control	4. Transnational campus control
Curriculum design and assessment determined by home campus only. Maybe fly-in-fly-out delivery.	Opportunities for contextualisation of learning activities &/or assessment items. Assessment or sample moderated by home campus.	Transnational campus decisions constrained only by attaining the same learning outcomes. May include sample assessment moderation by the home campus.	Units of study or programmes offer only on transnational campus but with the qualification awarded by the home campus institution.
Key features: The unit, learning activities and assessment are the same whoever delivers the unit.	Key features: The unit and assessment are the same whoever delivers the unit. Learning and teaching activities may be contextualised.	Key features: Unit learning outcomes are the same. Learning and teaching activities and assessment are contextualised.	Key features: The programme/unit is subject to quality assurance processes consistent with home campus national protocols.

induced challenges facing the sector and be committed to addressing them in the long term if they are to continue their operation' (Zhuang & Xueying Tang, 2012, p. 218). Likewise Heffernan, Morrison, Basu and Sweeney (2010) have pointed out that many Australian universities that have entered transnational education arrangements with Chinese universities pay too little attention to cultural differences and suggest that 'to administer these programmes better, academics need to understand the differences' (p. 27). The recommendations arising from these studies help inform the conclusion to the present paper.

Methodology

This study involved two Australian universities that have branch campuses in Malaysia: Swinburne University of Technology and Curtin University. Addressing the research questions as they related to home campus and transnational campus staff required data on the organisational arrangements for transnational education and staff perceptions of the way they played out on the home and transnational campuses. The methods employed in exploring the research questions included review of policies and procedures, surveys, individual interviews and focus groups. For the sake of consistency academics with leadership responsibility at whole of program level are referred to as program coordinators in the reporting below; those responsible for individual units of study are referred to as unit convenors.

Transnational education policies and procedures of the institutions were designed to ensure that programs met with Australian and local accreditation requirements. A variety of models was adopted within each institution, ranging from specification of all curriculum content and learning activities, provision of all learning resources, design and grading of all assessment by home campus academics, to simply requiring comparable learning experiences and learning outcomes on home and transnational campuses.

An online survey addressed operational aspects of transnational education. The survey was designed for academics who were program coordinators and unit convenors for programs offered at a transnational education location, including but not confined to the Malaysian branch campuses. The questionnaire investigated experience in working in or working with offshore locations and views on what worked well and what did not. Sixty-four responses were received.

Individual and focus group interviews were conducted to further explore staff experiences of working in a transnational education context. In particular they addressed staff views on how transnational education and internationalisation policies and procedures can best support academics undertaking program coordination or unit convening roles.

Findings

The models of transnational education encountered

Each of the institutions adopted more than one arrangement for the management of transnational education programs offered. For the purposes of the Learning Without Borders project the management arrangements were categorised (Table 1) as:

• home campus curriculum control
• limited transnational campus curriculum control
• distributed curriculum control
• transnational campus curriculum control.

The authors have styled the differing arrangements for the management of transnational education as models. The possible arrangements could be seen as a continuum from home campus control to local control, par-

ticularly as arrangements adopted were not universally applied by an institution and were dynamic. The arrangements sometimes varied not only between programs but also between units of study within programs; they also varied over time with changes in staff. In some cases local responsibility increased where local academics had more experience in teaching a unit of study. Nevertheless, there are distinct conceptual categories that are clear at either end. In the middle categories, the authors claim that there is a conceptual distinction between allowing some contextualisation of learning and teaching activities and requiring only that learning outcomes be the same.

The way the models played out in practice and the consequences for academics involved are described below and summarised in Table 2. Particular attention is given to the first model as it is a common approach for Australian universities.

Home campus curriculum control

In the first case, for offerings on the transnational campus, curriculum design and content, teaching and learning resources and activities, and assessment instruments were the responsibility of home campus program coordinators and unit convenors. Assessment of student work was either conducted by academics on the home campus or moderated by home campus academics. This arrangement, designed to ensure consistency between sites at which programs are offered, was typically adopted where programs were offered on multiple sites, or were offered at the transnational campus for the first time or by new staff. Sometimes this model was adopted on the grounds that programs taught by Australian academics who teach it in Australia are attractive to students at the transnational campus. For this reason one deputy dean reported of a transnational education partnership arrangement:

> The partners wanted Australian lecturers up there delivering it. They didn't want a franchised approach (interview).

This category includes the fly in/fly out format as described by a home campus program coordinator:

> We fly our staff up there to do all of the lectures and we've run one of the small groups and the partners will provide some tutors to run the other small groups. We developed and managed all of the assessment. We did all of the marking (interview).

Whether or not home campus academics teach offshore, the model involves tight control. The home campus convenor of a unit with large enrolments as an example stated:

I am prescriptive. Not just sample marking. I provide a teaching guide and revision notes. I make sure that teachers are on the same page. I provide a marking grid down to half a mark (interview).

At a branch campus a local unit convenor stated:

> The package comes with all the outcomes, assessment, PowerPoint slides and other documents ... I went over the whole thing and modified it just a little bit (interview).

One issue for home campus program and unit managers was recompense for their transnational education responsibilities. Arrangements varied widely, even within faculties. At one end of the scale, coordinators were granted a workload allowance for this responsibility, which one deputy dean reported 'equates to about a day a week' (interview). At the other end of the spectrum a programme coordinator reported that 'Time taken in meeting, unusual problems, coordination and teaching was done as overload outside term time' (Interview). For academics with unit convenor responsibilities who were employed on a casual basis there was sometimes little recompense. As one commented:

> As a sessional [staff member], it is difficult to establish, or negotiate clear working guidelines, procedures, and payment for this work (survey)

For some managers, part of the compensation for their transnational education responsibilities was a potential contribution to a case for career advancement. A home campus academic asked whether it does your career any good to have been involved in transnational education. Management responded:

> Most certainly ... because it's been about managing key relationships. It's about student management. It's been about facilitating and managing academics who go to deliver that program (interview).

On the other hand, a home campus deputy dean, questioned on involvement in transnational education management, said: 'I don't think it's a negative thing for your curriculum vitae, but I don't think it's a promotion' (interview). The educational administration demands of transnational education could in fact be seen as a career disadvantage. As one home campus unit coordinator observed:

> Involvement in transnational education does not do an academic career any good. If you want to get on, it is research here. I don't agree, but that's it (interview).

Convenors at transnational campuses also had responsibilities that they could cite but under this model they were of an administrative rather than academic nature, including, as a deputy dean reported, activities such as room bookings, assessment arrangements and organis-

ing meetings with visiting academics. As one program coordinator at a branch campus put it: 'It's not very clear what my role as the coordinator is, to be honest.' (interview). A transnational campus unit convenor did see association with teaching an Australia qualification as a career benefit.

I have on my resume, the name from, say, Australia, which is known for quality education; that does have a value' (interview).

On the other hand, he continued:

The fact that we don't have much involvement in curriculum, I would try to cover it up. I can't present a very strong case for my future career (interview).

One teacher on a transnational education campus viewed the provision of all learning resources and assessment items by the home campus as making his life easier, but from academic managers on branch campuses responses were typically negative.

The host country's institutions engaged in this kind of transnational education are recruiting low-skilled staff to merely deliver content decided in Australia. This appears to breed a whole class of 'academic coolies' … It has revealed the dangers of academic colonialism (survey).

Another stated:

This whole business about being equals and being culturally sensitive and all this kind of stuff, they're just using the words and it's really not there (interview).

Several home campus managers were uncomfortable with this arrangement. A home campus unit convenor conceded:

I found it quite awkward because I've had applications from [transnational campus] staff members who are really more senior than me, for me to write them a reference based on my visit to Malaysia (Interview).

A home campus program coordinator saw the management arrangement as 'the real master–servant relationship and it was just awful' (interview).

Limited transnational campus curriculum control

Limited transnational campus curriculum control arrangements permitted adaptation of some learning and teaching activities to take account of the context in which the students operated. Transnational campuses academics might also be allowed to suggest some assessment items, though assessment outcomes would be moderated by home campus academics. This arrangement was adopted where the number of sites was limited and the academ-

ics at the transnational campus had some experience in teaching the program.

As an example, a home campus associate dean reported:

We moderate student work if a unit's been taught for the first time. We have independent cross marking of exams, assignments and research projects. But now these units are in a steady state. We look at their assessment sheets but we don't actually do any cross marking (interview).

For a marketing education program the home campus convenor reported:

Because of equivalency, we control the curriculum part, the assessment … and when I say we control this, it's within reason that we allow them to actually change a certain percentage … They follow the same sort of textbook for the theory, but for the practical aspect we actually encourage their convenors to give local examples (interview).

For a business law unit a home campus convenor stated:

My role was to make it consistent but to allow for a localisation of content. Instead of making overseas students learn Australian consumer law, they can do international law in this area or they can do their own jurisdiction (interview).

In this model local input may be modest. In the experience of a branch campus unit convenor:

Staff may introduce their way of presenting but by and large the content of the teaching material comes from [the home campus]. Staff are free to present it in their own way … but must conform with material and content (interview).

For academic managers based on the home campus their experiences were much as reported for Model 1. For transnational academic managers the additional responsibilities could make a difference. Some transnational academic managers saw operating in a transnational education context as positive for their careers. One program coordinator stated:

My involvement has enhanced my career greatly. Working for a few years with counterparts at the main campus has strengthened my understanding and improved my professionalism (survey).

Academics with program management responsibilities on branch campuses saw career advancement opportunities, even where the extent of their educational decision making was limited. One stated:

I think there is limited power from our side to do something. It is positive in that I learn a lot of things (interview).

Table 2: Models and the consequences for managers on home and transnational education campuses

1. Home campus control	2. Limited transnational campus control	3. Distributed control	4. Transnational campus control
For home campus managers			
Managers can demonstrate leadership in curriculum design and implementation in a trans-national education context and cross-cultural experience. The management load may limit opportunities for career advancement through research and publication.	Managers can demonstrate leadership in curriculum design and implementation in a trans-national education context. Managers may be relieved of some of the assessment load of Model 1 but still the load may limit opportunities for career advancement through research and publication.	Managers can demonstrate some understanding of curriculum design and implementation in a transnational education context. Managers are relieved of some of the responsibility for design of learning student assessment, providing more opportunities for other career development.	Managers may have a modest opportunity for demonstrating some understanding of curriculum design and implementation in a transnational education context. They have more opportunities for other career development activities.
For transnational education campus managers			
Allows demonstration of teaching ability but not management.	May be able to cite contribution to curriculum design, learning and teaching activities and assessment.	May be able to cite management and leadership in curriculum design, and assessment.	Can cite management and leadership in curriculum design, and assessment.

Distributed curriculum control

Where the number of sites through which the program was provided was limited and the academics at the trans-national campus had considerable experience in teaching the program, distributed control might be adopted. This might involve transnational campus determination of some elements of curriculum, contextualisation of learning and teaching resources, and activities and contributions to assessment. In its most liberal form all that was prescribed by the home campus was the learning outcomes that were to be attained by students. Home campus moderation of assessment of student work still applied.

Interviews with home campus deputy deans provide a picture of the way this plays out.

> Before the start of semester we each swap our unit outlines across to ensure, for example, that our assessment is compatible, our learning objectives are compatible. They will provide us with what their major assignment is, or what their exam is and we'll just QA [quality assure] that and say 'Yep, that's OK' (interview).

For engineering, a deputy dean on the home campus stated:

> We're really striving to say that the two programs are equivalent but you don't have to be identical. So, for example, in engineering, codes of practices are quite important and the Malaysians will use their codes of practice there, but [they will] also cross reference with our ones as well. They'll use some of the design examples that are more about the Malaysian context than an Australian context (interview).

A local campus unit convenor described the operation this way:

> I get some material from Australia, like unit outline, slides, etc. I generally just take it as guideline, and then I get it approved, get suggestions from my counterpart. Teaching method also; I adopt my own (interview).

For home campus academic managers, where Model 3 was adopted, some of the positives of models involving tighter home campus control still applied. In addition some home campus academic managers see the arrangement as having mutual benefit:

> It is seen as a two-way learning opportunity for the academics – not someone looking over another's shoulder (interview).

Sharing responsibility was often seen to be appropriate. As a home campus program coordinator stated:

> I have a lot of professional respect for them. We're working on this together. They know their students, I know my students, they know what the end point is and if we get there differently, it doesn't really matter (interview).

From an educational point of view, local academic managers also see this model as desirable. As one unit convenor put it:

> Basically, I like to take the responsibility on my own … because here in Sarawak, it is me who is teaching the course … [I have] direct interaction with students; my counterpart sitting in Australia cannot actually have direct interaction with my students (interview)

For transnational campus academic managers this model enabled them to claim experience in design of curriculum, learning resources, learning and teaching activities, and assessment. Nevertheless, a focus group conducted at a branch campus pointed to a desire for recognition and reward. High teaching loads along with management responsibilities meant little time was available for research in a context in which research is highly valued in applications for promotion. One branch campus program coordinator observed:

> It is negative for my research career, definitely, because I've got no time whatsoever to research. I think [that is why] I'm not an established professor yet (interview).

Transnational campus curriculum control

In a few cases, academics at the transnational campus took full responsibility for curriculum, teaching and learning activities, as well as for assessment of student work. This applied where the program or units of study counted towards a home university award but were offered only on the transnational campus. A major entitled 'Borneo Studies' and an environmental engineering degree developed on the Curtin University Sarawak campus provide examples (see http://archive.handbook.curtin.edu.au/october2012/courses/31/312657.html). One branch campus unit convenor reported:

> We do have specific electives units that we have developed ourselves so we are not entirely free of curriculum development responsibilities (interview).

In this case, academic managers on the transnational campus can claim experience in all aspects of program management and at a level recognised for Australian quality assurance purposes.

Conclusions

To hark back to Giddens' concept of organisations being constituted by people, the authors have cited here some of our participants' understandings of the rules and resources that apply to their roles in the organisation and their sense of enablement and constraint in undertaking these roles. We have classified these responses to identify consequences of the balance between home campus and transnational campus decision making for academic managers involved. No differences by academic disciplines offered were observed.

In our key questions we asked what the organisational features of the various models of transnational education encountered are. The opportunities for the locus of decision making in transnational education ranged from all program and unit of study decisions being made at the home campus of the institution, through the possibility of some local contextualisation of teaching to local decision making constrained only by the need to assure the same student outcomes at transnational locations as those attained at the home campus. Additionally, in a few cases, units of study were developed and offered only on a transnational campus. The model adopted has consequences for academic managers at home and in transnational locations.

The authors asked whether some arrangements for the management of transnational education produced a set of unequal relationships between local academics and home campus academics and what the consequences were of adopting a particular model for the home-based and local academics involved. A high degree of home campus control enables home campus academics to exercise and demonstrate a range of educational management functions but places a workload burden on them. A high degree of home campus decision making limits managers on transnational campuses to administrative decisions rather than substantial academic decisions; it also limits their ability to demonstrate academic leadership, thus limiting their career opportunities. This is sometimes seen as neocolonialism by those engaged at the local level. While it is not the focus of this study, which is concerned with arrangements for management, it might be noted that a high degree of home campus control may also result in learning and teaching activities and assessment tasks foreign to the context and experiences of students in transnational settings.

Finally, the authors asked if best practice can be identified. As the definition of transnational education adopted here involves an academic award granted by a home institution, a major consideration is assurance that the learning outcomes of transnational students are commensurate with the learning outcomes for students studying on the home campus. Many Australian awards will also qualify students for recognition by professional associations in Australia, so the standard of students graduating from transnational education campuses needs to satisfy their requirements as well. This can suggest that a high level of home campus control is required and imply a subsidiary role for local academics. On the other hand, there are local governmental and professional quality assurance requirements to be satisfied. The branch campuses that were the focus of this study had to satisfy the requirements of the Malaysian Qualifications Agency along with requirements of Malaysian professional associations such as Engineers Malaysia and professional bodies in account-

ing. It becomes a matter of satisfying home and local requirements. This means that some local campus have to input to program content and program management. In the event, the authors found that addressing quality requirements and meeting with multiple agencies occupy a considerable portion of program managers' workloads on transnational campuses.

An approach based on students attaining equivalent outcomes from their study at home and on local campuses may constitute the most satisfactory relationship. Within an obligation to achieve the equivalent learning outcomes it enables learning activities to be locally designed and for assessment to be tailored to suit. This approach acknowledges the differing environments of home campus and transnational education students. It gives the possibility of 'glocalisation, a meaningful integration of local and global forces, [which] can help educational leaders inform and enhance their pedagogy and practice' (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007). It is closer to a postcolonial arrangement operating with a more equal balance of decision making between local academics and home campus academics. It provides opportunities for transnational education academics to take some management responsibilities and to exercise some leadership. It may also enable them to attract immediate reward for their effort and to further their careers. It can relieve management demands on home-campus academics.

Acknowledgements

Peter Ling is engaged in academic development at Victoria University and Swinburne University Australia and was project officer for Learning Without Borders.

Margaret Mazzolini is pro vice-chancellor Learning and Teaching at Victoria University Australia and was project leader for Learning Without Borders.

Beena Giridharan is the dean, Teaching and Learning at Curtin University, Sarawak, Malaysia, and was a member of the Learning Without Borders project team.

References

Armstrong, M. (2012). *Armstrong's Handbook of Management and Leadership* (3rd ed.). London: Kogan Page.

Cohen, L. & Bunker, A. (2007). Exploring the Role of Unit Coordinators Within Universities. Paper presented at the 30th HERDSA Annual Conference, Adelaide, 8–11 July.

Craib, I. (1992). *Anthony Giddens.* London: Routledge.

Debowski, S. (2003). Lost in Internationalised Space: The challenge of sustaining academics teaching offshore. Paper presented at the 17th IDP Australian International Education Conference, Melbourne.

Dunn, L. & Wallace, M. (2006). Australian academics and transnational teaching: An exploratory study of their preparedness and experiences. *Higher Education Research and Development, 25*(4), 357–369.

Eldridge, K. & Cranston, N. (2009). Managing transnational education: does national culture really matter? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 31*(1), 67–79.

Giddens, A. (1991). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gilbert, H. & Tompkins, J. (2002). *Postcolonial Drama: Theory, Practice, Politics*. London: Routledge.

Global Alliance for Transnational Education (GATE). (1997). *Certification Manual.* Centenial, CO: GATE.

Gribble, K. & Ziguras, C. (2003). Learning to teach offshore: Pre-departure training for lecturers in transnational programs. *Higher Education Research & Development, 22*(2), 206–216.

Heffernan, T., Morrison, M., Basu, P. & Sweeney, A. (2010). Cultural differences, learning styles and transnational education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 32(*1), 27–39.

Jones, S., Applebee, A., Harvey, M. & Lefoe, G. (2010). Scoping a Distributed Leadership Matrix for Higher Education. Paper presented at the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia annual conference, Melbourne, 6–9 July.

Lane, J. (2007). Transnational education: issues and trends in offshore higher education (review). *Review of Higher Education, 31*(1), 119–120.

Lawton, W. & Katsomitros, A. (2012) *International Branch Campuses: Data and developments.* Observatory on Borderless Higher Education. Retrieved from www.obhe.ac.uk/documents/view_details?id=894.

Leask, B. (2004). Transnational Education and Intercultural Learning: Reconstructing the offshore teaching team to enhance internationalisation. Paper presented at the Australian Universities Quality Forum, 2004, Adelaide.

McBurnie, G. & Ziguras, C. (2007). *Transnational Education: Issues and Trends in Offshore Higher Education*. New York: Routledge.

Osterhammel, Jürgen (2005). *Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview.* trans. Shelley Frisch. Princeton: Markus Weiner.

Roberts, S., Butcher, L. & Brooker, M. (2010). *Clarifying, Developing and Valuing the Role of Unit Coordinators as Informal Leaders of Learning in Higher Education.* Sydney: Australian Learning and Teaching Council.

Warwick, P. (2014). The international business of higher education – A managerial perspective on the internationalisation of UK universities. *International Journal of Management Education, 12*(2), 91–103.

Zhuang, L. & Xueying Tang, A. (2012). Sino–UK transnational education in China: Rhetoric versus reality. *Journal of Technology Management in China, 7*(2), 218–234.