

Yongzheng Liu and Yu (Aimee) Zhang

Contents

1	Introduction	558
2	Literature Review	559
3	Case Study	559
4	Barriers Between Chinese and Australian/New Zealand Universities	562
5	Future Directions	570
6	Cross-References	570
	References	570

Abstract

University collaboration generates enormous benefits. However, the majority of these collaboration outcomes are far from satisfaction. Previous literature focused on the number of coauthored publications as a measurement of successful collaboration. However, new student enrollment, increase of knowledge share, and global influences for both partners are also important for global collaborations. China has been the major source of both undergraduate and postgraduate overseas students for many universities. Many Australian and New Zealand universities have Chinese universities as their international strategic partners. But the differences between Australian and Chinese policies, structures, and cultures have been barriers in these collaborations. The majority of intercountry university collaborations, which took great amounts of time and efforts, did not generate expected results. The chief barriers are discussed in this chapter. To save transaction costs in seeking for suitable collaborators and increase the success rate in current

Y. Liu (✉)
NZIEEI, Levin, New Zealand
e-mail: nzieei@hotmail.com; aimee_zy@hotmail.com

Y.A. Zhang
WEMOSOFT, Wollongong, NSW, Australia
e-mail: aimee_zy@hotmail.com; aimee@wemosoft.com

collaborations, it is important to identify the key issues in university collaboration between Australia, New Zealand, and China. This study collected empirical cases from observation of more than 10 years of university collaborations and face-to-face interviews with three pioneer Chinese universities. Universities between Australia/New Zealand and China have many differences, and some of them are barriers for cross-country university collaborations. Mobile technology can help solve most of the communication problems and reduce misunderstanding between communication. The possible solutions are also discussed in the end of this chapter. The results shed a light on future cross-country university collaborations for universities and educational institutions.

1 Introduction

University collaboration generates enormous benefits, such as coauthored publications (McCombs 2010; Qiu and McDougall 2013); the sharing of knowledge or data (McCombs 2010; Kennedy et al. 2013; Keengwe 2013); the generation of new ideas, tools, and other intellectual properties (Fernández-López et al. 2013; Collins and Hammond 1997; Coad and Teruel 2013); and greater efficiency (Hwang and Chang 2011; Butoi et al. 2013). Inter-country collaboration has also been one of the major sources of international student enrollment for some Australian universities (Park 2013). These outcomes are also influenced by different factors, such as trust, cultural difference, location distance, shared goals, and mutual benefits (Fernández-López et al. 2013; Hwang and Chang 2011; Coad and Teruel 2013) and are also associated with high costs and risks (McCombs 2010; Fernández-López et al. 2013). Furthermore, students are different today (► Chap. 49, “Student Feedback in Mobile Teaching and Learning”). They seek information and opportunities online instead of following the paths which were prepared by universities. They have more choices and know how to design their education better. Previous literature focused on the number of coauthored publications as a measurement of successful collaboration. However, new student enrollment is another benefit generated from university collaborations (Park 2013). China has been the major source of both undergraduate and postgraduate overseas students for many universities (Balaram 2010). Many Australian universities have Chinese universities as their strategic collaborators.

The majority of cross-country university collaborations, which took great amounts of time and efforts, did not generate expected results (Park 2013). It should be argued that the motives and risks for university collaborations are also different between Australian and Chinese universities, which may explain the high failure rate. Therefore, to save transaction costs in seeking for suitable collaborators and increase the success rate in current collaborations, it is important to identify the differences of university collaboration in Australia and China. This study identified the differences and barriers between Australian and Chinese university collaboration and proposed potential solutions by adopting mobile technology in cross-country communication and teaching. This chapter focuses on Australian, New Zealand, and Chinese universities' collaborations.

2 Literature Review

The literature on cross-country university collaborations is plentiful (Sana et al. 2013; Qiu and McDougall 2013; Cheon et al. 2012; Hsu et al. 2013; Liaw et al. 2010). The types of collaboration are diverse from research (McCombs 2010; Collins and Hammond 1997; Dabbagh and Dass 2013) to teaching (Sana et al. 2013; Reich and Daccord 2008; Liaw et al. 2010). China has a different higher education structure and background (Zhang et al. 2009; Su et al. 2009; Balaram 2010). The targeting benefits are usually more political than academic in China. Cross-country university collaborations between Western universities and Chinese universities are usually required to go through an official interface of each university instead of through individuals or research centers. Many cross-country university collaborations with Chinese universities failed to reach their expectation because of the misunderstanding of the different educational and managerial system. Adopting only the number of coauthored publication as a measurement of successful university collaboration does not suit the situation in China. China has special expectation on international educational collaborations (MEPRC 2003). Chinese universities take other benefits (such as political benefits and visiting trips) as more important outcomes from university collaborations. The regulations published by the Chinese government (MEPRC 2003) and relationships between universities and different government departments are important for university collaborations and the source of support or grants from the government of China.

The Chinese universities and Australian universities have many differences in international university collaborations in terms of types and barriers. This study adopted both qualitative observations and face-to-face interviews with high-level managers in different departments in universities. A qualitative case study approach will be adopted to identify current collaboration types, barriers, and key determinants for Chinese universities' collaborations with international partners. Interviews with the international officers, deans of faculties, and directors of research centers will be conducted in three Chinese universities. An observation on Australian and New Zealand universities' collaboration is also adopted in this study. Both authors have been involved in different level of university collaborations as the key contact person between universities. The results will provide suggestions for both Chinese universities and Australian/New Zealand universities on their global collaboration strategies and current collaborations with each other.

3 Case Study

Universities collaborate with global partners on various types of activities and programs, such as international conferences, visiting meetings, workshops and seminars, undergraduate and postgraduate exchange projects, and teaching and research collaborations. Most of the Chinese universities seek supplementary educational resources, good experience, and bilingual educators through international collaborations. They have been urged to connect with the global education

Table 1 Interviewed universities and agents for international university collaboration

Studied universities	Types of collaboration	Collaborating partners
<i>University of Science and Technology of China: Professor Wang Rongsen</i>	Guest professor, visiting professor, 3 + 1 + 1 student undergraduate + postgraduate programs, visiting research fellow, joint education for PhD, Microsoft-sponsored mobility study project, CSS scholarship, research collaboration	America, Australia, the UK, Canada, Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Switzerland
<i>Beijing Information Science and Technology University: Professors Ge Xinquan and Li Chen</i>	Visiting research fellow, teachers training program, 3 + 1 or 2 + 2 undergraduate student program	America, Australia, Japan, and Ireland
<i>East China Jiao Tong University: VP Shi Huanping</i>	2 + 2 undergraduate student program, 1 + 1 postgraduate, international conference, visiting trips	America, the UK, Taiwan, and Russia

Source: Interview from this study

level and quality. China has announced the global university collaboration policy for years. However, there are some problems with the implementation of the policy in practice. This study focused on the types, barriers, and key determinants for successful cross-country university collaboration between Australia/New Zealand and China. This study is an international collaboration study on three Chinese universities and Australian/New Zealand universities. To study the barriers for international university collaborations, three Chinese universities were interviewed for a case study. University presidents, deans, heads of schools, international officers, professors, and managers are interviewed to understand the different opinions and expectations from different departments in universities. The interviewed universities are listed in Table 1.

3.1 East China Jiaotong University (Rank 240 in China)

The East China Jiaotong University (ECJTU) was established in 1971. It is located in Nanchang, Jiang Xi Province, China. ECJTU has 17 faculties and 60 undergraduate majors. It has more than 22, 000 students and 1, 600 staffs now. It also provides master's and PhD degrees.

ECJTU had collaboration with many international universities, such as universities from America, the UK, and Russia. ECJTU has a good relationship with the transportation department rather than the local government (due to the history of this university). The interviews were conducted with the vice president, Professor Shi Huanping; associate dean of economics and management faculty, Professor Han Shizhuan; associate dean of international faculty, Professor Zhou Liping; dean of international faculty and international officer of ECJTU, Professor Fan Yong; and Professor Shang Yong and Professor Tang Bin from the international faculty

in ECJTU. The different views and visions provide better answers to the research questions in this study.

As the Chinese government required 4 % of GDP to be invested into higher education, ECJTU got four million RMB on lab and infrastructure projects. One third of the staff in transportation system was from the university. The faculty of Economics and Management in ECJTU has ten undergraduate majors with about 500 undergraduate students and 200 postgraduate students.

ECJTU had many collaborating projects with international universities. The types of collaboration include 2 + 2 undergraduate student program with the UK (approved by the educational department from the government), 1 + 1 postgraduate with the USA (high expectation from students), international conference on transportation, and visiting Taiwan University. ECJTU also planned for international collaboration on postgraduate studies. However, the high tuition fees and global reputation of the partner universities became barriers for enrollment. They took openness, action, and sharing as the key determinants for successful university collaboration. In terms of seeking for international partners, the research ranking, reputation of the vice-chancellor of partner university, and research centers are regarded as important selective factors.

3.2 University of Science and Technology of China (Rank 4 in China)

The University of Science and Technology of China (USTC) was established in 1958 in Beijing, China, and was chaired by Mr. Moruo Guo. It moved to Hefei, AnHui Province, in 1970. USTC has 15 faculties and 30 majors and master's and PhD degrees. It has about 15, 500 students and 1, 572 staffs now. Ranked as the top four university in China, USTC is similar to high-ranking universities in Western countries.

USTC had collaboration with universities from America, Australia, the UK, Canada, Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Switzerland. Professor Wang Rongsen, Professor Lu Wei, and Professor Jin Hong accepted the interview of this study. The average publication on journals is seven per person per year in the economics school in USTC. They have a very good understanding on the structure and process of foreign universities. Most teachers and students have experience of foreign study or research. The English level of professors and researchers is very good.

USTC collaborates with international universities on different projects, including guest professor, visiting professor, 3 + 1 + 1 student undergraduate and postgraduate programs (with Taiwan and American universities), visiting research fellow, joint education for PhD, international-enterprise-sponsored study project, students' scholarship, and research collaboration.

USTC also had many visiting professors from other universities. The medical insurance during visiting was a problem. They require the coverage from the partner universities. If the visiting professor is over 60, the Chinese government now requires health report and insurance. Technically, academic visitors over

65 are not allowed to visit China for a long stay now. The understanding of the medical service in China is another problem facing the foreign visitors.

USTC believes the contact person is vital for successful university collaboration. The quality of visiting researchers is important but hard to identify. USTC usually sends invitation to the dean of faculty or head of school in their partner university and asks them to recommend visitors.

3.3 Beijing Information Science and Technology University (Rank 370 in China)

Beijing Information Science & Technology University (BISTU) was formed in 2008 by the combination of two institutions: Beijing Institute of Machinery (BIM) and Beijing Information Technology Institute (BITI, which was the 2nd branch school of Peking University in 1978). It has approximately 15,000 students. It has 11 faculties now. The dean of commerce, Professor Ge Xinquan; dean of information management, Professor Li Chen; associate dean of arts, Professor He Shensi; vice president, Professor Xu Xiaoge; and previous international officer, Professor Fan Yutao participated in the interviews of this study.

BISTU had collaboration with universities from America, Australia, Japan, and Ireland. The types of collaboration include visiting research fellow, teachers training program, and 3 + 1 and 2 + 2 undergraduate student program. BISTU had many projects sponsored by the Chinese government and Beijing local government. The policy change in China affected the international collaboration. All programs and visits need to be approved now. The Australian policy change on master's programs (2 years now) also influenced collaboration. The master's collaboration has been stopped since then.

The interviewees in BISTU also agreed that the contact person is vital for international collaboration. Sometimes, when the contact person left, the collaboration between two universities was closed. Language communication is also a barrier for research collaboration. Communication is vital for international collaboration.

4 Barriers Between Chinese and Australian/New Zealand Universities

The purpose of global educational collaboration is to utilize different resources and advantages, and high-quality human resources with global educational background to implement higher quality education. It can also increase and enhance the teaching quality of both sides and allow the Chinese universities or institutions to learn from their global partners. To facilitate the global educational collaboration, the Chinese government published the "Chinese-Foreign Cooperation in Running Schools Regulation" (CFCRS regulation) in 2003 (MEPRC 2003). The higher education in China has experienced reform during the past three decades.

Table 2 Barriers for international university collaborations

Major barriers	Risks
Policy and structural differences	Student exchange and visiting staff
Different expectations	Cannot reach an agreement or expectation
Cultural differences	Misunderstanding
Communication barriers	Misunderstanding and delay

Source: Observation from this study

But there are still some barriers toward the international university collaboration between Chinese universities and Western universities.

Based on more than 10-year observation on China and New Zealand/Australian university collaborations, there are some barriers for university collaborations between Chinese universities and foreign universities. China and Australia/New Zealand have very different economic histories, structures, and performances. The foreign collaboration regulation published by the Chinese government also indicated the different expectations in global collaboration (MEPRC 2003). The major barriers are summarized in the following table and explained in detail in the sections below (Table 2).

4.1 Policy and Structural Difference

The first barrier toward international university collaboration among Australian, New Zealand, and Chinese universities is the policy and structural difference. The strict governance and investigation on foreign universities and educational institutions influenced the initiative of global educational collaboration. The CFCSR regulation limited the foreign partners to universities or colleges only. But these collaborations usually include foreign enrollment, visa application, management of students' accommodation, evaluation on teaching materials from both sides, and teaching collaborations. Some students even enrolled in courses in different universities or faculties. Furthermore, the different legal systems, regulations, and policies in different countries influenced peoples' thinking, behavior, and custom. To increase efficiency and quality of services, the foreign universities usually contracted some services to educational agents to sign contracts or negotiate collaboration with Chinese partners. They only follow the agreement to provide teaching services, which is not allowed by the CFCSR regulation.

Chinese universities are regarded as state-owned institutions, which are governed by government departments and regulations. The advantages for such centralized system include plenty of funds and resource supports from the government, separated functions and regions in planned development, resource relocation with higher-level management that needs change, and quality assurance from province or central government level. However, there are some disadvantages for this system, including limitation of the international collaborations and visitors,

limitation of differential development and enrollment, enlargement of the quality inequity by allocating too much resources to top universities, and delay of approvals due to bureaucracy.

Some policy changes may influence international university collaboration too. For example, as mentioned in the case study in the section above, BISTU has to stop their master's collaboration with Australian partners due to the 2-year requirement for master's degree in Australia. USTC also stopped their invitation for senior researchers over 65 years old due to the new regulation by the Chinese government.

Universities are regarded as not-for-profit in China. The expectation on foreign collaboration is that collaboration should be not for profit too. However, this is not very attractive among Australian and New Zealand universities. This difference brought a problem for international collaboration.

The Australian government also required the collaborating universities to have formal representative agent in China. Australian universities rely on agents to enroll new students and provide visa, insurance, and consultation services. They pay commission fees to these agents for new enrolled students too. However, the number of approved agents in China is very limited due to the strict investigation and supervision in China. Many small agents have to collaborate with the approved agents by paying them "rental fees" for adopting their names. The quality of services provided by these agents varies dramatically. This kind of collaboration lowered the average quality of service provided to Chinese students. The international educational agents are regarded as "dirty words" in the Chinese market now. In a global collaboration, Chinese universities usually avoid any agent's name appearing in agreement or activities.

Another barrier toward international university collaboration is the structural difference in Australia/New Zealand and China. International university collaboration or program must go through a special department – International Office in Chinese universities. The office is usually managed by a professor with international experience or educational background. They plan the visiting trip for all staff or teachers, send invitation to other partners, enroll and manage foreign teachers, sign agreements with international partners, and monitor the international projects. Any international project or visit must be approved by the international office. Therefore, the personal relationship with the managing professor in the international office is vital for any international collaboration. If the person in charge of the international office changed (e.g., retired), the collaboration would be totally different. In Australia and New Zealand, international office is also important in each university. However, the real collaboration is usually conducted by different faculties, schools, research centers, or individual researchers. Similar research interests, publications, and grant applications are usually the drives for collaboration between researchers. However, these kinds of collaboration are not regarded as formal collaboration in Chinese universities. The universities must sign an agreement on "university level" and then "faculty level" before any collaboration is formally conducted by individuals. The different structures are barriers for international collaboration.

4.2 Different Expectations

The second barrier for international collaboration is different expectations. Universities, like firms, usually look for higher-ranking partners in global collaboration. However, collaboration with similar-level partner can reach better results (Zhang 2012). Chinese universities usually took the ranks of partner universities and quantity of collaborating countries/universities as political achievement. The global reputation of visitors and government-supported grants are also important results expected by Chinese universities. However, in Australia and New Zealand, universities usually collaborate with Chinese universities for their international students. They expect to enroll more students through 2 + 2 or 3 + 1 undergraduate program or 1 + 1 postgraduate program. The different expectations prohibit the success results of international university collaborations.

On the other hand, the different evaluation of journals and publications is another barrier toward international collaboration. Australia has its own evaluation system on journal publications. Only level A or A* journal publications are encouraged by faculties and universities now. This excludes many Chinese journals in China, which are regarded as higher-ranking journals by Chinese universities. In China, many American journals are also ranked high by universities. Some level B or level C journals in Australia could be important publication journals in China. The different evaluation systems brought problems in international collaborations.

The professors in Chinese universities are very common. Sometimes, a professor is not necessary to be a PhD. Therefore, they expected the visitors or collaborators to be a professor too. In Australia and New Zealand, there are not many professors in each university, and they are usually busy with their research projects. The Chinese universities usually expect the visiting group that includes the vice-chancellor (top-level principal in a university), dean of collaborating faculty, and international officer. It is important to send the same level of managers to the meeting with visitors in China. However, this is usually difficult for Western universities.

4.3 Cultural Differences

Cultural differences are a big topic in any international collaboration. It is vital for global collaboration (Zhang 2012). Australia and New Zealand are deal-focused culture (Gesteland 2012) in which deal comes first. However, China is a relationship-focused culture (Gesteland 2012), which usually required the partner to be a friend to start any kind of collaboration. Contract is important in deal-oriented but not relationship-focused cultures. Any kind of written document or lawyer before the friendship establishment would be regarded as mistrust in China. Dining is very much a part of establishing business relationships in China. There are many hidden rules in Chinese dining, and the Australian government published an article “Doing Business in China” to help business understand these cultural

differences (Austrade 2013). However, it should be argued that the general rules may not be suitable for different provinces or regions.

Chinese people usually use indirect language in negotiation to “save face.” Expressive facial or body language and intense or firm eye contact in a meeting are not welcomed in China (Gesteland 2012). “Sincerely” means “say it as it is” in Australia but “say it indirectly to help others” in China. The schedule is made 1 year early in Australian universities but 1 week to 1 month early in China. But the expected responding time for email and message in China is usually within 1 day. All those important differences brought problems for international collaboration between Australian/New Zealand and Chinese universities.

Another important thing during collaboration is business gifts. The studied Australian university had been sending their Chinese partner clocks as gifts for 5 years, which is regarded as the end of life in China. In China, white chrysanthemum (or blue or yellow flowers) is only used in funerals in China. However, they are usually used as gift for newborn or wedding in Australia. Clock/watch (pronounced as end of life), comb or book (pronounced as lose), handkerchief, and cards written in red ink (means end of relationship) are not good gifts. A gift from the city or state where the Western university is located is usually a good gift in collaboration. To reach a successful international collaboration, whether for business or university, great emphasis should be put on cultural differences.

4.4 Communication Barriers

Communication barriers are also important for international university collaboration between Australian/New Zealand and Chinese universities. Firstly, Australia and China have two to three time differences due to the time zone differences (Government 2013). Secondly, the social media in China is very different from the other countries (► Chap. 25, “[Mobile Education via Social Media: Case Study on WeChat](#)”; Zhang 2012). Thirdly, the holidays are different in Australia and China, including school sessions and public holidays. The public holidays and cultural holidays in China includes January 1, New Year’s Day; late January/February, Spring Festival and Chinese New Year; March 8, International Working Women’s Day; April, Qingming Festival (in lunar calendar); May 1, Labor Day; May 4, Youth Day; May, Duanwu Festival (in lunar calendar); June 1, Children’s Day; July 1, anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China; August 1, People’s Liberation Army Day; and October 1–2, National Day. The different holidays greatly influenced communications between universities. Table 3 shows the different holidays in China and Australia in 2014.

As universities are usually very busy in the start of a semester (for orientation, selecting subjects, and changing tutorials in Australia) or end of a semester (for final exam, marking, and graduation), the best period for communication or visit in a year is from late May to early June or late October to early November. The delay of response not only brought barriers for collaboration but also brought some misunderstandings. The out-of-office auto-reply email from an Australian university is

Table 3 Different holidays in China and Australia

Month	China	Australia
Jan	Autumn Semester 1-5 New year	New year 1 Auz day 27
Feb	Holiday (25 Jan – 9 Feb)	Recess
Mar	Spring Semester	Autumn Semester Labour day 3
Apr	Qing Ming 4-6	Easter 18-21 ANZAC 25
May	Labor Day 1-7	Autumn Semester
Jun	Duanwu (31 May – 2 Jun)	Autumn Semester to 26 Jun
Jul	Holiday	Recess
Aug	Holiday	Spring Semester starts 28 Jul
Sep	Mid-Autumn 6-8	Queens' birthday 29
Oct	National Day 1-7	Spring Semester
Nov	Autumn Semester	Spring Semester to 20 Nov
Dec	Autumn Semester	Holiday Christmas 25-30

Source: Observation from this study

The boxes show the suitable communication period for the Chinese university and its foreign partner in a year

regarded as a refused email for a visiting group in China, which caused the end of collaboration between both universities.

The Chinese universities will not respond to emails or telephone call during holidays (or 2–3 days near holidays) because staffs usually take annual leave before or after holidays. In Australia, the deputy officer will answer emails in place of the on-leave manager. However, if the manager in charge is not available, the deputy officer in China will not answer emails to avoid any mistake. Formal emails are not viewed often in China. The technical problems are very common in Chinese universities, and sometimes the emails cannot reach the expected person in time. All of these barriers threaten international university collaboration. One problem could cause the end of collaboration or years of delay. To solve those problems, some suggestions are introduced in the following section. Mobile technology and solutions could greatly enhance global collaboration for a better result.

4.5 Suggested Solutions

A good understanding on cultural and country difference is important for successful university or business collaboration across country. Showing respects to each other and following the rules and regulations in different countries are very important during global collaboration. A clear responsibility for each party in the global collaboration is also important. Chinese universities are usually responsible for enrollment and advertisement, teaching and management in China, assisting document accumulation for visa application for students, evaluation of students, management of students when they study abroad, and giving the graduation certifications. The third-party agents or representatives are responsible for visa application of students, services for students who study abroad, group visit and services from Chinese universities, communication between both universities, and problem

solving. Australian or New Zealand universities are responsible for teaching abroad, evaluation and assessment of students abroad, management and evaluation, and graduation certifications abroad. The roles can be changed in certain cases. However, responsibilities are usually written in an agreement or contract clearly before the start of global collaboration. Financial problems and cost issues are usually the most common problems during global university collaboration. A transparent financial design and instant communication are always required during global collaboration between universities. The third party between both universities is usually important for communication and problem solving. They usually have very high trust level with both universities. The real problem solving is usually based on trust and good communication.

To collaborate with Chinese universities under current regulations and rules, it is important to create innovative collaboration models for a successful collaboration. As listed in Table 4 (some of them are already adopted and implemented by Chinese and foreign universities), there are usually many different collaboration models due to the real cases between universities. Some universities in this study have adopted many collaboration models with different universities at the same time. The selection of collaboration model is usually based on the real situation of each university, the requirements from the policy and rules in each country, the quality and numbers of expected students, and the negotiation between both universities in a given period.

There are also some suggestions for meetings and negotiations with Chinese partners: business professional attire should be worn when interacting with the Chinese universities, and it is better to have a Chinese business card with Chinese characters (not all professors can read English), exchange business card and gift with two hands, attend dining to establish personal connections, have small talks before a meeting, prepare a gift that is representative of your country or city, find the person who is in a position to make decisions, show respect to high status, not use red ink when writing, and try to avoid public holidays for business communications.

It is usually good to have a personal communication number instead of using the formal university email. Chinese people usually have QQ and WeChat as instant communication tools (► Chap. 25, “[Mobile Education via Social Media: Case Study on WeChat](#)”). WeChat is a free mobile application that can be downloaded from Apple Store or Google Play for free. It also has English version. Therefore, it is good to have this number or mobile phone number for communication. The voice message or message can be reserved in their mobile phone for a convenient time to be read.

Mobile technology can also assist teaching and research projects. An instant communication, interactive teaching, and multimedia contents can engage students better and reduce misunderstanding (► Chap. 2, “[Characteristics of Mobile Teaching and Learning](#)”). The examples of mobile teaching projects are introduced in other chapters (► Chaps. 2, “[Characteristics of Mobile Teaching and Learning](#)”, ► 49, “[Student Feedback in Mobile Teaching and Learning](#)”, ► 19, “[Tutors in Pockets for Economics](#)”, and ► 25, “[Mobile Education via Social Media: Case Study on WeChat](#)”).

Table 4 Collaboration between Chinese and foreign universities under regulation

1. Continuing education	a. Vocational to undergraduate degree	This is called “3 + 2” collaborating mode. Students need to finish 3-year vocational study in Chinese college and pass IELTS 6.0 to enroll into a 2-year course study in foreign university to get their bachelor degrees
	b. Vocational to postgraduate degree	This is called “3 + 3” collaborating mode. Students need to finish 3-year vocational study in Chinese college and pass IELTS 6.5 to enroll into a 3-year (including 1-year prepared class, 1-year master’s course, and 1-year master’s degree study) master’s degree study
	c. Undergraduate to postgraduate degree	This is called “4 + 2” collaborating mode. Students need to finish 4-year bachelor study and pass IELTS 6.5 to enroll into a 2-year (including 1-year master’s course and 1-year master’s degree study) master’s degree study
	d. Credit transfer for courses	This refers to the undergraduate or vocational students in Chinese universities who pass IELTS 6.0 and want to study abroad. Their Chinese course credit can be transferred into the foreign courses if they passed the evaluation of the foreign university
	e. Continuing study	All the previous collaborating modes have English language requirement (IELTS 6.0 for bachelor and 6.5 for master’s students) for new enrollment. If a student cannot get required IELTS score, he/she can also get conditional offer from foreign university. They can study a 3–12-month English course and pass IELTS test or similar test required by the university to continue his/her study there
2. Student exchange	This collaborating mode is based on university visiting and investigation before they sign the formal “2 + 2” student exchange agreement. Both universities agree on each other’s course credit for their collaborating majors. Students need to finish 2-year undergraduate study in the Chinese university and then finish another 2-year study in foreign university to get degrees from both universities. This collaborating mode is usually based on matured majors in both universities and can be extended to other collaborating mode later	
3. Based on real collaborating projects	a. English training for Chinese staff	
	b. Overseas teacher enrollment for Chinese university	
	c. Teachers’ training (groups) in foreign university	
	d. Foreign student enrollment for Chinese university	
	e. Chinese high-level managers group visiting service	
	f. Introducing foreign-teaching curriculum and measures	
4. Hybrid overseas universities/institutions	This collaborating mode is a new registered educational institute that belongs to a university approved by NZQA (New Zealand Qualifications Authority) and its Chinese partner. The hybrid institute is usually small but has special characteristics. It can enroll both Chinese and foreign students and increase the global reputation of Chinese partner. There are universities from Japan, Taiwan, and Mainland China which have opened their foreign college in New Zealand, for example, the Auckland Institute of Studies by Taiwan University and the Auckland College of Natural Medicine (for Chinese medical major and acupuncture major) by Liaoning Chinese Medical University. The university from Liaoning, China, arranges visiting from China to New Zealand as well as from New Zealand college to China	

Source: Observation from this study

5 Future Directions

University collaborations are usually far from an expected success result between Australian/New Zealand and Chinese universities. The reasons include political differences, structural differences, different expectations, cultural differences, and communication barriers. This study suggests some collaborating modes and solutions for successful international university collaboration between Chinese and foreign universities.

To enhance the performance of international collaboration, mobile technology could be adopted in global university collaboration. It increased the response rate and efficiency in communications, reduced misunderstanding, and increased the performance for collaborating projects. It provides a supplemental method for face-to-face communication and greatly reduces the communicating cost in collaboration. It also brought new potential collaborating types for international university collaborations such as video teaching and interactive teaching.

In the future, mobile technology will bring new opportunities to university collaboration as well as the educational industry to provide more convenient learning materials and better learning experience and services to students and individuals. It is changing everyone's life and will change the way people learn and collaborate too.

6 Cross-References

- ▶ [Characteristics of Mobile Teaching and Learning](#)
- ▶ [Mobile Education via Social Media: Case Study on WeChat](#)
- ▶ [Student Feedback in Mobile Teaching and Learning](#)
- ▶ [Tutors in Pockets for Economics](#)

References

- Balam, P. 2010. Universities and academic institutions: Competition and collaboration. *Current Science* 98: 285–286.
- Butoi, A., N. Tomai, and L. Mocean. 2013. Cloud-based mobile learning. *Informatica Economica* 17: 27–40.
- Cheon, J., S. Lee, S.M. Crooks, and J. Song. 2012. An investigation of mobile learning readiness in higher education based on the theory of planned behavior. *Computers & Education* 59: 1054–1064.
- Coad, A., and M. Teruel. 2013. Inter-firm rivalry and firm growth: Is there any evidence of direct competition between firms? *Industrial and Corporate Change* 22: 397–425.
- Collins, J., and M. Hammond. 1997. *Teaching and learning with multimedia*. London: Routledge.
- Dabbagh, N., and S. Dass. 2013. Case problems for problem-based pedagogical approaches: A comparative analysis. *Computers & Education* 64: 161–174.
- Fernández-López, Á., M.J. Rodríguez-Fórtiz, M.L. Rodríguez-Almendros, and M.J. Martínez-Segura. 2013. Mobile learning technology based on iOS devices to support students with special education needs. *Computers & Education* 61: 77–90.

- Gesteland, R.R. 2012. *Cross-cultural business behavior marketing, negotiating, sourcing and managing across cultures*. Gylling: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Austrade 2013. Doing business in China, <http://www.austrade.gov.au/ArticleDocuments/1358/Doing-Business-in-China-discussion-paper.pdf.aspx>.
- Hsu, C.-K., G.-J. Hwang, and C.-K. Chang. 2013. A personalized recommendation-based mobile learning approach to improving the reading performance of EFL students. *Computers & Education* 63: 327–336.
- Hwang, G.-J., and H.-F. Chang. 2011. A formative assessment-based mobile learning approach to improving the learning attitudes and achievements of students. *Computers & Education* 56: 1023–1031.
- Keengwe, J. 2013. *Pedagogical applications and social effects of mobile technology integration*. Hershey: Information Science Reference.
- Kennedy, M.J., M.K. Driver, P.C. Pullen, E. Ely, and M.T. Cole. 2013. Improving teacher candidates' knowledge of phonological awareness: A multimedia approach. *Computers & Education* 64: 42–51.
- Liaw, S.-S., M. Hatala, and H.-M. Huang. 2010. Investigating acceptance toward mobile learning to assist individual knowledge management: Based on activity theory approach. *Computers & Education* 54: 446–454.
- Mccombs, S.W. 2010. *Mobile learning: An analysis of student preferences and perceptions surrounding podcasting*. Doctor dissertation, University of Houston.
- MEPRC. 2003. Chinese-Foreign cooperation in running schools regulation. In *China*, ed. M. O. E. O. T. P. S. R. O. Beijing: Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China.
- Park, T.-Y. 2013. How a latecomer succeeded in a complex product system industry: Three case studies in the Korean telecommunication systems. *Industrial and Corporate Change* 22: 363–396.
- Qiu, M., and D. McDougall. 2013. Foster strengths and circumvent weaknesses: Advantages and disadvantages of online versus face-to-face subgroup discourse. *Computers & Education* 67: 1–11.
- Reich, J., and T. Daccord. 2008. *Best ideas for teaching with technology: A practical guide for teachers, by teachers*. New York: M.E. Sharpen.
- Sana, F., T. Weston, and N.J. Cepeda. 2013. Laptop multitasking hinders classroom learning for both users and nearby peers. *Computers & Education* 62: 24–31.
- Su, z., E. Xie, and Y. Li. 2009. Alliance motivations, control mechanisms and alliance performance: Evidence from China. *Frontier Business Research China* 3: 103–119.
- Zhang, Y. 2012. *An analysis of collaboration in the Australian and Chinese mobile telecommunication markets*. Doctor of Philosophy (Economics), University of Wollongong.
- Zhang, Y., A. Hodgkinson, and C. Harvie. 2009. Inter-firm collaboration in Chinese telecom market. In *The 6th SMEs in a global economy conference*, China.