



Article

# Signalling the ‘Multi-Local’ University? The Place of the City in the Growth of London-Based Satellite Campuses, and the Implications for Social Stratification

Rachel Brooks <sup>1,\*</sup> and Johanna Waters <sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup> Department of Sociology, University of Surrey, Guildford GU2 7XH, UK<sup>2</sup> Department of Geography, University College London, London WC1E 6BT, UK; johanna.waters@ucl.ac.uk

\* Correspondence: r.brooks@surrey.ac.uk

Received: 19 July 2018; Accepted: 8 October 2018; Published: 13 October 2018



**Abstract:** Around 2009 some UK universities (based outside of the capital) began to open ‘satellite campuses’ in London. There are currently 14 such campuses at present, which have been developed primarily with an international student market in mind. Concerns have been raised, however, about the quality of teaching on these campuses and the fact that student attainment is ostensibly falling significantly below that for the ‘home’ campus. This project is the first of its kind to investigate, systematically, the ways in which universities are representing themselves in relation to these campuses (data include an analysis of prospectuses, YouTube content, websites and material garnered at open days). Using these data, we discuss the role that the City of London plays as a pivotal backdrop to these developments: the way it serves to substitute and compensate for lower levels of resources provided directly to the student from the university (here we consider accommodation, the outsourcing of teaching, the absence of a substantive campus environment and a general lack of focus on ‘pedagogical’ matters in almost all marketing materials). Instead, the universities place London at the front and centre of attempts to ‘sell’ the campus to potential students. The paper makes some innovative conceptual links between work in migration studies on the role and function of global cities in attracting workers and the way in which the city operates in this case to attract international students. These campuses feed into debates around the increasing inequalities evidenced as a consequence of the internationalisation of higher education, even when such developments are ostensibly ‘domestic’.

**Keywords:** international higher education; City of London; satellite campuses; UK HEIs

## 1. Introduction

Higher education (HE) in the UK is changing. The UK government has for some time embraced ‘internationalisation’, in recognition of the huge financial gains it provides. Over the past decade, scholars have become increasingly aware of the critical changes to higher education wrought by such processes of internationalisation. Most recently, these have included a spatial reconfiguring of ‘the university’; through overseas branch campuses and collaborative university partnerships (transnational higher education), higher education institutions (HEIs) are extending their spatial reach in intriguing ways (Geddie 2012; Waters and Leung 2017). Madge et al. (2015) have begun to explore the conceptual implications of these transformations, claiming the ‘multi-sited, multiscalar character of international study challenges simplistic dichotomies of here/there and unsettles the spatial imagination away from thinking about ‘the international’ . . . solely in relation to . . . European-American-Australian centres, and instead explicitly locates itself as coming out of, and

to, multiple locations' (Madge et al. 2015, p. 692). Yet very little research to date has taken seriously the diverse nature of this multi-sited-ness with its multi-scalar characteristics. Universities are spatially multiplying and fragmenting in many different ways, only some of which can be associated with overseas collaborations or international branch campuses (Healey 2016).

In this article, we address directly questions about the diverse 'multi-locatedness' of HEIs by drawing on a study of UK HEIs with 'satellite' branch campuses in London. In this way, we hope to challenge simplistic understandings of 'international study' which associate it solely with learning 'overseas'. Over the last decade, over a dozen UK higher education institutions (HEIs), based some distance from London, have established new campuses in the capital city. Most offer postgraduate programmes in vocational areas such as business, management, accountancy, tourism, law and computing, but there is considerable variety in their size, ranging from under 100 students to over 2000 (QAA 2014). There is also diversity in the type of 'parent' HEI—including older institutions such as Liverpool and Newcastle, as well as newer universities such as Glyndwr University and the University of Cumbria.<sup>1</sup> Crucially, available evidence (QAA 2014) would suggest that these campuses are being established primarily to recruit international students, who are assumed to be 'more attracted to London than to the home campus' (p. 1). However, achievement levels are apparently falling behind the 'home' campus and concerns about the quality of teaching have been expressed (QAA 2014). As these are a new development (since 2009), no academic research has yet explored their significance, and we want to do so in the context of wider debates about the changing spatialities of higher education as a consequence of internationalisation and the potential implications of these for social stratification and (in)equalities of access.

The article considers the students and markets targeted by the London branch campuses in their promotional materials and on open days. In particular, the paper evaluates the different experiences that students attending a branch campus can anticipate vis-à-vis the 'home' institution and suggests some of the reasons for this. Conceptually, the paper is interested in exploring, *inter alia*, the following questions: how does the development of London-based satellite campuses illustrate claims around the multi-sitedness and multi-locatedness of contemporary higher education? How important is the place of London in representations of international higher education? To what extent does the place of London replace the institution in claims made to prospective students about what to expect from a degree course? Ultimately, we are interested in how the development of satellite university campuses might exacerbate existing inequalities between different types of student and their experiences. We begin with a discussion of the literature on international students and mobilities. We then consider these in relation specifically to the issue of inequalities in international higher education, before alighting on the function of cities in the internationalisation of higher education and the international mobilities of students. The methods deployed in our empirical research are discussed, before presenting some of the key findings. The role that the city of London plays in facilitating the creation of inequalities through contemporary processes of internationalisation is considered, before we finally draw some wider conclusions around the stratification of higher education—both between and within nations—and the extent to which such developments in international provision serve to reproduce long-standing inequalities in access.

It is important to note that our focus is on how the London campuses promote themselves, and the extent to which this is similar to their 'parent' campus, rather than assessing the quality of the education received by students attending the institutions. The materials (such as prospectuses and websites) that we discuss in this article seem particularly important for prospective students as publicly-available quantitative data (for example, on the 'Unistats'<sup>2</sup> website) relating to student

---

<sup>1</sup> Universities in the UK can be divided between 'newer' institutions (so-called post-1992 universities) and 'older' institutions (pre-1992 universities). With the passage of the Further and Higher Education Act, 1992 marked the year when former polytechnics (offering vocational qualifications) became universities.

<sup>2</sup> This is the official website for comparing UK higher education course data: <https://unistats.ac.uk/>.

satisfaction, teaching quality and labour market outcomes are generally not accessible for the London campuses specifically. This is because final year cohorts have not yet graduated (as programmes have been started recently), cohort sizes are too small for relevant data to be reported separately or there is no differentiation between the same course run by the same HEI on different sites.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. *International Student Mobilities: Motivations*

Burgeoning academic literature on international student mobilities over the past decade has seen some changes, but also striking continuities, in the ways in which the motivations of students pursuing international qualifications are described and conceptualised (Brooks and Waters 2011). There is now a large body of work drawing upon the ideas of Pierre Bourdieu (1984, 1986) around the concepts of 'capital', 'field' and 'habitus'. The notion of capital is perhaps the most prevalent of these; international students are seen to be driven to seek education overseas by a desire to accumulate different types of capital (largely cultural but also social capital) (Waters 2006). Cultural capital includes the 'institutionalised' capital provided by the reputation of a degree awarding institution and the 'embodied' capital associated with exposure to a foreign language and a different cultural environment. Graduates are able to use this capital in the labour market, subsequently—to exchange their overseas academic credentials for 'economic capital' as they access jobs and promotions. As discussed below, capital is seen to beget capital; students from middle-class backgrounds, already 'rich' in familial cultural, social and economic capital, are more likely to pursue overseas study and therefore to benefit from the capital it provides.

In the 'field' of international higher education, students are thought to be heavily influenced by international league tables and the reputations of high-ranking institutions (Marginson 2008; Findlay et al. 2012; Jöns and Hoyler 2013). They are motivated to study at an elite institution with globally recognised, transferable and portable institutionalised cultural capital. There is also, scholars have noted, a significant effect associated with social capital (or networks of students) that facilitate international study to particular destination countries and institutions (Brooks and Waters 2010; Prazeres et al. 2017). Just like the 'chain-migration' of old, international students tend to follow other international students, who provide valuable information and support, either directly or through an increasing number of social media channels. Students' 'habitus' is also thought to be important, reflecting a propensity to be mobile (Waters 2007; King and Raghuram 2013; Xu 2017). Habitus represents socialisation, usually within a family setting, from an early age into holding constant a set of beliefs around what is possible and associated aspirations. In the case of international study, young people's habitus enables them to envisage the possibility of travelling overseas for study, as well as providing the resources necessary to allow this to happen.

More recently, some scholars have sought to challenge more simplistic renderings of international students' motivations as the straightforward accumulation of capital. Waters et al. (2011), for example, considered the motivations of privileged British students seeking degree-level study abroad and concluded that, although the outcome was the same (i.e., the accumulation of valuable cultural capital), students were motivated by a wider range of factors, including a desire to delay entering the labour market, pursuit of 'happiness' and other intangible, experiential factors. Forsberg (2017) has argued, in relation to her research on young people in northern Sweden, that some individuals simply do not desire the 'capital' associated with moving away. Furthermore, some claims are made that cultural capital is not sought by international students at all. Yang (2018) has researched a group of Indian international students studying in China and concluded that there was little evidence to support the claim that their international student mobility 'would eventually generate any meaningful 'cultural capital' for them ...' (p. 3); their decision-making around international education was less calculating than the discourses around the accumulation of capital might portend. Thus, although a great deal of literature discussing the motivations of international students still tends to fall back on concepts of

capital, field and habitus as explanatory 'tools', recent work has attempted to nuance and complicate this discussion somewhat (Holloway et al. 2012).

## 2.2. Inequalities and International Students

Although there has been some change over recent years, with a wider variety of social groups engaging in international student mobility (e.g., Deakin 2014; Luthra and Platt 2016), crossing national borders in pursuit of a higher education remains largely the preserve of the more affluent. Indeed, evidence from across the world has shown how the middle classes, in particular, have made use of such mobility to ensure the reproduction of their social position. This is evident in cases where middle-class children have failed to gain access to the most prestigious forms of education domestically—for example, to medical schools in Norway (Wiers-Jenssen 2008), and to the highest-status national universities in England (Brooks and Waters 2009a) and Hong Kong (Waters 2008). Studying overseas has also been an effective means, in some national contexts at least, of securing access to prestigious jobs upon the return home (Kratz and Netz 2018; Waters 2009) and of taking an important step towards securing citizenship of another country (Ong 1999; Robertson 2013). More affluent groups have tended to be over-represented amongst the geographically mobile as a result of, firstly, the economic capital that is often required to facilitate a move abroad and, secondly, the cultural capital—indeed, research has indicated that those with previous experience of living or travelling abroad are much more likely than their peers to study for a degree outside their home country (Brooks and Waters 2009b; Murphy-Lejeune 2002). In the UK at least, inequalities at school level can also be influential: elite and well-resourced private schools typically offer much more encouragement and support to study abroad to their pupils than do their state counterparts (Brooks and Waters 2015). In general, then, international student mobility often serves to reinforce the privileges of high socio-economic groups.

It is also the case, however, that international students can themselves be recipients of unequal treatment once they have arrived in their host country. This has been documented most frequently in relation to those who move to Anglophone nations in the Global North. Within classrooms, international students can often be subject to social isolation and stereotyping—for example, the assumption that South Asian students have a 'passive' approach to learning (Harrison and Peacock 2010; Kember 2000). Moreover, as the number of international students in any one country increases, so it becomes harder for students and the electorate more generally to expect or require universities to pursue social justice—because institutions are less dependent on the support of local, or even national, communities (Tannock 2013). Within wider society, in some nations, international students have been subject to racism, exclusion from labour markets, and suspicion about their motives for being abroad. Baas (2014) illustrates this well with respect to the reception of Indian students in Melbourne, Australia. He argues that while such students had historically been welcome in Melbourne, attitudes changed around 2007 partially as a result of their greater visibility within the city. New student accommodation led to them congregating in the central business district and particular places in the suburbs, rather than in less prominent locations as had been the case previously. In the UK, international students have faced severe curbs on taking up a job during or after their degree since restrictions were introduced in 2012 (when the post-study work visa was scrapped), and have been closely monitored throughout their time in the UK—through regular checks on both their attendance at university and commitment to their studies (Jenkins 2014; Mavroudi and Warren 2013). Alongside this, UK policy documents have suggested that some international students are responsible for propping up 'bogus' higher education institutions (Brooks 2018; Lomer 2017), while fees remain substantially higher for such students than for their domestic counterparts (this is not, however, unique to the UK). Thus, while those who are internationally mobile for higher education tend to come from more privileged social backgrounds, this does not always provide immunity from facing inequalities within their destination country.

### 2.3. The Role of Cities in Student Migration

The role that cities play in the internationalisation of higher education has been rather overlooked to date. Cities have been seen as ‘destination’ and ‘reception’ points for international students (for example, see [Sidhu et al. 2011](#); [Fincher and Shaw 2009](#)). Students more generally, and international students more specifically, have been seen to transform the urban landscape through their consumption practices and residential choices ([Smith and Hubbard 2014](#)). The active part that cities can play in the creation of international student mobility, however, has been less widely considered. Here, we draw upon [Collins’s \(2014\)](#) recent intervention concerning the ‘contingent assembly of the urban and its role in globalising higher education’ (p. 242). [Collins \(2014\)](#) argues that ‘urban spaces need to be understood as much more than just the geographical backdrop to the globalisation of higher education’ (ibid.). He argues that key cities are tied to imaginative geographies of them as desirable places, inducing ‘aspirations to become mobile’ amongst international students (ibid., p. 243). In addition, he highlights the role that cities play in ‘situated learning’, wherein students acquire ‘place-specific knowledge’ within the classroom and beyond, in terms of language and culture in daily interactions in the city’ (p. 243). In this paper, we explore these ideas in relation to our data, asking, inter alia, to what extent *is* London more than a geographical backdrop to international student mobility? Do HEIs promise a form of situated learning to prospective students and is this achievable? Do students attending a London campus get to experience London, beyond a rather superficial appreciation of its scenery? As we will discuss, below, the degree to which UK HEIs with London campuses use London precisely as a ‘geographical backdrop’ was quite striking. The imagery of London is powerful and evocative.

Researchers interested in international higher education are beginning to consider the complex geographies of institutional reputation and prestige and how these interact with the identities of particular cities ([Findlay et al. 2012](#); [Beech 2014](#)). [Beech \(2014\)](#), in her detailed examination of why international students chose to study in Aberdeen, Belfast and Nottingham, has made claims for the importance of ‘imaginative geographies’ for those students, in particular, who ended up studying outside of England. She has shown how those imaginative geographies, anticipated in advance of moving to a place to study, sit uncomfortably alongside the reality of living in those places. [Prazeres et al. \(2017\)](#) have also considered the ‘distinctive qualities’ of place that might attract international students to less reputable higher educational institutions. The city may enmesh with ‘specific lifestyle desires’ of students, corresponding to ‘personal imaginaries’ (p. 116). As [Raghuram \(2013\)](#) has written, ‘Although the nation state is still the implicit spatial framework for research on student migration, many of the explicit comparisons that students engage in appear to be in relation to places’ (p. 144).

London has an indisputable presence on a global stage. As one of three global ‘command centres’ in Saskia Sassen’s landmark book *The Global City* (1991), its influence on the world economy is disproportionate and highly significant. It is described as a ‘key location’ for finance and specialised service firms, as a site of ‘knowledge production’ and as a significant market in its own right. [McDowell \(1997\)](#) notes the ‘new forms of work’ being undertaken by a new ‘international elite’ in cities such as London. Like other global cities, London concentrates national as well as international wealth and opportunity. The Trades Union Congress, which represents over 50 trade unions in the UK, last year called on political parties to put a halt to the disproportionate growth of London and the South-East of England in the UK (with a 40% share of GDP), to the detriment of places outside this area ([The Guardian 2017](#)). Within the UK, London is a rather exceptional space.

The City of London also has a history of attracting expatriate workers to its banks and ‘auxiliary financial and professional services’ ([Beaverstock and Hall 2012](#), p. 271). This is important in relation to how London campuses are ‘sold’ to prospective international students. [Beaverstock and Hall \(2012\)](#) have considered the ways in which London’s labour market functions in relation to immigration and global mobility patterns, arguing that London is a ‘significant location for large and medium-sized global banks ...’ and that the ‘presence of these large global banking enterprises in London creates an

unprecedented demand for talent of all nationalities, drawn from well-established ‘pipelines’ (p. 278). In other words, London acts as a draw for talented immigrants wanting to work in global banking corporations. These migrants follow clearly demarcated ‘pipelines’. Supporting these recruitment strategies is a ‘well-established organizational strategy’ of sourcing talented migrants from overseas. Less clear (in fact, not mentioned at all) is the extent to which ‘locally educated’ students from outside these ‘pipelines’ have a chance of breaking into these migration-employment routes. The strong indication of this article (and others) is that mere *proximity to* London’s financial district is immaterial when it comes to opportunities for employment within London’s financial district. As our analysis of data on the London campuses has clearly shown, proximity to (and presence in) London is sold as a clear and discernible asset. However, the article also stresses the importance of personal networks (social capital) and this is one thing that is promised by the majority of London campuses. They will provide students with ‘real world’ contacts within individuals that work in London’s financial district. Most courses purport to bring such individuals into the classroom to engage with discussion with the students on the programmes; more will be said of this later in the paper. We turn now to describe our research methods.

### 3. Methods

We first identified all the London campuses of UK HEIs (situated outside the capital) through an online search and with reference to the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) report published in 2014. Interestingly, this strategy revealed that a number of London campuses running in 2014 are no longer operating (notably the University of East Anglia and the University of South Wales). In total, at the time of our data collection (between April and June 2018), 14 HEIs had a campus in London.

We pursued four main approaches to generating data focussing on the: (i) campus websites; (ii) prospectuses; (iii) promotional films; and (iv) open days (see Table 1 for a summary). As noted previously, our focus centred on the ways in which the London campuses were promoted and represented, and how these compared with the promotion of the parent campus. We acknowledge that such representations may not necessarily map on in a straightforward manner to the actual experiences of students but contend that they are significant in their own right, as they are likely to have a considerable bearing on students’ decision-making processes, and shed light on the priorities of the institutions. Each of the four approaches is now discussed in turn.

All of the 14 London campuses had some kind of dedicated web presence. However, this differed quite significantly in terms of the amount of material that each website contained, and relationships with the ‘parent’ website. For example, the website of Cumbria London contained only minimal information and appeared as a ‘subpage’ of the parent HEI website. In contrast, the website of Loughborough University London was much more extensive and self-contained. For each of the websites, we conducted a content analysis and a more discursive analysis. In relation to the former, we completed a grid for each institution, noting details about, for example: courses on offer and fees payable; composition of the student body; staffing; relationships with the ‘parent’ campus; location; student life; accommodation; and student representation. For the discursive analysis, we examined the language that was used to talk about students, the education on offer and the campus location, and also explored the images deployed.

**Table 1.** London campuses and methods of data collection.

Parent HEI	Name and Location of London Campus	Website Analysed	Prospectus Analysed	Promotional Film Analysed	Open Day Attended
Anglia Ruskin University	ARU London	Yes	Yes	No film available	Yes
Coventry University	Coventry University London	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Glasgow Caledonian University	GCU London	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Glyndwr University	Glyndwr University London Campus	Yes	No prospectus available	No film available	No
Loughborough University	Loughborough University London	Yes	No prospectus available	Yes	No
Newcastle University	Newcastle University London	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Northumbria University	Northumbria University London	Yes	Yes	No film available	No
Ulster University	Ulster University London	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
University of Cumbria	Cumbria London	Yes	Yes	No film available	Yes
University of Liverpool	University of Liverpool in London	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
University of Sunderland	University of Sunderland in London	Yes	Yes	No film available	No
University of Wales Trinity St David	UWTSD London	Yes	No prospectus available	Yes	No
University of Warwick [only the Warwick Business School has a London campus]	WBS London	Yes	No prospectus available	No film available	No
University of West of Scotland	UWS London Campus	Yes	No prospectus available	No film available	No

Subsequently we conducted a similar analysis of the prospectuses for the London campuses. As Table 1 notes, not all of the campuses had their own dedicated prospectus and, in one case (Cumbria), the London campus was discussed only as part of the main university prospectus. Most prospectuses were available to download electronically; Cumbria's was available only in hard copy, and so we ordered a copy to be delivered through the post. As with the websites, we recorded systematically what was said about topics key to our focus (e.g., the courses on offer, the students targeted, the location of the campus, the facilities and accommodation available) and also explored the language and images that were used. Seven of the 14 campuses had produced promotional videos, which were available on the website (most of these were located on the campuses' homepage). Our analysis of the videos focussed on: the key images deployed; the dominant narrative (if one was evident); the actors who spoke (e.g., the vice-chancellor, students, staff); the use of music; and the text (if any) that was overlaid on images. Finally, we attended open days at two of the London campuses. Here, we took detailed field notes about: the content of presentations; less formal interactions between staff and current and prospective students; the location of the event (including the building and rooms in which it was held); and any publicity material handed out. Throughout, our emphasis was on the messages conveyed about the campus, its courses and students. Data from all four strands were first analysed separately, and then combined so that we had a complete 'case' for each London campus. For each London campus, we also analysed the prospectus and website (but not films or open days) of the parent institution, so that we could assess the extent to which there was consistency with respect to messaging, branding and more substantive elements of the 'student experience'.

#### 4. Evidence

In this section, we outline key themes from our analysis of the publicity materials. We first discuss some of the salient characteristics of the education on offer to prospective students, before exploring the types of students who appear to be targeted by these campuses. As part of this discussion, we make reference to the way in which the location of the campuses—in London—is used within the materials; this is, however, interrogated more fully in the discussion section, which follows.

##### 4.1. Characteristics of Education Offered

Our analysis of the various materials from the 14 London campuses suggests that in many cases there were significant disparities between the teaching and resources offered at the parent campus and that available within its London counterpart, with many of the London campuses appearing to offer an inferior pedagogical experience to their students. Below we outline some of the particular characteristics of the education offered by the London branch campuses and, where relevant, draw comparisons with the parent campus.

##### 4.1.1. Courses on Offer

The vast majority of the London campuses focus on vocational degree subjects, typically including business and management degrees. In most cases, the range of programmes on offer is relatively narrow. For example, Anglia Ruskin University's London campus offers 12 undergraduate programmes—one is in law, one in social care and all the others are business-focussed—and all three of its postgraduate programmes are business-related. At Ulster University London only two undergraduate programmes are on offer (in accounting and management, and computing systems) and its four postgraduate programmes all focus on business, management and computing. A further distinguishing feature of the programmes on offer at the London campuses is the prevalence of 'top-up' degrees—i.e., final year-entry programmes that expect students to have studied for a Higher National Diploma or foundation degree elsewhere. Such degrees are available at the London campuses of Glyndwr University, Cumbria, Coventry, Northumbria, and Sunderland. While similar final year-entry programmes are available at other higher education institutions in the UK, what distinguishes a number of the London campuses is that, in some subject areas, it is only this form of qualification



that is available; full degrees in the same subjects are simply not offered. This is the case in Glyndwr, Cumbria and Northumbria. While we are unable to make any independent assessment of the quality of these 'top-up' courses, students' academic experiences may suffer from not being able to socialise with and learn from students from other year groups, nor establish relationships with teaching staff that last more than one academic year.

#### 4.1.2. Staff Qualifications and Experience

Some, but not all, of the websites include information about the staff who teach at the London campus and, in 11 of the 14 cases, individual staff profiles are also provided. (Interestingly, for the London campus of Ulster University, individual information is provided about only the recruitment team, not teaching staff.) In general, where relevant information is available, the level of academic qualification of staff is considerably lower than within the parent campus. For example, on the University of Liverpool in London website, staff details (which are quite hard to find, as they are located under the 'Contact Us' page) indicate that only five of the 15 teaching staff have a Ph.D. Moreover, in many of the campuses, staff typically bring professional—rather than academic—experience to the classroom. For example, the Coventry University London website suggests that the vast majority of its staff have come straight from industry, with no prior background in higher education. While such experience does not necessarily mean the quality of teaching is lower, such profiles typically differ from those evident in the parent campus, where higher education experience is more common, and staff profiles often mention relevant pedagogical expertise (for example, fellowship of the Higher Education Academy, or achievement of a postgraduate certificate in education, alongside a Ph.D.). They do also suggest that both the research and teaching expertise to which students have access are likely to be considerably lower than in the parent campus. Finally, in one of the London campuses, it appears that some teaching is outsourced to a private agency. Northumbria University London notes on its website that 'All our programmes at the London campus are . . . taught by QA Higher Education and University staff'. It goes on to explain that QA Higher Education 'is part of QA, the UK's largest corporate training provider' and 'This means that throughout your studies at our London campus, there is a key focus on ensuring you build and develop the key skills that employers are looking for'. Again, while we are unable to make any independent assessment of the quality of this provision, it is clearly not research-led. Moreover, its description as training rather than education suggests that a conceptual focus and theoretical orientation are likely to be lacking.

#### 4.1.3. Lack of Emphasis on Research; Proximity to Employers

In contrast to many of the parent university websites and prospectuses, which foreground the research credentials of staff, interesting and internationally-significant on-going research programmes and the presence of postgraduate research students, very few of the London campuses emphasise such aspects in their publicity material. Indeed, it appears that it is possible to study on a postgraduate research programme in only four of the London campuses (Loughborough, Glasgow Caledonian University, Newcastle, and Warwick Business School) and, even here, cohorts are typically small. For example, on the Glasgow Caledonian University website, it appears that only four members of staff are available to supervise postgraduate research, and that there are currently only 13 registered Ph.D. students. Instead, a dominant motif across the websites, prospectuses and films is the importance of proximity to employers and other business organisations. Although in some cases, links with employers do appear strong (for example, through professional placements, industry-led guest lectures, and opportunities for students to make recommendations, on the basis of their project work, to companies), in about half the sample it is the geographical proximity that is emphasised rather than any close or material collaboration. For example, images of city office blocks and students in suits dominate many of the prospectuses, while the films often foreground boardrooms (rather than classrooms or other possible sites of learning). The text tends to reinforce such messages: the

prospectus of London Coventry prominently displays its strapline, 'A real business opportunity' on its cover.

#### 4.1.4. Buildings in which Teaching Takes Place

A further difference between many (although not all) of the London campuses and their parent institutions is the attention given to the buildings in which students learn. Why these are commonly foregrounded within the parent website and prospectus, they often do not feature prominently, if at all, on the London campus publicity material. Instead, images tend to focus on impressive buildings nearby, often with little or no direct connection to the institution—for example, London landmarks such as Tower Bridge and the London Eye, or tall, glass-fronted office blocks. In some cases, this is presumably because the actual buildings in which the London campus is located are not necessarily very impressive. Indeed, the London campus of the University of Wales Trinity St David (UWTSD) is situated 'within Kennington Business Park', while the website of Glyndwr University London makes reference to the small size of its buildings:

'The Glyndwr University London Campus is a compact teaching facility. It comprises modern teaching and learning spaces with up-to-date, well-maintained teaching and learning facilities. There are 8 lecture and seminar rooms, two general computer laboratories and one specialist computer laboratory for network modules'.

These rather modest facilities contrast markedly with the glamorous and expansive nature of the images used that make reference to the broader London cityscape.

#### 4.1.5. Lack of Dedicated Accommodation

In contrast to most of the parent HEI websites, which devote considerable space to the accommodation available to students, the London campus websites, prospectuses and films feature this much less prominently. Moreover, more significantly, there is much less dedicated accommodation available to the students based in London. In general, the London campuses point prospective students to the rooms available through private providers. For example, the Anglia Ruskin website notes: 'ARU London has no student accommodation of its own, but we have compiled a list of the details of organisations offering student accommodation in areas that are easily accessible to the University'. Similarly, the Glyndwr website states: 'The administrative team at the London Campus can help applicants and new students with information about local estate agents, private providers of student residences and homestay providers'. UWTSD London does not offer even an accommodation list of its own, warning students: '... the cost of accommodation is high in comparison to many other cities. You will find some basic information on the UKCISA [UK Council for International Student Affairs] website'. Glasgow Caledonian University directs prospective students to two student halls run by the private provider 'urbannest'. Overall, then, across the institutions, there is no dedicated accommodation provided and, in many cases, students are left to navigate this expensive market largely by themselves.

#### 4.1.6. Wider Student Life

Finally, much less detail is provided about extra-curricular activities and other aspects of wider student life in the publicity materials of the London campuses than in those that relate to the parent campus. The materials typically make reference to the opportunities available in the capital rather than to student-specific activities provided by the institution. These excerpts from the websites of the London campuses of the University of the West of Scotland London and University of Wales Trinity St David's are illustrative:

'The UWS London Campus is right in the heart of London and the area surrounding the campus offers plenty of entertainment and relaxation options for anything from a quick

study break to a great day out . . . There are numerous coffee shops, cafes and restaurants if you have some spare time between lectures and the surrounding areas offer a wealth of leisure facilities and visitor attractions (e.g., Borough Market, London Bridge, Southbank and the Old Vic Theatre), so there is a huge range of options on offer to suit all price ranges. There are also a number of leisure centres nearby operated by Southwark Council for taking part in sporting activities’.

‘Studying at UWTSD London gives you the opportunity to explore and experience one of the world’s most vibrant and dynamic cities . . . London offers unique opportunities for your study, work, leisure and travel. Whatever you expect from your life, you will find it in London’.

This use of the resources and attractions of the city as apparent ‘compensation’ for the lack of institutional provision is a theme we return to below.

#### 4.2. Target Audience

In general, the majority of the London campuses appear to be targeting international students specifically. This is evident through the images deployed in the marketing materials and the nature of the ‘student profiles’ that are included—particularly in the prospectuses. The Coventry University London prospectus, for example, has lots of photos of international students, with their countries of origin clearly displayed. In addition, a number of prospectuses emphasise the ‘internationally connected’ nature of London. Indeed, the Northumbria prospectus notes prominently that over 160 international destinations have direct flights to London and the city boasts restaurants with menus from over 70 countries, and provides a map showing flight times from various cities (outside the UK) to London. Similarly, the Newcastle prospectus claims that the top reason for choosing to study at the campus is its ‘international outlook’, while the first two pages of the ‘student support’ section within the Glasgow Caledonian prospectus focus on the needs of international students specifically (including English language support and employment opportunities). The introductory text to the Sunderland prospectus adopts an almost identical tone, noting (on the very first page) that ‘as many of our students come from across the world, we also offer English for Academic Purposes courses’. A notable exception from this broad focus on international students is Anglia Ruskin University, which positions itself instead as offering a cheaper higher education to domestic students. In its prospectus, for example, the majority of ‘student voices’ are those of home students and, unlike most of the other prospectuses, there is no separate section for international students. The general section of the prospectus is structured around three main themes, one of which is ‘affordability’. This focuses on: the lower fees charged (starting at £8000 rather than £9250); opportunities to engage in significant paid work, as all courses are timetabled over only two days; and the free textbook that is provided to all students.

The paper turns now to discuss the implications of some of these findings in relation to the wider academic literature, focusing in particular on the role that the City of London plays in shaping the strategies of HEIs and associated experiences of students attending programmes on these campuses.

### 5. Discussion

It is a well-worn argument that global cities—of which London is one of the most pre-eminent—have a huge role to play in attracting people; regionally, nationally and internationally (Sassen 1991). UK HEIs know this, making London an especially attractive ‘host’ for a satellite university campus. It is no accident that London is the location of the satellite offshoots of

UK HEIs<sup>3</sup>—London is intentionally chosen for its appeal to (primarily) international students. This appeal is wide-ranging, but includes a certain aesthetic (high-rise buildings and iconic landmarks), a world-leading financial district (with a significant concentration of banks and other financial and legal institutions), a cosmopolitan and yet also quintessentially British culture, a complex of leisure facilities (theatres, cafes, restaurants and night life), prestigious HEIs and a bustling urban feel.

As discussed earlier in the paper, the literature would suggest that international students (although often privileged in many ways) frequently have ‘poor’ educational experiences and relatively low levels of satisfaction. International students are frequently undervalued—if not outright exploited—by UK HEIs, where universities seem largely to lack an ‘ethics of care’ around their treatment of international students (Tannock 2013; Lomer 2017; Beech 2018). It is important, therefore, that where international students are the explicit targets for particular programmes at particular institutions, that these are subject to scrutiny. International students are especially attracted to London for all of the reasons discussed in the literature review above—they are often unable to separate the place from the perceived opportunities that living there affords (the ‘bright lights’), particularly in relation to employment opportunities but also vis-à-vis leisure and cultural experiences. As Prazeres et al. (2017) have written in relation to the ‘lure and allure of place’ when it comes to international students:

‘The appeal of place is one of the main motivations that lures students to particular cities rather than specific institutions (Ho 2014). Particular places and the particularities of these places can offer desirable opportunities and amenities that appeal to students’ everyday lifestyle aspirations. The value and prestige of reputable universities are thus weighted against students’ more mundane and extra-curricular interests’. (2017, p. 117)

So-called ‘urban lifestyle’ can be a big aspect of this allure; a part of what Collins (2014) describes as ‘urban educational prestige’ (p. 242). London has this in abundance. It is our contention that universities are themselves exploiting the appeal of London (and London’s educational prestige)<sup>4</sup> potentially to offset a shortfall, as noted above, in the kinds of services and opportunities a prospective student might come to expect of a UK university (a wide range of programmes and a degree of choice within those programmes, excellent teaching facilities, a ‘campus life’, dedicated accommodation, well qualified staff, and so on). In all of the marketing materials that we reviewed, London (specifically striking images of London) looms large. Collins (2014) describes cities as ‘more than just the geographical backdrop’ to universities’ internationalising tendencies, but in the materials we have reviewed, it is a very prominent backdrop, with little to suggest how institutions facilitate students’ engagement with London.

As noted above, universities give scant detail on what a student can expect in the way of ‘wider student life’ and frequently they make recourse (instead) to the opportunities that London provides—a sense of the city is here, now ‘make your own entertainment’. The example given in the section above, taken from the University of the West of Scotland’s London Campus materials, was especially striking: ‘The . . . campus is right in the heart of London and the area surrounding the campus offers plenty of entertainment and relaxation options . . . There are numerous coffee shops, cafes and restaurants . . . and the surrounding areas offer a wealth of leisure facilities and visitor attractions (e.g., Borough Market, London Bridge, Southbank and the Old Vic Theatre), so there is a huge range of options on offer . . . There are also a number of leisure centres nearby operated by Southwark Council for taking part in sporting activities.’ As the quotation explicitly states, these opportunities are either private businesses located in London or operated by the council and, therefore, nothing to do with the HEI in question. This example is emblematic of how UK HEIs are using London to substitute for relatively poorer facilities and opportunities offered directly to students.

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that a small number of UK HEIs have satellite campuses in London and at least one other UK destination (e.g., Ulster University also has campuses in Birmingham and Belfast).

<sup>4</sup> Colleges of the University of London are habitually found within the top 20 of different world university rankings.

Similarly, HEIs generally avoided showing their teaching facilities within marketing materials. Glyndwr University London Campus is quite unusual in describing its facilities as ‘compact’. We attended a couple of open days for these London campuses and were able to witness first-hand the nature of the learning environment. The ones we saw bore no resemblance to a university campus—very high rents and space at a premium mean that any ‘campus’ located in the centre of London will inevitably be small, tightly packed and office-like. As one institution put it at their open day, ‘there are no bean bags for lounging around here’. Instead, images of London landmarks (especially the Gherkin) abound.

A related point concerns a stress on ‘proximity to employers’ made by all of the London campuses we have examined. There is an assumption that students on these programmes are attracted to London’s financial district and studying at the London campus will give students direct access to this district. However, we have little evidence to support the claim that students will be exposed to—and are able to network with—influential individuals from within the financial industry. Work in the academic literature would suggest that firms located in London and extremely ‘closed’ spaces and very hard to ‘break into’. In their analysis of London’s labour market in relation to financial services in particular, for example, [Beaverstock and Hall \(2012\)](#) make the following important observations:

‘City jobs are built on a particular narrow skill set, which are highly sectoral and occupationally specialized, combining tacit and codified (explicit) knowledge, with reputation and, increasingly, evidence of global career paths ... These are not easily substituted from the surrounding local labour market. Indeed, there are clear, identifiable barriers to entry: an Oxbridge or a globally recognized business school education, experience of working in other financial centres; graduate entry through internships, often available through personal City ties; and of growing importance, experience of working in financial centres in Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa ...’. (p. 273)

They also discuss the ‘pipelines’ through which international talent travel, to the exclusion of individuals outside of those well-defined routes. What, then, do UK HEIs mean when they promise ‘proximity to employers’ in their marketing materials for their London campus? As the literature attests, there is a huge difference between being in the same, proximate space as employers and being within the networks needed to obtain desirable employment. Clearly, we are unable to comment, based on our data, upon what students actually are able to experience vis-à-vis interaction with employers. However, in the marketing materials we reviewed, such details remain vague and the promise of ‘proximity’ abounds.

## 6. Conclusions

UK universities with London campuses are tapping directly into the urban aspirations of potential international students. The appeal of particular urban spaces has been noted in several recent papers ([Prazeres et al. 2017](#); [Collins 2014](#); [Ho 2014](#)) and London, widely described as one of the world’s preeminent global cities ([Sassen 1991](#)), acts as a magnet to aspiring students. As noted by [Prazeres et al. \(2017\)](#), places offer ‘desirable opportunities and amenities that appeal to students’ everyday lifestyle aspirations’ (p. 117). Furthermore, the City of London’s role as a hub in global financial services means that students in London can be said to be ‘close to employers’ ([Beaverstock and Hall 2012](#)). Spatial proximity has a significant role to play in discourses found in the marketing materials of the London campuses of UK HEIs. However, the [QAA \(2014\)](#) has recently drawn attention to some potential ‘problems’ associated with these campuses, not least the fact that students’ attainment seems to be significantly lower and their marketing appears to be aimed directly at an international student market (not a problem in and of itself but raising some questions as to the pedagogic value and content of programmes geared primarily to an international clientele). The research reported in this paper draws on a project exploring the nature of the London campuses of UK HEIs, with particular attention given to what, exactly, they are ‘selling’ potential students.

Our data analysis strongly suggested some of the ways in which potential students at the London campuses of UK HEIs are being ‘short-changed’, including significantly circumscribed programme options (and no optional courses within those programmes), differently qualified staff, an absence of emphasis on research-led teaching, small, cramped teaching facilities and a lack of dedicated accommodation for students. London campuses seemed to provide little or nothing to students seeking a wider ‘student life/experience’. Instead, universities rely heavily on the city to ‘make up’ for shortfalls in student choice and pedagogical experience. It is almost as if the campus gives students the opportunity to experience London—it (university study) provides them with a way into London. Once there, it is up to the individual student to go out and experience all London has to offer. Potential students are repeatedly told that they will be spatially proximate to ‘employers’, without any sense of how this proximity translates into real opportunities for employment. Lecturing staff are ‘close to industry’ because many of them would seem to be recruited directly from non-academic jobs in ‘the City’. However, the link between this fact and the academic nature of the qualification pursued by students is never really explored in the marketing materials. It is assumed to be self-evident that students will ‘benefit’ from staff recruited directly from industry. In summary, the paper has suggested that what the London campuses of UK HEIs are offering is in various ways ‘lacking,’ and the symbolic production of place (Collins 2014) (in this case London) is a key feature of these campuses’ identities.

More broadly, the paper contributes to an analysis of the spatiality of HE and how it relates to student mobility (Raghuram 2013) and confluent discussions around the spatial transformation of higher education, as it increasingly becomes ‘multi-sited’ (Madge et al. 2015). As we have shown, the discussion of internationalisation in relation to multi-sitedness should not be limited to a small literature on international branch campuses (Healey 2016) and a larger literature on transnational education (see Waters and Leung 2017) but can and should be expanded to encompass new sites *within* the UK. From the analysis of our data and our reading of the extant literature, we conclude that similar considerations underpin overseas and UK-based satellite campuses and collaborations—an attempt to attract international, fee-paying students. Consequently, ‘international education’—and the spatial reconfiguration of the university—is even more complex than it at first appeared, supporting the claims of Madge et al. (2015) that the internationalisation of HE ‘explicitly locates itself as coming out of, and to, multiple locations’ (Madge et al. 2015, p. 692).

In addition, this paper has contributed to the growing body of work that has explored the increasingly differentiated nature of international student mobility, and the opening up of opportunities to those of more modest means (e.g., Collins 2014). It will also articulate with broader debates about the stratification of higher education—both between and within nations—and the extent to which such developments in international provision serve to reproduce longstanding inequalities in access.

**Author Contributions:** Rachel Brooks and Johanna Waters shared the data collection, analysis and writing up equally between them.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## References

- Baas, Michiel. 2014. Victims or profiteers? Issues of migration, racism and violence among Indian students in Melbourne. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 55: 212–25. [CrossRef]
- Beaverstock, Jonathan, and Sarah Hall. 2012. Competing for talent: global mobility, immigration and the City of London’s labour market. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 5: 271–88. [CrossRef]
- Beech, Suzanne. 2014. Why place matters: Imaginative geography and international student mobility. *Area* 46: 170–77. [CrossRef]
- Beech, Suzanne. 2018. Catching the tram to Coventry: balancing care and international student recruitment in Hong Kong. Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference on Migration and Mobilities, University of Plymouth, Plymouth, UK, 13 July.

- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. The forms of capital. In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Edited by John Richardson. Santa Barbara: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Brooks, Rachel. 2018. Higher education mobilities: A cross-national European comparison. *Geoforum* 93: 87–96. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Brooks, Rachel, and Johanna Waters. 2009a. A Second Chance at ‘Success’: UK students and global circuits of higher education. *Sociology* 43: 1085–102. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Brooks, Rachel, and Johanna Waters. 2009b. International Higher Education and the Mobility of UK Students. *Journal of Research in International Education* 8: 191–209. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Brooks, Rachel, and Johanna Waters. 2010. Social networks and educational mobility: The experiences of UK students. *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 8: 143–57. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Brooks, Rachel, and Johanna Waters. 2011. *Student Mobilities, Migration and the Internationalization of Higher Education*. Basingstoke: Springer.
- Brooks, Rachel, and Johanna Waters. 2015. The hidden internationalism of elite English schools. *Sociology* 49: 212–28. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Collins, Francis. 2014. Globalising higher education in and through urban spaces: Higher education projects, international student mobilities and trans-local connections in Seoul. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 55: 242–57. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Deakin, Hannah. 2014. The drivers to Erasmus work placement mobility for UK students. *Children’s Geographies* 12: 25–39. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Fincher, Ruth, and Kate Shaw. 2009. The unintended segregation of transnational students in central Melbourne. *Environment and Planning A* 41: 1884–902. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Findlay, Allan, Russel King, Fiona Smith, Alisdair Geddes, and Ronald Skeldon. 2012. World class? An investigation of globalisation, difference and international student mobility. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37: 118–31. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Forsberg, Sara. 2017. ‘The right to immobility’ and the uneven distribution of spatial capital: Negotiating youth transitions in northern Sweden. *Social & Cultural Geography* 2017: 1–21.
- Geddie, Kate. 2012. Constructing transnational higher education spaces: International branch campus developments in the United Arab Emirates. In *Changing Spaces of Education*. Edited by Rachel Brooks, Alison Fuller and Johanna Waters. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 53–72.
- Harrison, Neil, and Nicola Peacock. 2010. Cultural distance, mindfulness and passive xenophobia: Using Integrated Threat Theory to explore home higher education students’ perspectives on ‘internationalisation at home’. *British Educational Research Journal* 36: 877–902. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Healey, Nigel. 2016. The challenges of leading an international branch campus: The “lived experience” of in-country senior managers. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 20: 61–78. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Ho, Kong Chong. 2014. The university’s place in Asian cities. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 55: 156–68. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Holloway, Sarah, Sarah O’Hara, and Helena Pimlott-Wilson. 2012. Educational mobility and the gendered geography of cultural capital: The case of international student flows between Central Asia and the UK. *Environment and Planning A* 44: 2278–94. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Jenkins, Matt. 2014. On the effects and implications of UK Border Agency involvement in higher education. *The Geographical Journal* 180: 265–70. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Jöns, Heike, and Michael Hoyler. 2013. Global geographies of higher education: The perspective of world university rankings. *Geoforum* 46: 45–59. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Kember, David. 2000. Misconceptions about the learning process, motivations and study practices of Asian students. *Higher Education* 40: 99–121. [[CrossRef](#)]
- King, Russell, and Parvati Raghuram. 2013. International student migration: Mapping the field and new research agendas. *Population, Space and Place* 19: 127–37. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Kratz, Fabian, and Nicolai Netz. 2018. Which mechanisms explain monetary returns to international student mobility? *Studies in Higher Education* 43: 375–400. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Lomer, Sylvie. 2017. *Recruiting International Students in Higher Education. Representations and Rationales in British Policy*. London: Palgrave.
- Luthra, Renee, and Lucinda Platt. 2016. Elite or middling? International students and migrant diversification. *Ethnicities* 16: 316–44. [[CrossRef](#)]

- Madge, Clare, Parvati Raghuram, and Pat Noxolo. 2015. Conceptualizing international education: From international student to international study. *Progress in Human Geography* 39: 681–701. [CrossRef]
- Marginson, Simon. 2008. Global field and global imagining: Bourdieu and worldwide higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 29: 303–15. [CrossRef]
- Mavroudi, Elizabeth, and Adam Warren. 2013. Highly skilled migration and the negotiation of immigration policy: Non-EEA postgraduate students and academic staff at English universities. *Geoforum* 44: 261–70. [CrossRef]
- McDowell, Linda. 1997. *Capital Culture: Gender at Work in the City*. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.
- Murphy-Lejeune, Elizabeth. 2002. *Student Mobility and Narrative in Europe. The New Strangers*. London: Routledge.
- Ong, Aihwa. 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Prazeres, Laura, Alan Findlay, David McCollum, Nicola Sander, Elizabeth Musil, Zaija Krisjane, and Elina Apsite-Berina. 2017. Distinctive and comparative places: Alternative narratives of distinction within international student mobility. *Geoforum* 80: 114–22. [CrossRef]
- QAA. 2014. London Campuses of UK Universities: Overview report of a thematic enquiry by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. Available online: <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/21786/1/London-campuses-of-UK-universities.pdf> (accessed on 8 October 2018).
- Raghuram, Parvati. 2013. Theorising the spaces of student migration. *Population, Space and Place* 19: 138–54. [CrossRef]
- Robertson, Shanthi. 2013. *Transnational Student-Migrants and the State*. London: Palgrave.
- Sassen, Saskia. 1991. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton.
- Sidhu, Ravinder, Kong Chong Ho, and Brenda Yeoh. 2011. Emerging education hubs: The case of Singapore. *Higher Education* 61: 23–40. [CrossRef]
- Smith, Darren, and Phil Hubbard. 2014. The segregation of educated youth and dynamic geographies of studentification. *Area* 46: 92–100. [CrossRef]
- Tannock, Stuart. 2013. When the demand for educational equality stops at the border: Wealthy students, international students and the restructuring of higher education in the UK. *Journal of Education Policy* 28: 449–64. [CrossRef]
- The Guardian. 2017. UK Economy is Being Sucked into London and South-East, Says TUC. Available online: <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2017/apr/28/uk-economy-london--south-east--tuc> (accessed on 6 August 2018).
- Waters, Johanna. 2006. Geographies of cultural capital: Education, international migration and family strategies between Hong Kong and Canada. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 31: 179–92. [CrossRef]
- Waters, Johanna. 2007. 'Roundabout routes and sanctuary schools': The role of situated educational practices and habitus in the creation of transnational professionals. *Global Networks* 7: 477–97. [CrossRef]
- Waters, Johanna. 2008. *Education, Migration, and Cultural Capital in the Chinese Diaspora*. New York: Cambria Press.
- Waters, Johanna. 2009. Transnational geographies of academic distinction: The role of social capital in the recognition and evaluation of 'overseas' credentials. *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 7: 113–29. [CrossRef]
- Waters, Johanna, Rachel Brooks, and Helena Pimlott-Wilson. 2011. Youthful escapes? British students, overseas education and the pursuit of happiness. *Social & Cultural Geography* 12: 455–69.
- Waters, Johanna, and Maggi Leung. 2017. Domesticating transnational education: Fortifying discourses of social value and self-worth in "meritocratic" Hong Kong. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 42: 233–45. [CrossRef]
- Wiers-Jensen, Janneke. 2008. Does higher education attained abroad lead to international jobs? *Journal of Studies in International Education* 12: 101–30. [CrossRef]
- Xu, Cora. 2017. Mainland Chinese students at an elite Hong Kong university: Habitus–field disjuncture in a transborder context. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 38: 610–24. [CrossRef]
- Yang, Peidong. 2018. Compromise and complicity in international student mobility: The ethnographic case of Indian medical students at a Chinese university. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 39: 694–708. [CrossRef]

