Chapter 4
The Institutional Prospects of Cross-Border Higher Education for East Asian Regional Integration: An Analysis of the JICA Survey of Leading Universities in East Asia

Kazuo Kuroda, Takako Yuki, and Kyuwon Kang

Introduction

The impact of globalization and internationalization is expected to rise in prominence on the agendas of national- and institutional-level systems of higher education. Although the concepts of globalization and internationalization refer to two distinct phenomena, they are often used interchangeably. While Altbach (2006, p. 123) defines globalization as "the broad economic, technological and scientific trends that directly affect higher education and are largely inevitable in the contemporary world," he argues that internationalization is more related to specific policies and programs by governments, academic systems, and institutions that deal with globalization. This Altbach's definition of internationalization is in agreement with the definitions of Knight (2004, p. 11), which suggest that "internationalization at the national, sector, or institutional level is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education." By dividing internationalization into layers, Knight refers to "top-down" effects that national and sector levels force on the internationalization process by implementing policies and strategies and "bottom-up" effects that institutions enact on the internationalization process; both effects reflect global dimensions. Cross-border higher education can be motivated and initiated by either bottom-up or top-down mechanisms. For example, bottom-up collaborations are initiated by individual universities that build partnerships with foreign universities to open up opportunities for student and faculty exchanges in

K. Kuroda (✉)
Graduate School of Asia Pacific Studies, Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan
e-mail: kakuroda@waseda.jp

T. Yuki
Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), Tokyo, Japan

K. Kang
Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA), Gyeonggi-do, South Korea

the service of improving academic quality. In contrast, top-down mechanisms are often initiated by national governments that push for the international collaboration of universities with the governments' economic and political incentives (Postiglione and Chapman 2010, p. 378). To make internationalization active, both top-down and bottom-up effects are required.

In the context of globalization and internationalization, the trend of regionalization is emerging in many parts of the world (not only in Europe but also in East Asia), and how and where the concept of regionalization fits into this context is another issue. The concepts of the globalization and regionalization of higher education share some similar aspects in that their effects cannot be controlled by any one actor or set of actors; rather, they are the de facto unexpected outcome of worldwide transformation. The internationalization process of higher education in policies and actions at the national, sector, and institutional levels is responding to the trends of globalization and regionalization. Therefore, when examining the progress of East Asian regionalization with regard to higher education, it is important to review internationalization processes from the viewpoint of both governments and institutions (e.g., universities).

Examining an overview of the current development and transformation of East Asian higher education with the perspectives of the institutional and governmental-led internationalization process, the "East Asianization of East Asia" that is prevalent in the regional economy also seems to be confirmed with regard to the cross-border activities of higher education. Intra-regional student and faculty mobility and university partnership-based cross-border activities are rapidly growing within the region and have shown the de facto integration of higher education in this region (Kuroda and Passarelli 2009). Policy discussions on the East Asian regional integration of higher education are also progressing and becoming active. Governments, higher educational institutions, international organizations, and international university associations are all discussing the construction of a new East Asian collaborative higher education framework as well as fostering the cross-border activities within East Asia. To make such policy processes more effective, it is important for policymakers to know the current status and perceptions of institutions on internationalization or regionalization. However, other than the International Association of Universities (IAU) studies by United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in 2003 and 2005, few analyses are available to systematically describe the perceptions of Asian higher educational institutions on cross-border activities in the region.

Therefore, this chapter aims to analyze the current status and views of leading East Asian universities on their cross-border (or international) activities, using data from the original survey conducted under the research project of the Japan International Cooperation Agency Research Institute (JICA-RI) titled, "Analysis of Cross-border Higher Education for Regional Integration and Labor Market in East Asia." It will examine universities' responses to the activeness of their cross-border activities, the significance of their expected outcomes, and the preferences of their region of partners; then, we will try to project the directions of a future East Asian regional higher education framework.

The rest of the chapter is organized as follows. The next section examines to what extent East Asian integration has progressed by discussing ongoing economic East Asian integration and exploring the current status of East Asian higher education integration. With an objective of suggesting the future directions for the regional higher education framework in East Asia, the section ends with a list of research questions. Section "Prior research" lays out the prior relevant empirical research with findings applicable to the research questions of this chapter. Section "Methods and data source" discusses the method of the research and includes the explanation of criteria for selecting target universities for the survey, as well as the overview of the survey. Section "Findings" presents the findings of the survey, and lastly, section "Discussion and reflections on the findings" discusses the findings and attempts to draw policy implications.

Contexts and Research Questions

East Asian Integration Prospects

Behind the concept of the "East Asian Community" lays a situation where the weight of this region in the world economy is expanding and where, due to the growing interdependence within the region, a relatively more independent economic system that does not rely on the Western economy is forming. With the growing presence of East Asia in the world economy, this region is experiencing a shift from reliance on traditional Western dominance to an intra-regional network. Therefore, the economic interdependence exists with increasing mobility trade, financial flows, services, investment, and capital across the whole region. Watanabe (2004, p. 9) demonstrated "the East Asianization of East Asia" based on an analysis of the amount of trade within the region and concluded that "the most important issue now is whether this de facto economic integration can be transformed into a framework for institutionalized integration."

Examining Asian economic regionalization, the discussions and experiences on the issues of regional integration have already taken a firm rooting within Southeast Asia compared to the other Asian subregions, and it is a more recent phenomenon to discuss Asian regionalization within the scope of East Asia as a whole. For instance, at the Fourth ASEAN Summit in Singapore in 1992, the ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA) was established, and ASEAN committed to establishing an ASEAN Community by 2015. Beyond Southeast Asia, ASEAN also became a central forum for discussing East Asian regional cooperation and a long-term prospect for East Asian regional integration since the establishments of the ASEAN + 3 (China, Korea, and Japan) framework in 1997 and the First East Asian Summit (10 ASEAN countries + China, Japan, Korea, Australia, New Zealand, and India) in 2005.

East Asian Higher Education Integration

The regional integration in the area of higher education in Asia is still at an embryonic stage, with a lack of the "awareness about the interconnected of these issues and the overall structure of higher education system within the region" (SEAMEO RIHED 2008, p. 77). However, in terms of an institutional-led mechanism, the de facto "East Asianization of East Asia" movement with regard to higher education systems can be increasingly seen in Asian universities, and there are government-led dialogues occurring for higher education cooperation in Asia.

The de facto "East Asianization of East Asia" movement is observed with the growing presence of East Asian countries as hosts of international students, the growing number of students moving from one part of East Asia to another part of East Asia, and the growing number of interuniversity linkages and cross-border activities within East Asia. According to Kuroda and Passarelli (2009),

> statistical data suggests that the tremendous growth in Asian student mobility is a circular pattern of knowledge flows, propagated through student exchange and made possible through greater collaboration between education systems. This heightened collaboration is one significant factor leading us to claim that a certain degree of de facto integration is observable, despite the lack of political and regulatory framework necessary to claim de jure integration.

Based on the de facto integration of higher education in East Asia, there are also growing policy discussions on the regionalization of higher education in East Asia. In 2005, at the First East Asian Summit in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, which served as the beginning of the political discussions directed toward promoting practices and policies for a regional framework in East Asia, the role of higher education was recognized as playing a vital role in political integration. At the Second East Asian Summit in Cebu, Philippines, an agreement was made to promote regional educational cooperation. Prior to the Fourth East Asian Summit, the Meeting on Higher Education of ASEAN+3 countries was held in Phuket, Thailand, in 2009, and its outcomes suggest dramatic changes in the policy environment surrounding educational cooperation in the Asian region. The policy statements in these meetings often acknowledge the meaning of the regional framework of higher education in relation to political and academic dimensions but less in relation to economic dimensions. In contrast, as Lujiten-Lub (2007) suggests on European higher education, economic rationales driving internationalization are seen as being increasingly important because national policies are moving toward more economic-oriented rationales. These rationales are "everything related to the direct (income and net economic effect of foreign students) and long term economic benefits (such as internationally trained graduates and foreign graduates as keys to trade relations, etc.)" (National Agency for Higher Education 1997, p. 213).

When looking at subregions, Southeast Asian countries began discussing educational regionalization in 2003, before the discussion of East Asian regionalization, by constructing the Socio-Cultural Community (which covered education) as the "third pillar" of the ASEAN integration. Furthermore, recent dialogues on the

Asian regionalization of higher education included "exploring the ideas of creating higher education common space in Southeast Asia" at the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization/Regional Centre for Higher Education and Development (SEAMEO/RIHED).

Most recently, the discussion on cross-border higher education in Northeast Asia became active. At the joint press conference by Premier Wen Jiabao of the People's Republic of China, Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama of Japan, and President Lee Myung-bak of the Republic of Korea following the Second Japan-China-ROK Trilateral Summit Meeting on October 10, 2009, Prime Minister Hatoyama said:

> I also stated that what will be indispensable for trilateral cooperation is exchanges among the youth of the three countries, in particular those among university students. As one aspect of university student exchanges, we should for example actively consider permitting the interchangeability among universities of credits earned. This would naturally require a degree of consistency in the levels of the schools concerned. While I do not consider this something that is possible for all universities, we will be promoting cooperation as qualitative levels are standardized. I proposed that through such cooperation, it would be possible for the various political and psychological hurdles still remaining among our three countries to be transformed and overcome.

In response to the trend of focusing on the collaboration of the three countries in Northeast Asia, the Asian version of European Region Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS), the Collective Action for Mobility Program of University Students (CAMPUS ASIA) was introduced. The program had an objective of facilitating student mobility in the three countries with a long-term goal of establishing the foundation of academic exchange in Asia and expanding boundaries by collaborating with the countries in Southeast Asia in the future (KEDI 2009, p. 2).

In East Asia, there are already regional organizations that aim to construct a new regional collaborative education framework. Some organizations are motivated by universities, and others are encouraged by governments for different coverage of countries. These organizations include university associations, quality assurance agencies, and ministry networks. For example, ASEAN University Network (AUN) and University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (UMAP) are the university associations that foster collaboration among the universities and oversee the entire higher education sector within the region. AUN and UMAP are different in terms of membership affiliation and target region. The membership of AUN is limited to the major universities of the respective countries of ASEAN, whereas the membership of UMAP is relatively more open to the universities in the Asia Pacific region. Additionally, the Asia Pacific Quality Network (APQN), a nongovernmental private international institution, is a network of quality assurance agencies, and it also has an important policymaking function. Within the regional higher education framework in Asia, governments, universities, and evaluation institutions interact in complementary ways with government organizations. Furthermore, as an Asian version of ERASMUS, the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Centre for Higher Education and Development (SEAEMO RIHED) promotes functional cooperation in Southeast Asia.

These organizations should be the basis of and play an important role in constructing a new East Asian collaborative higher education framework and fostering the cross-border activities within East Asia. However, compared to the European region, where the regionalization of higher education is more advanced, the East Asian region is still exploring the directions of the regional framework, such as what type of cross-border activities should be the target, what kind of objectives and functions this new framework should have, and what countries should be within this framework.

Research Questions

Despite growing political attention on the regional level of the governance framework of higher education in Asia, there are few empirical evidence-based studies on this issue. Thus, by examining the current status and views of leading East Asian universities on their cross-border (or international) activities, this chapter aims to envision the directions of a future regional higher education framework in East Asia and consider the policy implications of the internationalization of higher education in East Asia in the context of regionalization. More specifically, the chapter will examine the following questions:

1. Types of cross-border activities: What types of cross-border activities are perceived to be more active by leading universities? How does the current level of activeness differ as compared with the past and future? What types of cross-border activities of higher education should be targets of the future regional framework of East Asia?
2. Expected outcomes of overall cross-border activities: Which expected outcomes of overall cross-border activities are perceived to be more important than others by leading universities? How does the importance of expected outcomes vary across different time periods: past, present, and future? What expected outcomes of cross-border higher education should be targeted by the future regional framework of East Asia?

Prior Research

Among the few prior relevant research studies about the internationalization of higher education, the IAU Global Surveys were the only institution-level surveys that covered several countries in East Asia, whereas there are some other university surveys on internationalization for specific countries in the region, namely, Japan, Korea, and Malaysia.

In 2003, IAU conducted a survey of all IAU member institutions with the aim of gathering "impressions" from a sufficient number of institutions from each region

of the world about current institutional priorities, practices, and concerns about higher education internationalization (Knight 2003, p. 7). In 2005, IAU conducted another similar but more developed survey, adding more dimensions and targeting a larger number of higher education institutions, including those institutions that are not IAU members (Knight 2006). Both IAU surveys cover more institutions from American and European countries compared to Asian countries. From the "Asia" region, according to their definitions, 32 institutions responded to the IAU 2003 survey,[1] but the report did not indicate the specific countries of the universities that responded. For the IAU 2005 survey,[2] 96 institutions from 19 countries in the "Asia Pacific" region responded. Among the 19 countries, there are only 8 East Asian countries: Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, China, Japan, and Korea. However, neither survey in 2003 or 2005 indicated the number of institutions that responded according to their country, in either the "Asia" or the "Asia Pacific" region. Thus, it is difficult to determine the number of responded institutions from East Asia.

On the types of cross-border activities, the 2003 IAU survey asked about the "level of importance" for difference aspects of internationalization. The 2003 data showed that, among the ten aspects, the universities' most important aspect in the "Asia" region is "strengthening international research collaboration" followed by "mobility of students." Both "mobility of faculty members" and the "international dimension in curriculum" were tied for the third most important aspect.[3] In addition, in the 2003 survey, the informative open-ended question was asked, "What is the most quickly expanding aspect of internationalization at your institution?" For Asian universities, the most quickly expanding activity was "mobility of students/ faculty," followed by the "recruitment of international students" and "international research collaboration." The 2005 IAU survey also indicated that the biggest growth area for Asian universities was "international institutional agreements/ networks," followed by the "recruitment of fee-paying foreign students" and "international research collaboration." Comparing the results of the 2003 and 2005 surveys, some shifts in priorities were observed, although these shifts may be partly due to the differences between the two surveys in the sample selection criteria and the number of universities that responded. In the context of dynamically changing cross-border higher education, it is also important to address the status of different types of internationalization for universities over the different time

---

[1] All 621 IAU members received the survey, and 176 completed surveys were returned from 66 countries, which represents a 28 % response rate. Universities that responded from the "Asia Pacific" region represent 18 % of the total respondents.

[2] A total of 3,057 HEIs listed in the IAU World Higher Education Database, after excluding incorrect and nonfunctioning e-mail addresses, received the survey, and of that number, a total of 526 completed surveys from 95 countries were returned, representing a response rate of 14.7 %. Universities that responded from the "Asia Pacific" region represent 18 % of the total respondents.

[3] The 2005 IAU survey also asked about the elements (cross-border activities) in which universities were actively involved. However, the survey report presents the results not only for Asian universities but for all universities that responded in the world.

periods. This status is one of the dimensions that our survey focuses on in order to understand leading Asian universities' views about the level of activeness of cross-border activities.

On the expected outcomes of cross-border activities, the 2003 and 2005 IAU survey did not use the exact term "expected outcomes"; instead, these IAU surveys asked about the reasons and rationales of internationalization. In the 2003 survey report, the reasons for becoming more international specifically among Asian universities were not presented, but in the 2005 survey report, the most prioritized rationale for Asian universities was to "increase student and faculty international knowledge capacity and production," followed by to "strengthen research and knowledge capacity and production." The following two rationales, "create international profile and reputation" and "broaden and diversify the source of faculty and students," were equally important.[4] However, these IAU surveys did not capture any changing priorities of Asian universities over time or their views on the regional-level objectives of cross-border activities.

The other relevant university-level surveys were not conducted on a regional scale, but they covered a larger number of higher education institutions within specific countries, namely, Japan, Korea, and Malaysia. Although these national-level studies may not be sufficient to project the direction of the future of the regional higher education framework, it is surely helpful for policymakers to consider internationalization and regionalization from the specific countries' viewpoints. In fact, their studies are more appropriate than surveys conducted on a global or regional scale for the countries whose governments have the political wills to be regional hubs or gateways of higher education.

For Japan, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) and Tohoku University conducted a university survey on the internationalization of higher education in 2008. The MEXT survey (Yonezawa 2007)[5] examined the universities' managerial policies for internationalization, their awareness of globalization when setting the goals of many activities, their maintenance and utilization of indicators and data for assessment, and their comments on the assessment of the internationalization of Japanese universities. On the types of cross-border activities, the MEXT survey asked universities to check whether each of 25 cross-border activities had been implemented by universities. The most popular activity implemented by universities was "study abroad or workshops by students," followed by "hiring foreign scholars and researchers" and "study abroad or workshops by faculty and researchers." The least implemented activity was "establishing oversea branch campus(es)." In relation to the expected outcomes

---

[4] For instance, in the 2003 survey, the top three most important benefits were "student staff and teacher development," "research," and "teaching and learning," and in the 2005 survey, the top three most important benefits were "more internationally oriented students and staff," "improved academic quality," and "strengthen research and knowledge production."

[5] The questionnaires were distributed to all 756 universities' international affairs offices or their equivalent in Japan, and 624 completed questionnaires were returned, with a response rate of 82.5 %.

of cross-border activities, the MEXT survey asked universities about the significance of the five "causes for internationalization." The most significant cause was "to facilitate teaching and curriculum by internationalization," followed by "to increase academic, research, and knowledge standards and productivity by internationalization" and "to contribute to society and international cooperation with the university's (international) activities." This finding clearly shows that Japanese universities placed the most priority on improving their academic curriculums and standards by internationalizing their universities.

In 2007, the Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI) conducted a university survey based on "indicators of cross-border higher education," that is, a tool created by KEDI to understand the current status of cross-border higher education in Korea (MEST and KEDI 2007). Thus, the survey questionnaire mainly consists of the current factual questions for each cross-border activity,[6] and it provides a comprehensive overview of the regional preference of Korean universities' cross-border activities. The published data show that, for cross-border collaborative degree programs, Korean universities built the most partnerships with universities in North America, followed by Northeast Asia, Western Europe, Southeast Asia, and the Oceania and Pacific region. For research collaborations, the most partnerships had been built with Western Europe, followed by Northeast Asia, North America, and Southeast Asia. These findings indicated that while either North America or Western Europe was the most active region of partners in some aspects, Northeast Asia was the second most active partner (or the first among Asian subregions) for Korean universities.

For Malaysia, the National Higher Education Research Institute (IPPTN) conducted a university survey to explore the important elements of cross-border activities, motivations, and ongoing partner countries or regions for its research, "Internationalization and International Linkages in Malaysian Higher Education Institutions" in 2007 (Sirat 2009). On types of activities, the IPPTN survey suggests that Malaysian universities regarded "foreign travel opportunities for faculty/staff" as the most popular activity (among 16 activities), followed by "international institutional agreements/networks" and "visiting international scholars." The most important motivation for Malaysian universities' internationalization was to "create international profile and reputations," followed by the motivation of "contributes to academic quality" and "strengthens research and knowledge capacity and production." On regions of partners, the IPPTN survey results indicate that Malaysian universities have established various regions of partners, and the degree of activeness for specific regions depended on types of activities.

Building on these prior surveys,[7] we designed a new university survey to generally address universities throughout East Asia. We aim to address research

---

[6] It was distributed to the 201 4-year Korean universities, and KEDI received 190 responses, with a response rate of 95 %. For example, the questionnaire asked the respondents to indicate, for example, how many students and foreign faculty members, and from which countries of origin, are involved in their cross-border activities.

[7] In addition to prior university surveys, we also reviewed relevant studies based on the researchers' visits to a small number of Asian universities (e.g., Kuroda and Sugimura 2009).

themes more comprehensively, with a focus on the perspectives of East Asian countries and with the purpose of providing policy implications for the future direction of the regional higher education framework.

Method and Data Source

This chapter uses the original dataset from a university survey that we conducted in 2009/2010 for Southeast Asia plus five other countries (China, Japan, Korea, Australia and New Zealand) under the JICA-RI's research project named, "Cross-Border Higher Education for Regional Integration and Labor Market." The JICA-RI team prepared the questionnaire and selected "leading" universities in ways discussed below with collaboration from SEAEMO RIHED. The prior relevant survey by IAU was closely reviewed to refine our survey design. The survey implementation (i.e., the sending and collecting of questionnaires) and data compilation were mainly conducted by Asia Southeast Asia Engineering Education Development (SEED) (a nonprofit organization) in close coordination with the JICA-RI team. The research design, draft questionnaire, and list of sample universities were discussed at a workshop organized by JICA-RI, SEAMEO RIHED, and Asia SEED, on June 30, 2009, in Bangkok, Thailand. The workshop was attended by policymakers and researchers from eight Southeast Asian countries (Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Vietnam, Philippines, and Thailand), in addition to Korea, Japan, China, and Australia. The inputs and endorsements received at this workshop were incorporated into the research project.

Definition and Selection Methods of "Leading" Universities

The questionnaire was distributed to the 300 "leading universities active in cross-border higher education activities" in 10 Southeast Asian countries plus 5 other countries. We target "leading universities in cross-border higher education activities" in this survey firstly because policy discussions on the Asian regional framework of higher education, such as AUN and CAMPUS ASIA, began by targeting national representative universities and, secondly, because the universities that are active in existing international or regional frameworks are the most important foundation for determining the future of the internationalization and regionalization of Asian higher education. Therefore, the selection of leading universities was based on counting the number of times the universities appeared in the three global university ranking sources and their status as members of eight regional or international university associations.

The three global university ranking sources are (a) World University Rankings (WUR) 2008 by Times Higher Education and Quacquarelli Symonds, (b) Academic Ranking of World Universities 2008 (ARWU) by Shanghai Jiao Tong University, and (c) Ranking Web of World Universities 2008 (RWWU) by Webometrics. Given the difficulty of comprehending the whole perspective of "leading" universities due to greatly stratified higher education systems worldwide, the ranking sources are used to select the target respondents even though the evaluation methods used to rank the sources of universities always remain controversial and have many methodological and technical limitations. The selected three global university ranking sources are well known, and rankings provided by Shanghai Jiao Tong University and Times attract most the public attention among the rankings. Although RWWU is not as well publicized as the other two, it ranks the largest number of universities worldwide. Because the global university ranking lists tend to be dominated by American and European universities, using sources that rank a large number of universities worldwide is important for ensuring the presence of Asian universities for the purpose of the study. In 2008, the RWWU, ARWU, and WUR ranked the top 5,000, 500, and 400 universities, respectively. As indicated in Table 4.1, although the number of universities presented from Southeast Asian countries is less than the number of universities presented from the additional five countries, the lists generated from the three ranking sources present a relatively large number of Asian universities.

The eight regional or international university associations have particular relevance in any discussions aimed at the construction of a new regional collaborative educational framework in Asia. These associations are the AUN, the UMAP, the Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU), the Association of East Asian Research Universities (AEARU), the Association of Universities of Asia and the Pacific (AUAP), the IAU, the International Alliance of Research Universities (IARU), and the Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning (ASAIHL).

As summarized in Table 4.1, we first checked how many and which universities are present in each university ranking source or as members of the eight university associations. Then, we checked how many times the same university was ranked or an association member. For each country, Table 4.2 indicates the number of universities that appeared in at least one of the sources (Column A), the number of universities that appeared in at least two of the sources (Column B), and the number of universities that appeared in at least three of the sources (Column C). To avoid the excessive representativeness of some countries, especially the five additional countries, different criteria were used to select universities from different countries, depending on their macro-level elements, such as the size of the population and the total number of universities. The highlighted cells of Table 4.2 show the number of selected universities (279 total universities). Finally, 21 additional universities were selected on the basis of information provided by the participants at the workshop in Bangkok. This addition resulted in 300 "leading higher education

Table 4.1 Number of universities by university rankings and regional/international associations in Southeast Asia and the five additional countries

	Rankings			Regional and international university associations							
	RWWU	ARWU	WUR	AUN	UMAP	APRU	AEARU	ASAIHL	AUAP	IAU	IARU
Southeast Asia											
Brunei Darussalam	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Cambodia	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	1	1	0	0
Indonesia	23	0	3	3	0	1	0	32	20	1	0
Laos	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Malaysia	20	0	5	3	20	1	0	15	4	7	0
Myanmar	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Singapore	9	2	2	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	1
Vietnam	8	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	6	0	0
Philippines	13	0	2	3	20	1	0	30	54	10	0
Thailand	44	0	3	3	53	1	0	35	20	4	0
Subtotal	118	2	15	21	100	5	0	118	105	22	1
Plus 5											
China	334	18	8	0	0	6	5	0	28	3	1
Japan	265	31	23	0	41	6	6	4	4	44	1
Korea	92	8	7	0	8	2	3	0	14	3	0
Australia	41	15	21	0	38	3	0	21	14	13	1
New Zealand	12	5	6	0	4	1	0	5	0	2	0
Subtotal	744	77	65	0	91	18	14	30	60	65	3
Total	862	79	80	21	191	23	14	148	165	87	4

Source – Information from the websites of the above organizations in 2009

Note – *RWWU* Ranking web of world universities, *ARWU* Academic Ranking of World Universities, *WUR* World University Rankings, *AUN* ASEAN University of Network, *UMAP* University Mobility in Asia and Pacific, *APRU* Association of Pacific Rim Universities, *AEARU* Association of East Asian Research Universities, *ASAIHL* Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher, *AUAP* Association of Universities of Asia and the Pacific, *IAU* International Alliance of Research Universities

Table 4.2 Method of selecting 300 sample "leading" universities

	By criteria				Added by participants from workshop	
	A	B	C	Subtotal	in Bangkok	Total
Southeast Asia						
Brunei Darussalam	1[a]	1		1	0	1
Cambodia	5[a]	1		5	1	6
Indonesia	50[a]	17		50	11	61
Laos	1[a]	0		1	0	1
Malaysia	28[a]	18		28	0	28
Myanmar	2[a]	1		2	2	4
Singapore	9[a]	2		9	0	9
Vietnam	12[a]	3		12	2	14
Philippines	89	30[a]		30	2	32
Thailand	83	38[a]		38	2	40
Subtotal	280	111		176	20	196
Plus 5:						
China	349	31[a]	11	31	0	31
Japan	286	78	29[a]	29	0	29
Korea	96	24	8[a]	8	1	9
Australia	47	38	28[a]	28	0	28
New Zealand	13	7	7[a]	7	0	7
Subtotal	791	178	83	103	1	104
Total	1,071	289	83	279	21	300

Note – A Number of universities appeared in at least one of the sources listed in Table 4.1, *B* number of universities appeared in at least two of the sources listed in Table 4.1, *C* number of universities appeared in at least three of the sources listed in Table 4.1
[a]Number of selected universities in each country

institutions active in cross-border activities" in Southeast Asia and the 5 additional countries. The number of selected universities in each source is indicated in Table 4.3 and organized by country.

Leading Universities That Responded

In August 2009, the questionnaires were distributed mainly by e-mail to the top officials in charge of international or external affairs, such as directors, managers, or vice rectors of the International Affairs Office or the equivalent in the 300 leading universities. Questionnaires were sent by fax for officials without e-mail addresses. After sending questionnaires, follow-up activities were conducted for all of the target universities in Southeast Asia and the five additional countries. For universities in Southeast Asian countries, local consultants stationed in Vietnam, Cambodia, Malaysia, China, and Indonesia were engaged in follow-up activities. Out of the 300 universities, 131 (44%) universities completed and returned the

Table 4.3 Number of selected leading universities by university rankings and regional/international associations in Southeast Asia and the five additional countries

	Ranking			Regional and international university associations							
	RWWU	ARWU	WUR	AUN	UMAP	APRU	AEARU	ASAIHL	AUAP	IAU	IARU
Southeast Asia											
Brunei Darussalam	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Cambodia	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	0
Indonesia	22	0	3	3	0	1	0	32	20	1	0
Laos	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	-	0	0	0
Malaysia	20	0	5	3	20	1	0	15	4	7	0
Myanmar	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Singapore	9	2	2	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	1
Vietnam	8	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	6	0	0
Philippines	5	0	2	3	17	1	0	19	20	9	0
Thailand	34	0	3	3	24	1	0	35	16	4	0
Subtotal	99	2	15	21	68	5	0	107	66	21	1
Plus 5:											
China	30	18	8	0	0	6	5	0	14	3	1
Japan	29	21	19	0	14	6	6	2	0	21	1
Korea	9	8	7	0	5	2	3	0	0	1	0
Australia	27	15	21	0	28	3	0	18	12	13	1
New Zealand	7	5	6	0	4	1	0	5	0	1	0
Subtotal	102	67	61	0	51	18	14	25	26	39	3
Total	201	69	76	21	119	23	14	132	92	60	4

Source – Information from the websites of the above organizations in 2009

Note – *RWWU* Ranking web of world universities, *ARWU* Academic Ranking of World Universities, *WUR* World University Rankings, *AUN* ASEAN University of Network, *UMAP* University Mobility in Asia and Pacific, *APRU* Association of Pacific Rim Universities, *AEARU* Association of East Asian Research Universities, *ASAIHL* Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher, *AUAP* Association of Universities of Asia and the Pacific, *IAU* International Alliance of Research Universities

Table 4.4 Number of universities that responded, by country

	Responded universities	Response rate (%)	Target universities
Southeast Asia			
Brunei Darussalam	0	0	1
Cambodia	5	83	6
Indonesia	30	49	61
Laos	0	0	1
Malaysia	16	57	28
Myanmar	1	25	4
Philippines	7	22	32
Singapore	1	11	9
Thailand	9	23	40
Vietnam	14	100	14
Subtotal	83	42	196
Plus 5			
China	19	61	31
Japan	17	59	29
Korea	5	56	9
Australia	7	25	28
New Zealand	0	0	7
Subtotal	48	46	104
Total	131	44	300

Source – JICA Survey

questionnaire. Of 131 universities, this chapter analyzes 124 universities from the Northeast Asia and Southeast Asia regions, excluding 7 responses from universities in Australia because the focus of this chapter is on East Asia. Table 4.4 shows the number of universities that responded, by country.

Overview of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed to capture cross-border activities for leading universities in the following three dimensions: (a) the level of activeness of cross-border activities by different types of activities, (b) the level of significance of their expected outcomes by different types of outcomes, and (c) the level of activeness of their partners' regions. The questionnaire also attempts to address any changes over time (past, present, and future). The level or significance of activeness was measured on a Likert scale, assigning five choices: "4, highly active (significant)"; "3, fairly active (significant)"; "2, moderately active (significant)"; "1, slightly active (significant)"; and "0, not active (significant)."

For the first dimension, the questionnaire asked about the activeness of cross-border activities by eleven different types of activities, which are also grouped into the three levels as follows:

1. Student level: Outgoing mobility opportunities and acceptance of foreign students
2. Faculty level: Outgoing mobility opportunities, recruitment of full-time foreign faculty members, and cross-border research collaboration
3. Institution level: Cross-border institutional agreement, cross-border collaborative degree programs, and the use of information and communications technology (ICT) for cross-border distance education

In general, the names of activities themselves explain their characteristics, but "cross-border collaborative degree programs" conveys different meaning among people within and across countries. Therefore, it is important to set a working definition that reflects today's realities. For this study, this term was defined as a higher education degree program that was institutionally produced/organized with cross-border university partnership by at least two institutions in two or more countries or as higher education programs organized by a foreign provider. This definition does not include, for example, conventional student exchange programs based on cross-border university agreements. Double- and joint-degree programs are common examples of "cross-border collaborative degree programs."

For the second dimension, universities were asked to indicate the significance of the eleven expected outcomes for overall cross-border activities in the following three groups: academic, political, and economic. Each group is divided into four levels: institutional, national, regional, and global.[8]

1. Academic: To promote intercultural/international awareness and understanding, to achieve research excellence, and to improve quality of education
2. Political: To promote global citizenship, to promote the regional collaboration and identity of Asia, to promote national culture and values, and to improve the international visibility and reputation of your university
3. Economic: To meet the demand of the global economy, to meet the demand of the Asian regional economy, to meet the demand of your national economy, and to generate revenue for your own institution

In contrast, the 2005 IAU Global Survey categorizes the rationales driving internationalization of institutions into four groups: political, economic, academic, and cultural/social. However, social and cultural expected outcomes are excluded from this study. Although social and cultural rationales relate to the promotion of intercultural understanding and national cultural identity still remains significant, "perhaps, in some countries their importance does not carry the same weight in comparison to economic and political based rationales" (Knight 2006). Also, the

---

[8] In addition, we also asked the significance of the expected outcomes according to each of five types of cross-border activities, which were regarded as commonly acknowledged activities among the list of eight cross-border activities from the first dimension. These five activities are "outgoing mobility opportunities for student," "acceptance of foreign students," "cross-border research collaboration," "cross-border research collaboration," "cross-border institutional agreement," and "cross-border collaborative degree programs."

global and regional levels of expected outcomes are added in this study to observe whether or how Asian universities' expected outcomes for internationalization are viewed on global and regional levels. Furthermore, in addition to indicating the level of significance of different expected outcomes, the respondents were asked to indicate the levels across different time periods: past, present, and future.

Findings

Types of Cross-Border Activities

Table 4.5 suggests that the level of activeness varies across the different types of cross-border activities. The column titled "Present" shows that conventional activities such as "international/cross-border institutional agreement" and "outgoing mobility opportunities for faculty members" are regarded as being more active than innovative activities such as "cross-border collaborative degree programs" and the "use of ICT for cross-border distance education." The international institutional agreements and international mobility of students and faculty members are generally well established and a growing feature of higher education, whereas the international mobility of institutions and courses such as cross-border collaborative degree programs (e.g., twinning, double- or joint-degree programs) on a large scale is a more novel phenomenon. This mobility is made possible in part by recent innovations in ICT (McBurnie and Ziguras 2007, p. 21). These conventional activities are the basis or conditions of initiating further innovative forms of collaborative activities. For example, to conduct collaborative degree programs, universities are often required to have institutional agreements, though having institutional agreements does not necessarily mean having active collaborative degree programs.

While the lists of cross-border activities in the ranking order of the level of activeness have not changed much over time, the level of activeness for innovative activities is expected to grow extensively in the future, given its merits for fostering cross-border higher education. The level of activeness increased from 1.10 in the past to 3.09 in the future for "cross-border collaborative degree programs" and from 1.10 in the past to 2.95 in the future for the "use of ICT for cross-border distance education." Regarding "cross-border collaborative degree programs," Knight (2009, p. 12) suggests that "for many academics and policymakers, double and joint-degree programs are welcomed as a natural extension of exchange and mobility," and they offer the benefits of leading to deeper and more sustainable relationships than many other international programs. In addition to "cross-border collaborative degree programs," another innovative activity, in which the level of activeness is prospected to grow, is the "use of ICT for cross-border distance education." Using ICT for cross-border distance education has revolutionalized how universities operate in recent years; it has significantly helped to broaden

Table 4.5 Level of activeness of cross-border activities for East Asia

	Past		Present		Future	
Rank	Cross-border activity	Mean	Cross-border activity	Mean	Cross-border activity	Mean
1	Outgoing mobility opportunities for faculty members (F)	2.36	International/cross-border institutional agreement (I)	3.08	International/cross-border institutional agreement (I)	3.75
2	International/cross-border institutional agreement (I)	2.29	Outgoing mobility opportunities for faculty members (F)	2.98	Outgoing mobility opportunities for faculty members (F)	3.74
3	Cross-border research collaboration (F)	2.06	Outgoing mobility opportunities for students (S)	2.78	Outgoing mobility opportunities for students (S)	3.68
4	Acceptance of foreign students (S)	1.91	Acceptance of foreign students (S)	2.77	Acceptance of foreign students (S)	3.65
5	Outgoing mobility opportunities for students (S)	1.85	Cross-border research collaboration (F)	2.74	Cross-border research collaboration (F)	3.64
6	Recruitment of full-time foreign faculty members (F)	1.47	Recruitment of full-time foreign faculty members (F)	2.06	Cross-border collaborative degree programs (I)	3.09
7	Cross-border collaborative degree programs (I)	1.10	Cross-border collaborative degree programs (I)	1.87	Recruitment of full-time foreign faculty members (F)	3.04
8	Use of ICT for cross-border distance education (I)	1.10	Use of ICT for cross-border distance education (I)	1.80	Use of ICT for cross-border distance education (I)	2.95

Source – JICA Survey
Note – *4* Highly active, *3* fairly active, *2* moderately active, *1* slightly active, *0* not active, *(I)* institution, *(F)* faculty, *(S)* student. The mean for both 'cross-border collaborative degree programs' and 'use of ICT for cross-border distance education' is 1.104348

access to higher education and strengthen collaborative research (Jowi 2009, p. 269). The development of ICT is an effective system to deliver and exchange knowledge without requiring the physical relocation of students and faculty members. With its great contribution to fostering cross-border higher education, ICT is expected to be used more actively in the future. Therefore, the "leading" universities in Asia plan to increasingly activate "cross-border collaborative degree programs" and the "use of ICT for cross-border distance education" in the future.

Expected Outcomes of Overall Cross-Border Activities

Table 4.6 indicates the level of significance of overall cross-border activities' expected outcomes for all targeted countries. At present, "leading" Asian universities' most prioritized rationale for driving cross-border higher education is "to

Table 4.6 Significance of overall cross-border activities' expected outcomes for East Asia

	Past		Present		Future	
Rank	Expected outcome	Mean	Expected outcome	Mean	Expected outcome	Mean
1	To improve quality of education (A-I)	2.59	To improve international visibility and reputation of your university (P-I)	3.23	To improve international visibility and reputation of your university (P-I)	3.78
2	To promote national culture and values (P-N)	2.54	To improve quality of education (A-I)	3.19	To improve quality of education (A-I)	3.78
3	To achieve research excellence (A–I)	2.39	To achieve research excellence (A-I)	3.17	To achieve research excellence (A-I)	3.78
4	To improve international visibility and reputation of your university (P-I)	2.39	To promote intercultural/ international awareness and understanding (A-N)	3.13	To promote intercultural/ international awareness and understanding (A-N)	3.75
5	To promote intercultural/ international awareness and understanding (A-N)	2.38	To promote national culture and values (P-N)	3.09	To promote national culture and values (P-N)	3.68
6	To meet the demand of your national economy (E-N)	2.36	To meet the demand of your national economy (E-N)	3.01	To promote regional collaboration and identity of Asia (P-R)	3.63
7	To promote regional collaboration and identity of Asia (P-R)	2.24	To promote regional collaboration and identity of Asia (P-R)	2.93	To meet the demand of your national economy (E-N)	3.53
8	To generate revenue for your own institution (E-I)	1.94	To meet the demand of global economy (E-G)	2.69	To generate revenue for your own institution (E-I)	3.39
9	To meet the demand of Asian regional economy (E-R)	1.89	To generate revenue for your own institution (E-I)	2.68	To meet the demand of Asian regional economy (E-R)	3.34
10	To meet the demand of global economy (E-G)	1.87	To promote global citizenship (P-G)	2.63	To meet the demand of global economy (E-G)	3.31
11	To promote global citizenship (P-G)	1.85	To meet the demand of Asian regional economy (E-R)	2.62	To promote global citizenship (P-G)	3.29

Source – JICA Survey

Note – *4* Highly significant, *3* fairly significant, *2* moderately significant, *1* slightly significant, *0* not significant, *(A)* academic, *(P)* political, *(E)* economic, *(G)* global, *(R)* regional, *(N)* national, *(I)* institutional

improve international visibility and reputation of [their] own university" (see the column titled "Present"). The movement of "world-class" university status can be witnessed over the last decade, not only in the West, but also in the East, as many universities in Asia are concerned with improving their international visibility and reputation; the result shows that "leading" Asian "universities are not an exception in this movement." The rationale "to improve international visibility and reputation" increased in significance over time because it was ranked as the fourth rationale for the past, after "to improve quality of education," "to promote national culture and value," and "to achieve research excellence." In fact, the 2005 IAU Global Survey also shows that overall, Asian universities place a certain priority on the rationale to "create international profile and reputation," which is the third most prioritized rationale among the seven rationales. The reputation of universities is greatly important in improving universities' statuses on the university ranking lists, which have been increasingly influential in shaping students' choices for universities. This influence exists despite the fact that no ranking list of universities is absolutely objective. Furthermore, appearing in the worldwide ranking list makes the universities better recognized nationally and internationally, facilitating the formation of partnerships with recruitment agencies and other universities. Therefore, Asian universities, especially "leading" ones, regard the rationale "to improve international visibility and reputation of own university" as the significant rationale driving cross-border higher education.

Despite how many observers may claim that the "for-profit" side of internationalization is increasing in many countries of the world, the level of significance of the expected outcome "to generate revenue for your own institution" is unexpectedly low at present. This low level of significance of expected outcome may be partly because our targeted universities are leading ones, and the majority is of these universities are publically funded. Knight (2008) also argues that the trend of a dramatic movement of internationalization rationales toward income production may be true for a small group of countries, but it is certainly not the case for the majority of institutions around the world. Both the results of the 2005 IAU Global Survey and the JICA-RI survey show that universities do not place much emphasis on generating revenue by fostering cross-border higher education. According to the 2005 IAU Global Survey report (Knight 2006), the leading rationales driving cross-border higher education in the Asia Pacific region are to "increase student and faculty international knowledge capacity and production" and to "strengthen research and knowledge capacity and production." Other relatively important rationales include the following: "create international profile and reputation," "broaden and diversify source of faculty and students," and "contribute to academic quality."[9] However, the least important rationale for the world in general, as well as

---

[9] Similar to the worldwide priorities of rationales, the Asia Pacific region's most important rationale is to "increase student and faculty international knowledge capacity and production" (21 %), and the second most important rationale is to "strengthen research and knowledge capacity and production" (20 %) (Knight, 2006). The least important rationale is to "diversify income

Table 4.7 Significance of overall cross-border activities' expected outcomes (academic/political/economic) for East Asia

	Past		Present		Future	
Rank	Expected outcome	Mean	Expected outcome	Mean	Expected outcome	Mean
1	Academic expected outcome	2.45	Academic expected outcome	3.16	Academic expected outcome	3.77
2	Political expected outcome	2.27	Political expected outcome	2.97	Political expected outcome	3.60
3	Economic expected outcome	2.02	Economic expected outcome	2.75	Economic expected outcome	3.39

Source – JICA Survey

Note – *4* Highly significant, *3* fairly significant, *2* moderately significant, *1* slightly significant, *0* not significant

the Asia Pacific region, is to "diversify income generation." Likewise, the result of the JICA-RI Survey, as illustrated in the column titled "Present" on Table 4.6, suggests that "leading" Asian universities also place a relatively low level of significance on "generating revenue for their own institution," which is ranked as the eighth most significant rationale among the eleven rationales.

Overall, the findings at the different time periods seem to agree with the perceived priorities at each time period (see from column "Past" to column "Future" of Table 4.6). For instance, the significance of the expected outcome "to improve international visibility and reputation of your university" remains high, as does the level of significance of the expected outcome.

Table 4.7 reveals that when expected outcomes are grouped into academic, political, and economic expected outcomes, "leading" Asian universities prioritize academic and political expected outcomes slightly more than economic expected outcomes. This order of priority among academic, political, and economic expected outcomes does not seem to change over time, whereas universities perceive all three groups of outcomes, including economic outcomes, as being more significant in the future than at present (see from column "Present" to column "Future" of Table 4.7).

Grouping expected outcomes by global, regional, national, and institutional levels, Table 4.8 shows that, at present, the levels of significance of institutional and national expected outcomes are higher than that of the regional and global expected outcomes. Furthermore, while the national and institutional expected outcomes are consistently regarded as being more significant than regional and global expected outcomes over the time periods, the level of significance of the regional expected outcome grows almost as high as that of the national expected outcome in the future. In the future, the significance of the national expected outcome is 3.59, and that of the regional expected outcome is 3.58, as revealed in the column "Future" of Table 4.8. This growth in the level of significance of regional expected outcome shows how Asian "leading" universities' perspectives

---

generation" (6 %). Both findings from countries worldwide and the Asia Pacific region show how the rationale to "diversify income generation" is regarded as the least important rationale.

Table 4.8 Significance of overall cross-border activities' expected outcomes (institutional/national/regional/global) for East Asia

	Past		Present		Future	
Rank	Expected outcome	Mean	Expected outcome	Mean	Expected outcome	Mean
1	National expected outcome	2.43	National expected outcome	3.07	Institutional expected outcome	3.68
2	Institutional expected outcome	2.33	Institutional expected outcome	3.07	National expected outcome	3.65
3	Regional expected outcome	2.08	Regional expected outcome	2.93	Regional expected outcome	3.63
4	Global expected outcome	1.86	Global expected outcome	2.67	Global expected outcome	3.31

Source – JICA Survey

Note – *4* Highly significant, *3* fairly significant, *2* moderately significant, *1* slightly significant, *0* not significant

on expected outcomes increasingly expand from the institutional and national level to the regional level, indicating their increasing recognition of the importance of Asian regionalization.

Discussion and Reflections on the Findings

The analysis of this original empirical research provides the implications necessary to construct the architecture of a new East Asian regional higher education framework. The policy implications are discussed according to the findings from each dimension of the survey. The findings from the first dimension, activeness of cross-border activities, reflect the current and projected trend of the activities. The second dimension, significance of expected outcomes, identifies the commonly shared interests among the East Asian universities. Lastly, the third dimension finds which Asian subregions are actively collaborating with which regions of their counterparts and delineates a cohesive and functional definition of "East Asia." Therefore, the findings, the types of cross-border activities, and common interests need to be interpreted to form an appropriate regional framework are discussed below.

Regarding the first dimension of the survey, the conventional activities are currently perceived to be more active than the innovative activities, but the level of activeness of innovative activities will increase extensively in the future. Among the conventional activities, the activeness of "outgoing mobility opportunity for students" grew the most over the time periods, implying the universities' support for a greater amount of student mobility in the future. Furthermore, the growing presence of innovative activities, "cross-border collaborative degree programs," and the "use of ICT for cross-border distance education" in the future suggest some specific actions on the part of the universities. Activating "cross-border

collaborative degree programs" implies an increase in the number of bilateral or multilateral institutional agreements to jointly provide curriculums or degrees to students, and for "use of ICT for cross-border distance education" to be more widely used in the future, universities will need to invest further in constructing infrastructure to facilitate its use. Therefore, when constructing the East Asian regional framework, the discussion about increasingly activated cross-border activities is an important component in order for the framework to respond properly to the trend of cross-border higher education.

For an effective and appropriate framework, the framework must reflect how universities' interests are driving cross-border higher education; therefore, it is important to closely examine which expected outcomes are more or less prioritized than others by "leading" East Asian universities. In the context of universities paying serious attention to building world-class status, one of the main findings in the second dimension of the survey was that the universities are most interested in improving their "international visibility and reputation," both at present and in the future. This high interest in improving their "international visibility and reputation" might have resulted from the recent phenomenon of the international ranking of universities influencing the internationalization policies of individual institutions as well as governmental policies. To construct the future regional framework, this aspect of the incentives of individual institutions should also be adequately incorporated.

Furthermore, when grouped by academic, political, and economic expected outcomes, the most important aspect for individual leading universities in East Asia is "academic expected outcomes." In general, rationales, such as improving quality of education and achieving research excellence, are highly prioritized. Reflecting such prioritized expected outcomes among leading East Asian universities, the promotion of a regional framework of higher education should begin as a functional mechanism for these directions, such as a regional quality assurance (QA) network. For example, currently APQN is a key regional QA network with the objectives of promoting good practices and providing advice and expertise to assist the overall condition of regional QA systems in member countries. Furthermore, APQN assists its members in the development of credit transfers and improving the mobility and standards of cross-border education activities (SEAMEO RIHED 2008, p. 83). Also, AUN and SEAMEO RIHED are establishing their own regional quality assurance mechanisms in Southeast Asia. Such regional quality assurance efforts may serve the universities' interests related to academic expected outcome in the process of the regionalization of higher education and should be promoted within the new framework of East Asia.

As original findings of this survey, the political and economic aspects of expected outcomes are also increasingly significant in East Asia. Considering the insufficient policy discussions on these dimensions, East Asian governments and other stakeholders should further discuss and articulate the political and economic implications of this framework in formulating the regional framework. Considering that the policy statements from meetings on regional integration, such as the Kuala Lumpur Declaration in 2005, often acknowledge the meaning of a higher education

regional framework in relation to political and academic dimensions, but less so in relation to economic dimensions, more policy discussions on economic dimension are necessary.

This chapter has sought to capture the current status and perceptions of leading universities in East Asia with respect to cross-border activities in the context of regionalization. Although some of the situations in East Asia are common to other regions of the world, we have sought to explain the East Asian dimension of cross-border higher education in terms that have gained widespread use and adherence: internationalization, regionalization, and globalization. This chapter has empirically identified several directions of regional-level efforts to promote cross-border activities in establishing an East Asian framework of higher education with shared goals. We should not underestimate the role that universities have played and will play in reaching out across borders and establishing collaborative networks with institutions around the world. In East Asia, this policy discussion to formulate a new framework has just begun.

References

Altbach, P. (2006). Globalization and the university: Realities in an unequal world. In J. J. F. Forest & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Hatoyama, Y. (2009). *Joint Press Conference by Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama of Japan, Premier Wen Jiabao of the People's Republic of China and President Lee Myung-bak of the Republic of Korea following the Second Japan Japan-China-ROK Trilateral Summit Meeting* 2009. Joint Press Conference. http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/hatoyama/statement/200910/10JCKkyoudou_e.html

Jowi, J. (2009). Internationalization of higher education in Africa: Development, emerging trends, issues and policy implications. *Higher Education Policy, 22*(3), 263–281.

Knight, J. (2003). *Internationalization of higher education: Practices and priorities*. Paris: International Association of Universities.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8*(5), 5–31.

Knight, J. (2006). *Internationalization of higher education: New directions, new challenges*. Paris: International Association of Universities.

Knight, J. (2008). Internationalization: A decade of changes and challenges. *International Higher Education, 50*(Winter 2008), 6–7.

Knight, J. (2009). Double- and joint-degree programs: Double benefits or double counting? *International Higher Education, 55*(Spring 2009), 12–13.

Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI). (2009). *Asiapan Erasmus Program 'Campus Asia' Ui Chu Jin Jeon Ryak Gwa Jun Mang* [Driving strategies and prospects of Asian version of Erasmus Program 'Campus Asia']. Seoul: KEDI.

Kuroda, K., & Passarelli, D. (2009). *Modelling TNE directions in Asia*. London: The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.

Kuroda, K., & Sugimura, M. (2009). *Ajia Niokeru Chiki Renkei Kyuiku Framework To Daigakukan Renkei Jirei No Kensho* [Examination of case study concerning university inter-linkages and a framework of regional higher education integration in Asia]. Tokyo: MEXT.

Lujiten-Lub, A. (2007). *Choices in internationalization: How higher education institutions respond to internationalization, Europeanization, and globalization*. Enschede: CHEPS, University of Twente.

McBurnie, G., & Ziguras, C. (2007). *Transnational education: Issues and trends in offshore higher education*. Oxon/New York: Routledge.

Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MEXT), & Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI). (2007). *Go Deung Gyo Yuk Ji Pyo Mit Ji Su Gye Bal Yeon Gu* [Indicators and indices for development of internationalization of higher education]. Seoul: KEDI.

National Agency for Higher Education. (1997). *National policies for the internationalisation of higher education in Europe*. Stockholm: National Agency for Higher Education.

Postiglione, G., & Chapman, D. (2010). East Asia's experience of border crossing: Assessing future prospects. In D. W. Chapman, W. K. Cummings, & G. A. Postiglione (Eds.), *Crossing borders in East Asian higher education*. Hong Kong: Springer.

Sirat, M. (2009). Malaysia's experiences and issues of the internationalisation of higher education in the changing economic and labour market demand in the region. In *Workshop for "Analysis of Cross-border Higher Education for Regional Integration and Labor Market in East Asia"*. Bangkok: JICA-Research Institute, SEAMEO/RIHED, AsiaSEED.

The Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Centre for Higher Education and Development (SEAMEO RIHED). (2008). *Harmonisation of higher education: Lessons learned from the Bologna process* (Vol. 1). Bangkok: SEAMEO RIHED.

UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS). (1999–2007). *Number of mobile students*. UIS. http://www.uis.unesco.org/glossary/Term.aspx?name=International%20(or%20internationally%20mobile)%20students&lang=en

Watanabe, T. (2004). *Higashi Ajia Shijo Togo Heno Michi* [The path toward East Asia market integration]. Tokyo: Keiososhobo.

Yonezawa, A. (2007). *Kakudaigaku Ya Daisanshakikan Niyoru Daigaku No Kokusaika No Kansuru Hyouka Ni Kakaru Chousa Kenkyu* [Reviews on the internationalization of universities implemented by universities themselves and third-party evaluation organizations]. Tohoku University.