

MALCOLM COOPER

6. THE DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPING AND NURTURING THE “INTERNATIONAL” IN AN INTERNATIONAL JAPANESE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION

INTRODUCTION

The internationalization of higher education is not a new concept (NAFSA, 2005; Hudzik, 2011). Scholars and students have been crossing international borders for centuries and adapting to the situations they then find themselves in. However, during the past several decades the international dimensions of higher education have intensified. A core reality that distinguishes current patterns from those of the past is the scale and scope of what internationalization encompasses—the breadth of clientele served, the status of international faculty, the outcomes intended, and the concomitant reshaping of the institutional ethos in many university systems (Umakoshi, 1997; Eades et al., 2005; Kawauchi, 2006; Hudzik, 2011). There is a growing sense that internationalization is an institutional imperative in present-day Japanese higher education (Ebuchi, 1997; McVeigh, 2002), not just a desirable possibility. So while the business of universities has always also been the creation of ideas through research and their dissemination through education and application, increasingly, this is as much across as it is within borders, and is not just based on the free flow of ideas but is also manifested in the global flow of the students and scholars who generate them (Kerr, 1990; Kuroda, 2007). With easier travel and the Internet providing near instantaneous access throughout the world, more and more university systems flow across borders physically and virtually, with a definite impact on faculty, their academic organizations, and university administrators and management, as well as on students.

But there are downsides: global and local pressures on universities also derive from the current audit society—the pressures on faculty to publish to assist a university to succeed in an increasingly competitive environment for funding, a lack of permanent jobs due to the erosion of tenure in favor of short-term contracts, and reductions in institutional finance from government in favor of fee generation and other private sources of finance. In addition, there is often an uneasy mix of faculty from different countries within the internationalizing university, and often within them a local administrative system that only sees value in indigenous approaches and methods, many of which do not gel easily with the requirements of true

M. COOPER

internationalization (McVeigh, 2002; Hall, 1998). In the longer term the looming issue of the demographic problem now appearing in Japan and other countries (Kinmonth, 2005), and the possible impact on universities localized in teaching methodology of such alternative delivery systems as Massive Online Courses are also factors that must be taken into account. In addition the issue of costs is becoming much more important to both institutions and students alike: how to justify the expense of an international university education if it does not result in better job chances and leaves a massive personal debt on the one hand, and the increasingly difficult funding climate for public education on the other. These pressures are modifying the purpose and delivery of higher education in many countries as a result of the internationalization of higher education (Umakoshi, 1997; Taylor & Miroiu, 2002). This chapter is a timely examination of some of the factors and issues embodied in this change.

THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF A NATIONAL TERTIARY EDUCATION SYSTEM (OR PARTS OF IT)

To provide an introduction to the difficulties inherent in responding to these global and local pressures, it is instructive to look at the situation of Japan. The way externally derived internationalization and English-language teaching at branch campuses of U.S. universities in Japan has been treated, the falling birth rate in recent times, and the more recent desire of a few top Japanese universities to become major international players, have given rise to some radical experiments in internationalization (Umakoshi, 1997). These have come in several phases, with U.S. branch campuses being established in Japan from the 1980s (Temple University (TUJ) for example was established in 1982 and now has some 2,000 students), but without the same benefits as accredited Japanese universities because they were not given the status of *gakkō hōjin*, or educational corporations, and those of the more recent responses by the domestic higher education sector discussed below. In the late 1980s, in the middle of the bubble economy, more than 30 American colleges and universities had begun operations in Japan, partly due to bilateral efforts to mitigate trade friction. Yet most have closed their doors due to declining student numbers, the higher tuition fees resulting from their different tax status compared with their Japanese counterparts, the way their students were treated within the higher education system, their exclusion from educational support and change programs like the Global 30 initiative (see below), and because many students could not keep up with the level of English. Graduates of these foreign schools also found that their degrees were not considered as valuable as those earned at Japanese universities in the eyes of Japanese companies.

The foreign universities remaining in Japan saw their circumstances change slightly in 2004, when the education ministry started partially allowing credits earned at Japanese campuses of foreign universities to be transferable to Japanese

accredited colleges, and graduates from their programs were made eligible to apply to accredited Japanese graduate schools. Until that change was introduced, Japan campuses of foreign universities could not provide visas for foreign students. Before the system was introduced, students were not even eligible for commuter passes, which are available to all students at Japanese colleges. Yet even after this change there are only five foreign universities that fall under the credit transferability category, and there are few incentives for foreign educational institutions to make a costly investment at a time when Japanese colleges are competing over a shrinking pool of students.

More recently, the private Sophia, Waseda, and Ritsumeikan education trusts have recognized that one response to demographic change could be the attraction of enough students from overseas to offset the expected decline in the Japanese product, as have some of the public institutions like Tokyo University (Kinmonth, 2005). These pioneering domestic organizations have also recognized that the bulk of Japan's potential overseas market for higher education would lie in East and Southeast Asia in the future (Watanabe, 2004; Kuroda, 2007), despite the historically strong linkages of the country with Europe and America. However, to achieve the desired outcome of maintaining and increasing student enrolments even from these sources, it was also realized that a large part of the curriculum had to be taught in English as well as in Japanese (Eades et al., 2005) in order to be attractive to students and their families, regardless of the actual origin of the students. And, in turn this language requirement necessitated the recruitment of bi-lingual and/or solely English speaking faculty and administrative staff (NAFSA, 2005).

Sophia University, due to its American connections, has taught in English for many years, but only in its Faculty of Comparative Culture, and in 1998 Waseda University established a bilingual graduate program in Asia Pacific Studies focusing on international relations and business management, and a separate small International College in 2004. Public institutions like the University of Tokyo have also established small additions to their teaching portfolios, mainly in the form of international graduate schools, and there have been some small colleges calling themselves international universities established. However, to date the only really comprehensive response from the private and public sectors of university education in Japan to the problem of falling student enrolments and the globalization of education opportunities has been that of the Ritsumeikan Trust, which in 2000 opened Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University (APU) in Kyushu, the first and even now in 2015 the only fully international university in the country (self-defined as involving a 50:50 split between domestic and international students and staff, and presenting major courses in two or more languages). It must however be recognized that each of these responses and that of the limited response of other public sector universities to the globalization and student number pressures were made within an educational system and a domestic community that does not universally value or support such a change (Eades, 2001).

INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION IN JAPAN

Discussing the domestic socio-cultural environment first, it should be noted that there are many individuals with sufficient energy and suitable ideas on how to internationalize the university sector in Japan, but University responses to the question of local and international community engagement have been tightly controlled by the central government in the past, and many local communities have had considerable difficulty with the idea of a significant *gaikokujin* (foreigner) population residing in their midst (Eades, 2001). Indeed, there remains an undercurrent of opposition in many communities to the idea of globalization, especially if it involves significant numbers of foreign faculty and students being welcomed into the local day-to-day environment. On top of this, prior to 1998 the Japanese Education Ministry's view of appropriate community engagement by faculty and staff of universities was circumscribed by its view of the proper relationships between national, city or prefectural and private universities and their stakeholder communities. This excluded foreign universities like Temple University Japan, so the concept was that only a few national universities should meet the needs of the nation in respect of *global* education (e.g., the Universities of Tokyo and Kyoto and similar institutions where the numbers of foreigners enrolled and teaching would be very small compared with the overall university population). The majority of city and prefectural universities should be restricted to meeting the needs of the local community that established them, and private universities should be mainly responsive to particular niches that could be identified in the local higher education market (Eades, 2001, 95; Eades et al., 2005).

It is not surprising, therefore, that this level of control even of private universities like the Ritsumeikan Trust, its faculty and its administrators gave such institutions little freedom to work with all possible stakeholders (and indeed get students from all possible sources) in order to create a new response to the globalizing and demographic pressures identified above. Indeed, it is almost as if the globalization of higher education, demographic and audit culture problems were being defined away for most institutions by the government and their local communities in order that the outside world could continue to be held at arm's length. But perhaps that is being too harsh, and the pattern of avoidance of the situation that they found themselves in should be seen as merely a result of the continuation of the isolationist/exclusionist policies of Japanese society as a whole (not of course in respect of Japanese exports of manufactured goods) since the end of the Second World War (Cooper et al., 2007). Certainly, local communities have in the past received little value from the internationalizing of the social research done by universities in Japan that might have provided some impetus and rationale for change in these relationships. This is largely because research outputs remain restricted to in-house publications, if they are written up at all (this does NOT apply to much scientific work, which does and did in the past reach an international audience, but its origins are limited mainly to the nationals and a few

private institutions), and do not inform any national or local debate on the benefits of internationalization.

However, soon after 1998 it was realized that Japan needed to compete in an increasingly international education system in at least East Asia in order to offset falling domestic student demand for places at Japanese universities. The first major new initiative came in 1999 when the government conditionally approved a plan to turn national and prefectural universities into independent administrative institutions (*dokuritsu gyōsei hōjinka*) in order to give them more financial and decision-making autonomy to invest in international education (Eades et al., 2005). Despite considerable controversy, over both the intent of the plan and the likely results, this measure was implemented progressively from 2004. While there may still be little consensus about the underlying aims of this reform, these changes actually meant for the private university market place of 750 universities a much greater level of competition in niche markets than it had hitherto experienced, while it added a need to properly address the requirements of internationalization to the demographic stresses on the public universities, even if that was only to encompass East Asia.

Finally, despite the community-wide resistance to the internationalization of its universities, there existed a strongly held assumption that Asia Pacific communities would need and value Japanese undergraduate and postgraduate courses in science and social science disciplines, including tourism and hospitality. This assumption was ironic in respect of a country that obviously did not value in-bound tourism (Funck & Cooper, 2013), and did not easily issue visas to residents of those countries it wished to attract students from! Thus the initially disappointing market reaction to the establishment of international schools at a few Japanese universities that resulted after 1998 was understandable, and gave rise to the realization that Japan as a whole did not, in fact, have enough quality resources in its desired-to-be competitive disciplinary areas, or indeed sufficient attractiveness as a national education destination, to implement such desires. This has in turn become another limiting factor for the few universities in this country that have tried internationalization, putting pressures on administrators with respect to the recruitment of international faculty and students that in many cases they are not equipped to handle.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES

In terms of the second major influence, that of changing student and community demographics, the situation within the Japanese market is indeed grim (see for example, Cooper & Eades, 2005; Kinmonth, 2005), but also raises the possibility that a Faculty and/or institution that could rapidly develop an international profile might well be able to offset the accelerating decline in the number of potential Japanese university students (from 2007, domestic student application numbers have been less than the number of places available each year; Kuroda, 2007). In the case of the Ritsumeikan Trust, for example, the establishment of an international university from the outset of the 1998 changes was therefore seen as the one advantage that

might offset all the negative implications of demographic trends and the need for internationalization, since it would be a source of new international and domestic research and education strength, attract international students, and thus be of interest to both the diminishing Japanese market and the growing markets in other Asian countries. That this was an advantage that had less substance than originally thought has led to the present set of difficulties.

Demographic change is creating a buyer's market for university education within Japan and elsewhere, while the fluctuating needs of the Asia Pacific region in terms of capacity building add a further dimension of uncertainty for a Japanese university sector also dependent to a considerable extent on this market for a viable student intake. The responses of a system that is belatedly trying to operate outside the close confines of (1) the traditional Japanese entrance exam system, (2) the centralized Ministry of Education control over curricula, (3) the job-hunting culture (*shuishoku katsudo*) that preoccupies students during their 4th year of undergraduate education, and (4) community ambivalence towards foreigners, are confused and partial, leading to more pressures on universities.

The effect of these is to force the broadening of the teaching base and concentration on vocational rather than academic subjects in order to reach a desirability level (*hensachie*) that will attract parents and students to your institution, and to emphasize job-hunting over higher level major subject study. From this point of view, the strategy of the Ritsumeikan Trust has been particularly interesting. Even though it does not feature in the Shanghai Jiaotong University rankings of excellence for example (Eades et al., 2005), Ritsumeikan University does feature prominently in some Japanese rankings, particularly in rankings by university presidents in Japan, for its vigorous expansion during the last 10–15 years! This has been impressive by any standards, and particularly so given the falloff in the cohorts of high-school leavers across the country as a whole (Kinmonth, 2005). Originally the Trust operated Ritsumeikan University itself (with 30,000 students, the second largest in Japan), and three high schools. Since the late 1990s, it has opened a second campus of the original university, Biwako-Kusatsu in Shiga prefecture, a second university (APU in Beppu), a law school and main administration office on a new separate campus in Kyoto, and is now building a fourth campus in Osaka. But it is the expansion in places (oriented towards vocational education in the sense of job market influence) that seems to be what has fuelled interest and greater student numbers, not rising quality in academic standards; a fact deplored by certain vocal elements in the faculty context within the Trust.

In reaching a balance between the academic-research and vocational-teaching models in relation to the Japanese domestic student entrance exam model (McVeigh, 2002), the situation of Ritsumeikan APU for example was at first broadly vocational, but now seems to be much more ambiguous. In the early days, the management side of the program was clearly vocational in nature, with a mixture of management science and economics designed to attract management trainees and MBA students. The Asia Pacific studies side of the program was initially divided into environmental,

THE DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPING AND NURTURING

media, and tourism streams, but many of the courses were actually sociology based, and the sociologists and cultural anthropologists were the largest single disciplinary group of academics on the campus. The addition of international studies and the revamping of the curriculum for the purposes of expansion in 2006–11 has, however, meant that this university will have to persuade prospective students and their families that a liberal arts education is as useful to them as management and science-based courses in order to continue to recruit the mass base of Japanese students (who place great store on vocational outcomes) that it needs to help subsidize the intake of foreign students (who desire at least an academically recognizable outcome as well as a job), many of who, particularly in the graduate school, are on some kind of scholarship or fee reduction.

GLOBALIZATION PRESSURES ON THE UNIVERSITY

A further complication in the case of globalization for universities in Japan is the necessity to teach undergraduate and graduate programs in both English and Japanese in a globalizing world. This is new to Japan (except in certain highly sought after and resourced science-based study areas), and means that universities wishing to internationalize have to recruit faculty and students from outside who have not been exposed to the Japanese university system (Cutts, 1997; McVeigh, 2002). Even when a fully international and bilingual university like APU is developed, only the few internationally recruited faculty that are attracted know anything about international education and how to engage with international academic and student communities, and this puts pressure on them and on domestic faculty to reach some form of balance as to how far they can be truly international without causing major collegial disruptions. International faculty also create an administrative burden for domestically oriented staffs, as documents have to be *translated* as well as developed for faculty and university governance meetings and student handbooks, and, perhaps more importantly, international faculty members often do not conform to Japanese academic practices! Given that most of the bureaucrats are not fluent in English, and usually few of the foreign faculty members speak and read Japanese fluently enough to compensate, there exists considerable tension within the internationalizing institution that is not found in purely domestic ones.

Other indicators also show the effect of the basic vocational-teaching structure of the normal Japanese university (designed for jobs) on internationalization: the high student to permanent staff ratio, the increasingly large number of teachers on short fixed-term contracts, the comparatively heavy teaching loads, the very large class sizes in some lecture courses (initially at APU teaching these was the benchmark for acceptance as a teacher—small classes were not considered to be evidence of a “proper university”), and allowing students to devote a considerable proportion of their final undergraduate year to job-hunting. Most crucial of all, many of the teaching staff (including the initial round of appointments to APU), and not only in the management courses, are usually from business and administrative rather than

M. COOPER

academic backgrounds. This system has developed because there has been until recently an emphasis by community, government, and university managements on teaching at the expense of research, to the point where the time available during the academic year for actually doing research has been very much restricted (Hall, 1998). The community, government, and university management discourse is of course publicly about international excellence in research in many universities, including Center of Excellence status, but the vocational-teaching and job-hunting logic of the institutions as a whole means that a coherent program of externally publishable research, and therefore of acceptance as international universities, has yet to take off in many areas (Ebuchi, 1997; Bence & Oppenheim, 2004; *Asahi Shimbun, Daigaku rankingu*, Annual).

In addition, the Ministry of Education reserves the right to monitor university degree programs and approve them on a fixed four-year cycle, which makes it difficult to change or modify curricula to respond to pressures that occur within faster time frames (Eades, 2001). Each new or revamped university curriculum has also to embody the latest Ministry thinking; as a result it is unable from the start to be flexible enough to cope with some of the problems outlined above. Individual faculty members as a whole also have very little input into curricula within the streamlined administrative structure advocated by the Ministry to support their approach to hierarchical governance presided over by a president and vice-presidents, who, *because* of that administrative culture, are unable to make the kinds of decisions that their counterparts in other countries can.

THE AUDIT CULTURE AND THE INTERNATIONAL VALUE OF JAPANESE EDUCATION

With respect to the value of Japanese education at the international level, there has developed, albeit hesitantly and slowly, an increasing emphasis by government on the “performance” of the University Sector in terms of the quality of its research and development activities, in line with the audit culture becoming prevalent in the rest of the global academic world (but see Elton, 2000 for comments on the value of this approach in the UK). This initiative only dates from 2001 and was first embodied in the Toyama Plan of that year, which proposed the establishment of a “Center of Excellence (COE) Program for the 21st Century” (Shinohara, 2002). The Toyama Plan had three main planks: the reorganization and consolidation of national universities; the introduction of private sector management methods to public universities; and the establishment of research COEs at institutions that could produce work of international quality and see this through to publication (Eades et al., 2005).

A major problem for APU and other Japanese universities and their faculties wishing to become more globally oriented is that in the social sciences, especially, research outputs remain restricted to in-house publications, if they are written up at all. While this does not apply as much to scientific work, which does reach an

THE DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPING AND NURTURING

international audience, the latter is mainly produced by the well-funded national universities and a few private institutions, not by the majority. As a result, it is difficult for other institutions to recruit international faculty members who have previously become immersed in the academic audit culture of their places of origin, since they have no benchmark to evaluate the “standing” of their proposed employer. While the COE program mentioned above was to some extent designed to offset this problem, the reality is that most funding failed to produce the publication output desired, and the program may therefore be deemed to have failed to globalize Japanese universities (Eades, 2005).

The latest pressure in this respect on those Japanese university faculty members wanting to and prepared to engage in the international audit culture is how to cope in today’s crowded, dynamic, and dis-intermediated digital scholarly environment. It is becoming more and more difficult to establish the quality, veracity, authorship, and authority of published papers, and, indeed, the quality of the publication and other dissemination outlets now available. The proliferation of sources and channels like journals, websites, datasets, and social media, some at least of which appear to be merely profit-making enterprises (Kaiser, 2003) is a definite problem. In one measurably successful action at APU, we responded to these problems by creating the International Association for Asia Pacific Studies and its fully refereed international journal *Asia Pacific World*. In the 6 volumes to date, we have been able to provide a publishing outlet for APU faculty that did not exist prior to 2009, as well as attract a lot of interest from international and other Japanese potential authors. This Journal also forms a bridge between faculty and at least the Research Office at APU, the Association’s initial sponsor, thereby offsetting some of the negative aspects of the administrative-faculty-student relationship described in the next section, which caused problems in the early years of APU.

ADMINISTRATORS, STUDENTS, ACADEMICS AND EXECUTIVES

Despite the obvious globalization pressures on today’s Japanese academia, the administrators of many institutions do not yet see internationalization as integral to their identity or strategy. Very few administrations have a deep understanding of and commitment to the needed changes in administrative and client-orientation processes to cope with internationalization, particularly in the current environment of resource constraints, falling domestic student numbers, and the normally strong internal competition for institutional funds, time, and attention in most organizations. And, even when internationalization is acknowledged as fundamental to the mission of a particular institution, like APU, it is not automatically clear what administrative process changes should follow and who should make them. In the case of APU, this has been made more difficult by an administrator tendency to treat even senior students as children, to punish rather than to listen, to disregard the experience of international senior students and faculty, and to insist on the “Japanese way” to the exclusion of any other, even when the results of doing so are obviously dysfunctional

for an “international” university. As a result, many of the statements made in support of internationalization by APU administrators and executives are just “sound bites,” and show a lack of understanding of the breadth and depth of the necessary changes in approaches to faculty and students, resource inputs and administrative processes that are needed to drive strategic action in the new internationalization model.

The importance of good strategic planning is, of course, recognized throughout Japanese higher education and in APU in particular (Gross & Greaves, 2000; Hudzik, 2011). All universities understand the need to clearly identify their mission and objectives, their priorities and targets for improvement, and the action to be taken to achieve them, and good progress has been made over a long period in most systems to improve the rigor of strategic planning. However, there is also a constant need to secure greater value from available resources and to audit the academic side of the business, even if the nature of international academia is poorly understood. Those responsible for tertiary organizations now recognize that it is quite likely that an institution’s long-term objectives will not be achieved exactly as stated, because unforeseen changes in the internal and external environment are inevitable and may require the objectives to be revised (Taylor & Miroiu, 2002). It is essential, therefore, for all institutions to retain flexibility to adjust as circumstances change so that they can exploit unexpected opportunities and respond to unforeseen threats. Consequently, there needs to be frequent review of the overall direction to take account of, and adjust to, actual and potential changes to the organization or its environment, but the fact that this must also include input from faculty members and students, is not sufficiently recognized in Japanese higher education.

It can be seen, therefore, that the international education, bilingualism, and cultural diversity that is being hesitantly embraced by Japanese universities comes at a considerable price. If the experience of Ritsumeikan APU is anything to go by, a number of the international faculty will not understand the Japanese way or language, and Japanese faculty and staff will not understand the foreign inputs needed by such a university, so meetings between them require both simultaneous translation and extensive documentation in both languages as well as extraordinary effort each time by both sides in order that real understanding is reached. If not, the discrepant expectations about teaching standards, about the necessity for language learning to dominate the critical first years of a degree, about the appropriate ways to conduct classes, examinations and grading, and about the amount of work to be expected from students will be unpleasant surprises for their administrative systems.

There may of course also be pleasant surprises for both sides, such as the outstanding quality of the best students from both domestic and foreign origins, the relatively low student dropout rate in Japan, and the often very high ratio of foreign and Japanese applicants to places when an international education system is in place. Many international students at APU, for example, become fluent in spoken Japanese and are actively sought after by Japanese companies upon graduation, while the standard of English among Japanese students in this institution is much higher than in the more traditional universities, and benefits this cohort as well.

THE DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPING AND NURTURING

One of the concerns of the APU administration has been that the recruitment of international students usually has to be heavily subsidized with scholarship money from a variety of sources and that, in the longer term, APU will either have to attract more foreign students paying their own way or find permanent sources of scholarship funding for them in order to remain viable financially. This problem is also compounded by the likelihood that, if as a result of declining scholarship funds the foreign students disappear, the rationale for many Japanese students coming to such a university will also disappear. There is also the problem of attracting, and keeping, good-quality international staff. In the comparatively isolated and very domestically oriented community of Beppu this plays out for example in very practical issue of the lack of nearby international schools for the children of prospective teaching staff.

THE EXECUTIVE

APU has put in place the international style academic management structure currently favored by the Ministry, with a senate, president, vice-presidents and deans in charge of major divisions of the university administration and its course offerings. But APU also has the management structure favored by the Ritsumeikan Trust, which appears designed to remove virtually all power from the academic side, while retaining the position names and descriptions, in favor of actual control and decision-making through the internal and Trust administrative hierarchy. The result is a real confusion of roles and, in some cases, outright hostility between individual actors in the drama. In this situation, often, the lowest common denominator response to a situation or problem thought up by floor-level administrative staff makes its way right to the top in this system and becomes policy unable to be modified by the more experienced academics. Indeed, the involvement of senior academics as the normal managers of the university as is found internationally (unless they are very good at playing politics) is actively resisted, often by the subterfuge of the quote “We cannot do what you are proposing, the Ministry will not let us do anything but that which we (the administration) are proposing,” if delaying tactics, mistranslation, and other forms of manipulation fail. As a result, if over important matters of curricula and student treatment the administrative-academic system is split in this way, the whole process has a tendency to become dysfunctional: exactly where is the decision making power in this university and who exercises it? And when we add the often quite normal disagreements over policy deriving from different experiential backgrounds between *academics* in the Executive, it is sometimes surprising that anything gets achieved at all in the decision-making bodies of the university (Hall, 1998).

The Students

A complete revamp of an existing educational system is a monumental task, made even more problematical by relative inexperience with the “international” in the Japanese context. When lack of international experience at the institutional level

M. COOPER

is coupled with the difficulties of implementing a strategy that is constrained by the country's only lukewarm understanding and acceptance of what this actually means, at least the initial outcomes in respect of the internationalizing policy might have been predicted. For example, conflict over course structures between the various parts of the student body has occurred in those universities embracing these changes. Japanese students still in the main want the old system of nonspecialized education in order to gain employment in Japanese companies, and international students remain unhappy that they cannot easily prove that they studied courses of relevance to potential employers outside of Japan. Faculty from the two different basic education traditions of the West and Japan are as equally divided about the merits of a disciplinary-based course system. As a result, Japanese students early on appeared to resist learning English and being fully involved with international students at APU, but are now expressing much greater confidence in this experience. This change is in turn increasing understanding of what it means to be an international university, among the students at least, and has created an at times fierce defense of internationalization in the Japanese system by the very people that had to change most.

It should be noted that, in the case of Japanese students, there are supportive dynamics in play as well. As Eades (2001) points out, Japanese students are becoming much more aware of their positions as consumers in what is increasingly a buyer's market. In addition Japanese companies want graduates with specific internationally realizable skills, and parents see their investment in their children's education as protection for their own futures in an increasingly aged Japan. Moreover, a new generation of high school graduates is appearing who have spent lengthy periods abroad on school exchange programs. These students have fewer inhibitions about speaking English than their counterparts educated only in Japan and lower resistance to undergraduate course specialization, and they therefore constitute a natural market for the kinds of initiatives embodied in Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University.

The Academics

Finally, we must not neglect the academics themselves. Here, a younger generation is rapidly taking over from the first appointments, and they are, in many cases, a much more multilingual, international and cosmopolitan group on both sides than their predecessors. Many of the new Japanese faculty have been educated abroad, are fluent in English and other foreign languages, and are much more interested in publishing their research internationally. Many of the new foreign appointees are also conversant with Japan, the language and the educational customs before they start, and as a result are prepared to try to negotiate with the "system" rather than automatically oppose it. Also, professional associations and universities with internationalizing money are taking the lead in establishing new journals and publication outlets in English and other languages, online as well as on paper. And

THE DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPING AND NURTURING

as universities become increasingly concerned with their research profiles under the audit culture, we may also expect the collapse of the age-wage salary structure as the top scholars regardless of age begin to bargain for salaries commensurate with their value in the global market place.

CONCLUSIONS

In the Asia Pacific region as a whole the internationalizing experiment in Japanese higher education that is typified by APU is of considerable interest, and its curriculum and research structure is already enabling that university to consolidate in this market. This is going to be helped by the fact that the smaller Japanese institutions that cannot deliver quality product to the international market are likely to disappear, given the downturn in domestic student numbers. But the fact that the internationalizing experiment by the Ritsumeikan Trust has been reasonably successful is, however, indicated by a completely different benchmark, and this provides an interesting postscript to the pressures and factors that brought the university into being in the first place. APU is now seen to be one of the national government's preferred source of "good practice" information and research in the areas of internationalization and new curricula. Considerable funds have been made available to the university (of the order of ¥5 billion) to study the impact of internationalization on Japanese education and to expand the range of curriculum and pastoral support choices open to international students in this country. It is manifestly obvious that, despite the problems experienced along the way in its first 13 years of life, APU was indeed a most relevant initiative to promote the ideals and aspirations of the Ritsumeikan Trust and the government as an international education provider.

The example of APU and the very many others like it across the globe show that international student mobility and international research linkages will continue to grow—but there will be significant limits (boundaries) to that growth. In particular, *demand* patterns are now much different than before; countries, industry, and indeed universities themselves have an increasingly different outlook on research student mobility and international research links. While it is a truism that there are more competitors fishing in the same pools on a world-wide basis—for students, for researchers, for staff, for revenue from higher education, for research outputs and linkages, etc.—we should expect that a form of protectionism will increasingly come to the fore. In other words, the demand for and supply of higher degree and research students in regions like the Asia Pacific will become increasingly concentrated within those regions, for reasons that have more to do with the playing out of regional trade, investment, and market forces than of the promotion of cosmopolitan styles of education.

As the Asia Pacific region becomes an Asia Pacific *Community*, international education, student mobility and the formation of intraregional research links will be just as much part of the discussions on tactics and strategy to achieve this outcome

as political and economic issues such as trade and security. Other regions of the world should therefore expect a decline in the numbers of research students and faculty seeking outside employment from the Asia Pacific region as this process works itself through, but if handled correctly, Japanese international universities like APU should find an important long-term niche market.

In this chapter I have argued that higher education has become increasingly competitive, and that one symptom of this is the increasing obsession with internationalization. The UK has taken the lead in the development of the audit culture for example, and many of the UK initiatives have been noted or adapted by the Ministry of Education in Japan in attempting to raise teaching and research in Japanese universities to “international standard.” On the one hand, Japan aspires to be the higher education hub of East Asia, and indeed its most prestigious universities are dominant in the region, particularly in the sciences. However, on the other, the Japanese higher education sector is numerically dominated by private universities, few of which feature in any form of rankings, let alone international rankings, or have the resources and governance structures required to effectively operate internationally. This raises the question of how the sector will survive given the pressures discussed in this chapter, and this is where the mobility of research students and faculty, and the methods to attract them will become an increasingly important battleground.

One alternative has already been tried in Japan. In recent years there have been several bold attempts by private universities to set up institutions to attract students from the international market, including the International University of Japan, Akita International University, and initiatives from both Waseda and Ritsumeikan (Ritsumeikan, APU). The scale of these experiments varies, from the very small (IUJ and AIU) to the substantial (APU). They vary in their approach to language, and in the markets they are trying to attract, as well as in the strategies they are using. APU appears to be going clearly down the vocational-teaching route, expanding student numbers, while at the same time trying to develop an academic-research base, particularly in its graduate schools. How far this strategy will work in the long run is an open question, given that the major universities competing in the international market are generally academic-research based in the first instance. Seeing how APU fares in the next few years will tell us much about whether Japanese universities can gain a foothold in the global mass market for undergraduate and research students, or whether their future lies more in cutting edge research in a few high prestige institutions, leaving most universities in the country to compete for an increasingly precarious domestic research student market resulting from long-term demographic decline (Eades, 2001; Kinmonth, 2005). The teething troubles that APU has experienced have been documented here, and the time has been difficult, but the overall quality of the student product and the vast majority of new faculty and administrators now have a university that has shown the ability to transcend these problems and provide an exemplar for others in Japan.

THE DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPING AND NURTURING

REFERENCES

- Asahi Shimbun. (Annual). *Daigaku Rankingu* [University Ranking]. Tokyo, Japan: Asahi Shimbun.
- Bence, V., & Oppenheim, C. (2004). The role of academic journal publications in the UK research assessment exercise. *Learned Publishing*, 17(1), 53–68.
- Cooper, M. J., & Eades, J. S. (2005). Landscape as theme park: Demographic change, tourism, urbanization and the fate of communities in 21st century Japan. *Tourism Review International*, 11(1), 9–18.
- Cooper, M. J., Jankowska, R., & Eades, J. S. (2007). The politics of exclusion? Japanese cultural reactions and the government's desire to double inbound tourism. In P. Burns & M. Novelli (Eds.), *Tourism and politics: Global frameworks and local realities* (pp. 71–82). London, UK: Elsevier Advances in Tourism Research Series.
- Cutts, R. L. (1997). *An empire of schools: Japan's universities and the moulding of a national power elite*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Eades, J. S. (2001). Reforming Japanese higher education: Bureaucrats, the birthrate, and visions of the 21st century. *Ritsumeikan Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, 8, 86–101.
- Eades, J. S., Goodman, R., & Hada, Y. (2005). *The 'Big Bang' in Japanese higher education*. Sydney, Australia: Trans Pacific Press.
- Ebuchi, K. (1997). *Study on the internationalization of universities*. Tokyo, Japan: Tamagawa Daigaku Shuppanbu.
- Elton, L. (2000). The UK research assessment exercise: Unintended consequences. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 54(3), 274–283.
- Gross, I., & Greaves, P. (2000). *Strategic planning in higher education: Higher education funding council 00/24*. London, UK: HEFCE.
- Hall, I. P. (1998). *Cartels of the mind: Japan's intellectual closed shop*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Hudzik, J. K. (2011). *Comprehensive internationalization: From concept to action*. New York, NY: NAFSA. Retrieved June 18, 2013, from www.nafsa.org/cizn
- Kaiser, L. K. (2003). *Who is the publisher?* Aurora, IL: Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy. Retrieved August 18, from <http://21cif.com/tutorials/micro/mmpdf/publisher.pdf>
- Kawauchi, K. (2006). Change in intercultural adaptation and anxiety of Japanese university students. *Aomori University of Health and Welfare Journal*, 7(1), 37–44.
- Kerr, C. (1990). The internationalization of learning and the nationalization of the purposes of higher education: Two laws of motion in conflict? *European Journal of Education*, 25(1), 5–22.
- Kuroda, K. (2007). *International student mobility for the formation of an East Asian community: Creation of new contemporary Asian studies paper 37*. Tokyo, Japan: Graduate School of Asia Pacific Studies, Waseda University.
- Kinmonth, E. (2005). From selection to seduction: The impact of demographic decline on private higher education. In J. S. Eades, R. Goodman, & Y. Hada (Eds.), *The 'Big Bang' in Japanese higher education* (pp. 106–135). Melbourne, Australia: Trans Pacific Press.
- McVeigh, B. (2002). *Japanese higher education as myth*. Armonk, NY: M.S. Sharpe.
- NAFSA. (2005). In J. L. Brockington, W. W. Hoffa, & P. C. Martin (Eds.), *NAFSA's guide to education abroad for advisers and administrators* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: NAFSA.
- Shinohara, K. (2002). Toyama plan: Center of excellence program for the 21st century. *National Science Foundation Report* (Memorandum No. 02–05). Tokyo, Japan: Tokyo Regional Office. Retrieved from <http://www.nsf-tokyo.org/index.htm> [Accessed May 20, 2009]
- Taylor, J., & Miroiu, A. (2002). *Policy-making, strategic planning and management of higher education*. Papers on Higher education, regional university network on governance and management of higher education in South East Europe. Bucharest, Europe: UNESCO Cepes.
- Umakoshi, T. (1997). Internationalization of Japanese higher education in the 1980s and early 1990s. *Higher Education*, 34(2), 259–273.
- Watanabe, T. (2004). *The path toward East Asia market integration*. Tokyo, Japan: Keisoshobo.

Malcolm Cooper
Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University