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Abstract

This study examines the various approaches to internationalisation of Japanese universities. It is the first study to map the effects of institutional structures and cultures on strategies for internationalisation. Using a qualitative case study method, the research examined the following principal question:

“How do institutional structures and cultures affect the implementation of internationalisation of education in Japanese universities?”

In Japan, university internationalisation has been actively promoted since the early 1980s in public policy. Internationalisation is viewed as a central element in the reform of Japanese higher education and alignment with world standards. As a result, most of the 780 universities in the country have introduced internationalisation activities to their core research and educational functions. While the importance of internationalisation of higher education has steadily acquired wider recognition, institutional activities for internationalisation vary in individual universities because the goals and character of internationalisation are deeply affected by structural and cultural contexts. Influential factors include institutional size and capacity, sector types, institutional history and profiles, missions and goals, and others. By considering these different factors, the study’s findings shed light on the internationalisation strategies, approaches and management techniques suited to different university types in Japan.

Three arguments are advanced. First, there are four possible patterns of approaches to institutional internationalisation in Japan on the basis of two simplified dimensions: centralised or decentralised structures; and ‘specialised’ or ‘universal’ patterns of cultural behaviours. These two-by-two factors create different four models that can identify and inform the present and future development of internationalisation in Japanese universities. Second, senior leadership, the roles of international offices, and a unique collaborative relationship between academic and administrative staff known as kyōshoku kyōdō in Japanese, are important factors in the practices of institutional internationalisation in Japan. While these factors are equally significant, their effects differ according to institutional internationalisation approaches. Third, internal communication is increasingly critical for achieving a ‘universal’ state of institutional internationalisation. The core internal organisational units for maintaining effective internal communication are: the central administration office; the university-wide international office; and individual departments. More intensive and focussed institutional efforts to network these central and local units and functions, taking into account both structural and cultural aspects, is required to further advance internationalisation in Japanese higher education.
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Chapter One
Internationalisation and the renewal of Japanese higher education

1.1 Statement of the problem

Internationalisation has been shaping higher education systems over the last three decades. Internationalisation as an intensive initiative began after the Cold War in some countries in North America and Europe, and the term ‘internationalisation’ has become explicitly used in research and practice of higher education since the 1980s. Since then, researchers and practitioners of higher education have both had academic and practical interest in internationalisation and have investigated its philosophical, pedagogical, social, cultural, political and economic meanings across higher education systems.

The body of research and practice on the internationalisation of higher education over the last thirty years highlights the central importance of regional characteristics in terms of effective policy and practice. The rationales, drivers and features of internationalisation vary in different countries and regions. For example, European countries have promoted internationalisation of higher education by constructing a meta-national scheme of student and researcher mobility within the area. The European Union (EU) has taken a leading position with a mobility scheme across the EU countries, with the objective of encouraging different higher education systems to harmonise as well as standardise. The agenda for this transnational cooperation has been the construction of regional identity across Europe to become an important competitor in the world-wide student and researcher mobility. In contrast, the US has facilitated the internationalisation of higher education through the bottom-up activities of experts. In addition to various initiatives in individual institutions, the networking of international educators beyond institutional boundaries has resulted in building influential associations of experts and practitioners, such as the International Association of Universities (IAU), NAFSA: Association of International Educators, and Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA). These non-profit associations for specialists of international education have played a key role in promoting the exchange of knowledge and practice, which has led to comprehensive internationalisation in different types of US higher education institutions.

Some countries in Asia have also shown rapid development in the internationalisation of their higher education systems since the late 1990s. The global labour market and inter-twined economic rationales have been massive driving forces for internationalisation in many countries of the Asian region, where high quality human resources from all over the world and domestic economic
development have been high priorities. National policies in some countries of Asia have been in accordance with regional trends, and have led to decisive national interventions to facilitate institutional internationalisation. Other regions, such as South America, the Middle East and Africa, have also been catching up with the leading global regions, by rapidly establishing internationalisation goals and policies since the 2000s. Overall, there are many distinctive forms of internationalisation of higher education across the world in the 21st century, shaped by characteristic regional and national internationalisation rationales and strategies.

Japan has its distinctiveness in the area, too. As with other countries in the Asian region, Japan has been promoting university internationalisation through powerful intervention by the national government. It has had a goal of supporting domestic universities in the competitive world trends of higher education in the global era. University internationalisation in Japan originated with a national announcement in 1983 for a scheme called the ‘100,000 international students plan’, which aimed to increase the number of international students studying at Japanese universities from about 10,000 in 1983 to more than 100,000 by 2000. As the national government has exerted influence over all sector types of national, local public and private universities, this plan had been a main influence for driving internationalisation for almost all universities in Japan during the 1980s and 1990s. Even after the target number of international students was achieved in 2003, the national government has continued the drive for university internationalisation (Kitamura 2001; Horie 2003; Kudo and Hashimoto 2011; Yonezawa 2015). Moreover, the influence of national leadership for university internationalisation has extended. It has reached into not only the strategies of international student recruitment but also the wider aspects of university activities. In particular, since the 2000s, the national intention in the promotion of university internationalisation has been to elevate university functions to world standards. This initiative clearly derives from an economic rationale. That is, internationalisation is for the purpose of economic redevelopment through recruiting high quality students and researchers from all over the world. From this reason, a series of national policies have been facilitating domestic universities to reform their governance and management systems so that they can participate in the aggressive world-wide competition in higher education. Thus, at the national level, the main reason for university internationalisation is now recognised as a university reform necessary to meet the world standard in higher education (Horie 2003; Yonezawa 2015).

Internationalisation as a university reform has increasingly become a dominant discourse in Japanese higher education policy. The government has been facilitating it by developing flagship funding projects based on the national policies. Basically, these national projects have selected particular universities from a field of candidates to provide them with a certain amount of financial
support for a limited period, usually five years. These support schemes tend to favour large and powerful universities which already have a capacity for promoting institutional internationalisation. The government has also developed other types of funding projects since the late 2000s to assist universities of smaller-scale to advance characteristic forms of internationalisation. Thus, the national support for university internationalisation now can be divided in two groups: support for internationalisation in prestige universities which can become the world-class educational and research bases; and support for internationalisation in characteristic universities which can promote unique institutional internationalisation in specific education or research areas1 (Yonezawa 2015). In either type, the national intention in internationalisation projects assumes selected universities will become shining models for institutional internationalisation so that other universities can follow this lead. By providing financial support to a small proportion of universities in this way, the national leadership has dominantly guided the entire movement of internationalisation in most universities in Japan.

Apart from the national direction, internationalisation within individual universities has also developed since the early 2000s. An increasing number of universities in Japan have begun to embed efforts for internationalisation in their institutional policy and strategic plans during the last three decades. There are various influential factors for universities to plan and steer the institutional internationalisation. Universities have to deal with demands from both student and labour markets in order for smooth transition of students from high school to university, and from university to the job market. In order for this to occur, they consider a broad range of internal conditions for the practical operation of internationalisation. These discussions of internationalisation possibilities are dominated by various perspectives of different stakeholders, which are built by philosophical, pedagogical, academic, political and commercial ideas from internal and external contexts. The emphases in facilitating internationalisation vary from institution to institution, and depend on individual institutional contexts.

My personal perspective on university internationalisation prior to this study resided at the institutional level. I was a practitioner who worked for international education programs in two national universities in Japan. My academic concern for university internationalisation is based on my professional experiences as a staff member on four projects regarding the internationalisation of

---

1 The latest and biggest national project for internationalisation called ‘Top Global University Project’, which launched in 2014, is one example. The project sets two tiers for selection of universities. They are: Type A for universities which have a potential to become world-class institutions and Type B for those which will lead the internationalisation by the innovative promotion of university internationalisation (MEXT 2014a). The detail of Top Global University Project will be illustrated in Chapter Three.
education and management at the two universities. When I started my career in internalisation at the second university, I soon realised the diversity in approaches that different universities took for their institutional internationalisation. From 2009 to 2011, I participated in the joint meetings of the selected 13 universities of a national project titled ‘Global 30 Project’\(^2\). One of the purposes of the meetings was to share practice and problems among participating universities in the implementation of the program. Through the meeting opportunities, I met many members from different universities throughout the country who were engaged with the Global 30 Project in their universities. While the goals for the Global 30 Project in each university were very similar, conversations with participants opened my eyes to the differences of practice in the programs among the universities. Some operated the project by powerful central leadership and a top-down approach, others devolved operational authority to departments and sub units. Some universities appointed specialists to work intensively in the fields of university internationalisation and international education programs for implementing the plan of the Global 30 Project, others collected regular faculty members from traditional departments in their universities to let them share the academic and teaching tasks for the project. The selected universities developed the Global 30 Project through different strategies, framed by their particular contexts.

Not only in the Global 30 Project but also through a total of seven-year working experience, I communicated with a variety of people working in university internationalisation inside and outside of the universities in which I worked. They were involved in university internationalisation at different levels of responsibilities as vice presidents, professors or administrative staff, and they had various backgrounds, experiences and interests. This experience of social interaction helped me acquire a basic perspective that internationalisation initiatives are significantly affected by the different perspectives and ideas of influential university people. People in universities are working with different vocational responsibilities, with specific attitudes, beliefs and values for internationalisation. These explicit and implicit attributes are built through the experience of their organisational responsibilities. These aspects shape their way of behaviours, and the aggregation of individual values and actions collectively constitute the characteristic practice of internationalisation in their universities. I saw, heard and felt people’s ideas, thoughts and behaviours which constructed the culture of their organisations. I realised that alongside the formal organisation system, the cultures of universities shape particular patterns of internationalisation in individual universities.

\(^2\) Global 30 Project is one of a series of funding projects by governmental initiative. 13 universities including national, local public and private ones were selected for the five-year funding project to improve institutional internationalisation of education. More details will be treated in Chapter Three.
The plurality of Japanese universities strongly influences the variation of the internationalisation approaches. There are about 780 higher education institutions in Japan\(^3\). They are different in terms of their sector types, institutional size, institutional policies and missions, the fields of studies offered, history, institutional traditions and customs, and so on. As my experiences at the two universities demonstrate, each university must tackle institutional internationalisation within their contexts. This idea brought me the following questions: who and what people and organisational units are involved in the policy-making and practice of institutional internationalisation in different types of universities? How do they operate internationalisation in practice, with what kind of the formal systems and informal patterns of actions? What kinds of physical and cognitive conditions affect staff members’ behaviours for internationalisation initiatives? How do they consider and interpret institutional internationalisation, and how do their ideas and thoughts reflect on the operation of internationalisation? In what ways do they develop the values, attitudes and beliefs for university internationalisation, and how do these personal thoughts and behaviours influence the organisational actions for internationalisation?

These are matters not written in the formal documents, but need to be investigated by in-depth observation of the lived experience of university people who are involved in the institutional internationalisation. This set of naive questions led my academic concerns to focus on the structures and cultures of universities. In this way, structures and cultures became two of important factors for this study on the management of university internationalisation.

1.2 \textit{ Purposes, focus and rationales of the study}

This study investigates patterns of university internationalisation in Japan. The study has sought to understand the management of university internationalisation through investigating institutional structures and cultures. The research context is universities in Japan, and particularly, an emphasis is put on the operation of educational internationalisation. As the study has looked especially at the fields of internationalisation of university education, it does not give full attention to the internationalisation of other areas in the university functions, for example, the internationalisation of research or the internationalisation of the entire institutional governance and management. The research focus is not only on the physical arrangements of organisational structures but also on the experiences, ideas and thoughts of people who work in policy-making and the implementation of internationalisation of education at their institutions. People who are included in the scope of this study are categorised in the following groups: practitioners of internationalisation of university

---

\(^3\) According to the national statistics in 2015, the number of higher education institutions in Japan is 779. Chapter Three allocates some pages to illustrating the outline of the higher education system in Japan.
education whose responsibilities are in coordination, administration, teaching and research on these field; directors of a central international office; and senior leaders at the central administration office of universities who are mainly responsible for university education and its internationalisation. These practitioners, managers and senior administrators are affiliated with the groups of either academic and administrative staff members in the Japanese university system. Specific internal organisational units that are treated in this study are the central administration office, international offices, and departments and other local units in universities.

Because this study aimed to investigate the dynamics of organisational units by exploring related people’s behaviours, a qualitative case study paradigm (Punch 2005; Stake 2005; Merriam 2009; Yin 2009) was adopted. Four universities were carefully chosen for the case studies using principles that will be described in detail in Chapter Five. Semi-structured interviews (Kvale 1996; Seidman 2009) were the main method to collect data for analysis (Punch 2005; Merriam 2009). This methodology enabled the study to collect ‘thick’ description of activities, ideas and thoughts of university members, which contributed to a better understanding of the process of policy-making and implementation of educational internationalisation at the institutional level. A hypothetical concept of internationalisation of university education in the Japanese university context is proposed and conceptual models are explored in later chapters.

The main aim of this study was to discover the functions of institutional structures and cultures of universities and the relationship of them to the management of university internationalisation. Subjective interpretation was employed to investigate the elements of institutional structures and cultures, gained through conversations with practitioners and administrators. Official university documents and websites were also used to support the subjective interpretation. An interpretive approach was used to construct the conceptual framework for understanding the practice of educational internationalisation in Japanese universities, which will be explained in Chapter Five.

For the above mentioned purposes and aims, this study employed the following research questions.

**Main question**

- How do institutional structures and cultures affect the implementation of internationalisation of education in Japanese universities?

**Sub questions**

- How are institutional structures formed and changed in Japanese universities?
How are institutional and organisational cultures formed and changed in Japanese universities?

- How do people in relevant organisational units build their ideas, values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviours through the practice of internationalisation of education?
- What factors in structures and cultures affect the practice of internationalisation of education?
- How do structures and cultures affect the practice of internationalisation of education?
- How do structures and cultures relate to each other for the practice of internationalisation of education?
- What differences can be seen in the process of developing the internationalisation of education in different types of universities in Japan?

There are three motives for me to choose this research theme. First, I sought to understand the gap between national policy and the institutional practice of internationalisation, and to shed light on the role of institutional viewpoints for university internationalisation. Second, I wanted to search for a theoretical model for understanding university internationalisation in the Japanese context. Third, I wanted to contribute to making institutional internationalisation initiatives more effective for university reform.

(1) The need for institutional viewpoints on university internationalisation

As already noted, national policy has been the main driver for university internationalisation in Japan for a long time. This centrally-driven approach worked effectively in the 1980s and 1990s when Japan drove university internationalisation through a large centred push. However, the relationship between the government as a leader and universities as followers has probably led to a lack of deliberate discussion of internationalisation policy within universities. In these circumstances, individual universities have tended to follow the national intentions without having clarity about their own institutional contexts and characteristics, which may have caused ineffective internationalisation practices. At this point in the 21st century, a sound institutional posture is called for, one which is well planned to connect with national policy as well as with institutional reality, in order to produce fruitful results of effective internationalisation.

In fact, planning institutional policy and strategies in accordance with national policy is complex work that requires much expertise. Horie (2003) has examined this issue, arguing that multiple gaps are evident between the government and universities in terms of the policy and practice of internationalisation. Her assertions are twofold. First, discussion of national policy for university internationalisation should include sufficient input from experts in international education who grasp the practical situation of internationalisation at universities. Second, the practices should be
more publicised to show the significance of university internationalisation (p. 165-167). In relation to the latter point, the literature on university internationalisation in Japan laments that research on internationalisation at the institutional level is surprisingly scarce, though there has been a certain amount of research on national policy of internationalisation (Kudo and Hashimoto 2011; Ota 2014). A theoretical foundation for internationalisation at the institutional level is long awaited in Japan.

By illustrating the detailed process of internationalisation from the inside of universities, this study promotes a better understanding of potential different pathways to internationalisation in various types of universities. These findings may stimulate a rethinking of the national support system for university internationalisation to accommodate more diverse approaches.

2) A Japanese model for the practice of university internationalisation

Since the completion of the ‘100,000 international students plan’ in the early 2000s, the Ministry of Education has begun to declare its role in the relationship with universities shifting from the relationship of ‘a leader and followers’ to that of ‘a supporter and main players’ of university internationalisation. Since then, a series of terms which emphasise institutional characteristics, such as tayōsei (diversity), tokusei (peculiarity) and kosei (individuality) of universities, have increasingly been used in policy papers aimed to encourage individual universities’ efforts. For example, a preface of the national project called ‘Top Global University Project’ writes that for the purpose of realising various initiatives which are required from the society, “universities have to use individual peculiarity and strength as well as develop international applicability of university system and institutional culture to improve international competitiveness” (MEXT 2014).

In a real sense, actions for individualisation should be achieved through efforts for internationalisation that are planned by careful observations and robust discussions in individual universities. Universities now need a fundamental mechanism to systematically learn themselves for the improvement of their internationalisation. The significance of organisational self-learning for institutional reform has recently received extensive emphasis in the management of higher education (Dill 1999). In the process of a self-learning system, a series of organisational activities

---

4 The Ministry of Education in Japan changed its name in Japanese and English as the scope of responsibility was widened by the large Japanese administrative reforms in the early 2000s. It was called Monbushō until 2000, which changed to Monbukagakushō in Japanese and ‘Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology’ (‘MEXT’ for abbreviation) in English after 2001. In order to avoid confusion, this study uses the name of ‘Ministry of Education’ throughout the main body of the thesis. However, the abbreviation ‘MEXT’ is used in bibliography if the designated references are published after 2001.

5 The detail of Top Global University Project will be described in Chapter Three.
are needed that include systematic problem solving, learning from one’s own experience, learning from others’ experience, experimenting with new processes, transferring knowledge within the organisation, and measuring learning (Dill 1999, 132-133). For the purpose of adapting internationalisation initiatives to university reform, this framework for self-learning is now increasingly necessary. However, such a systematic mechanism has not been in place in Japan in the context of both research and practice\(^6\).

This study focuses on university internationalisation in Japan ‘from the inside’, by looking at the organisational processes. It proposes a conceptual base which explains the Japanese practice of university internationalisation. The product of this study, which takes the shape of conceptual models of the practices of institutional internationalisation, provides a new and alternative view on research and practice in university internationalisation in Japan. Further, by adding new research findings from Japanese practices, the study also aims to add to the research on internationalisation of higher education across the world.

(3) Ensuring internationalisation initiatives contribute to university reform

As noted, internationalisation has been recognised as one of main pillars of university actions that can contribute to fundamental institutional change in the 21st century. In order for that, many countries, not only Japan, have been seeking to mainstream institutional internationalisation into the core management system. However, in many Japanese universities internationalisation activities and related organisational units have still been located at a marginal position from the central management and administration.

In order to bring internationalisation into the mainstream of university functions and to make internationalisation become a change agent for university reform, this study may provide informative findings for the following two reasons. First, the study provides a focus on the relationships between internal organisational units. In particular, the study looks at three units: namely the central administration office, the international offices, and departments and other local units. A variety of relationships among these organisational units taken in different universities offers insights into how to construct the organisational systems for bridging institutional policy and practice. Second, the perspectives of experts and practitioners of internationalisation are a possible resource to be used for university reform. Their experience, knowledge and ideas are developed by practices which are accumulated through networked communication. They can be a catalyst for

\(^6\) Yokota and Shiratsuchi (2004) note little accumulation of research on the general mechanisms or versatile models in the context of international student exchange in Japan (p. 350). This situation is applicable to a wider context of internationalisation in Japanese universities.
connecting internal organisational units, too. A university is a conglomeration of different organisational units where practitioners of internationalisation communicate. They also play a role of connecting the university with the outside world. Their communication partners vary from people in other domestic universities, those who are in foreign universities, in related organisations for internationalisation, national policy-makers to any other people in the field of internationalisation. Their experience through internal and external communication provides them with a ‘bird’s-eye’ view of the higher education system. This deep knowledge can contribute to the discussions on more effective university reform in the wider context.

1.3 The chapters to follow
Chapter Two discusses the general theoretical issues surrounding the internationalisation of higher education. The definitions and rationales for internationalisation of higher education in Europe and the US from the 1980s until the 2010s are intensively examined. Two terms, ‘process’ and ‘integration’, in the definition of internationalisation of higher education are focussed on, because these terms are important to the research questions of the present study. After that, some conceptual models for university internationalisation formed in the European context are examined. As these models are mainly based on structural factors, the other important dimension of cultural is discussed as well. In the last section of the chapter, the new concepts in internationalisation in the 2010s, namely ‘comprehensive internationalisation’ and ‘mainstreaming internationalisation’ are introduced from the viewpoint of their significance in the world-wide and Japanese context.

Chapter Three summarises Japanese national policies regarding university internationalisation and their impact on institutional internationalisation. A chronological review of policies regarding internationalisation of universities since the 1950s is intensively explored. The discussion demonstrates changing rationales for internationalisation across time. The chapter also deals with the impacts of other related national policies on the pattern of practice of internationalisation within institutions.

Chapter Four examines two important contextual issues in the internationalisation of Japanese universities. The first is the structure of the Japanese higher education system. The discussion on the higher education system in Japan reveals its characteristics of diversity and hierarchical structures. Related and important national policies for higher education management are explored for the purpose of investigating their impact on the internationalisation of Japanese universities. The second issue is the structural and cultural factors that affect the practice of educational internationalisation in Japanese universities. The discussion here reveals the approach-shift of internationalisation management and behavioural changes in the internationalisation practice in
Japan that occurred during the last decade.

In Chapter Five, the research strategy of this study is explained. The qualitative research paradigm, case study approaches and interview method is described to demonstrate why these strategies were adopted in light of the study's purposes and research questions. The hypothetical conceptual models for understanding the practice of internationalisation of educational internationalisation in Japan are proposed. The models proposed are based on the arguments presented in Chapter Two, Three and Four.

Chapter Six, Seven, Eight and Nine present the case studies of the four target universities. Chapter Six is about a large-scale national university called Hoshi University in this study, Chapter Seven is about a middle-scale private university named Niji, Chapter Eight is for a middle-scale national university labelled Tsuki, and Chapter Nine is for a large-scale private university dubbed Sora University. The description and discussion points in each chapter are as follows: an overview of the case university, relevant organisational units for educational internationalisation and the targeted international education program; the structural factors evident in the practice of educational internationalisation and how these work in practice; the cultural factors identified and how these are built; and, finally, how the identified structural and cultural factors relate to each other. The main purpose of these chapters is to discuss the factors in structures and cultures and how the structures and cultures are constructed in each university.

Chapter Ten synthesises the results of the four case studies. The hypothetical conceptual models which are established in Chapter Five are used for comparing the four case studies. The main thrust of this chapter is to understand the impact of structures, cultures and their relationships to the practice of educational internationalisation in the case universities.

Chapter Eleven concludes the thesis. In the first part, a discussion of future directions for institutional internationalisation in Japanese universities is proposed on the basis of the findings from the case studies. The discussions are framed around four important stakeholders for university internationalisation: national policy-makers; senior leaders of universities; experts of internationalisation; and all university staff members, and their roles for the further development of university internationalisation. The implications for further research into the management of institutional internationalisation in Japan are also explored here. In the last section of the chapter, the significance of this study for the further future development of higher education system in Japan is discussed.
Throughout the thesis, pseudonyms are used for the case study universities, internal organisational units and the sample international education programs. Some Japanese terms are written in *italic* style except for the pseudonyms of universities. I feel these Japanese terms should remain in order to preserve their meanings and nuances as much as possible. These Japanese terms are accompanied with English translations in appropriate places. As it is difficult to perfectly express Japanese pronunciation with the English alphabet, macrons are used for indicating long vowels in Japanese words.
Chapter Two
The internationalisation of higher education as a concept and practice

What is the internationalisation of higher education? There are a number of Japanese terms referring to the ‘internationalisation of higher education’, such as ‘kōtō kyōiku no kokusaika’ or ‘daigaku no kokusaika’ (internationalisation of universities). Goodman (2007) argues that in political and practical settings, ‘kokusaika’ has been used by different actors in different contexts for different purposes (p. 86). Multi-vocality is a feature of internationalisation of higher education, and various actors have taken advantage of its multiple meanings to utilise the concept for their own purposes. While Japan has developed and used the term ‘kokusaika’ in higher education since the 1980s, there has not been an indigenous development of its conceptualisation. The discussion on ‘kokusaika’ or ‘internationalisation’ of higher education in Japan has borrowed the basis of its meaning from Western countries. In order to understand the various meanings, it is firstly important to understand how the concept of internationalisation of higher education has been developed in some Western counties which have been active in internationalisation.

The purpose of this chapter is therefore to explore the concept and practice of internationalisation of higher education. The examination extends to its definition and approach, including some models in a particular approach of internationalisation, the influence of institutional structures and cultures with internationalisation, and new concepts of internationalisation of higher education in the 21st century.

2.1 The meanings of internationalisation of higher education
The internationalisation of higher education has developed and been sustained by the efforts of both practitioners and researchers across related fields. The practice of internationalisation contributes to its theorising, and the reverse is also true. However, while a range of practices in internationalisation has been demonstrated for over three decades in different countries and regions in the world, research into the internationalisation of higher education developed only since the 1990s. Since then, there have been rapid changes in the meaning, concepts and practices of internationalisation of higher education. Why did the intensive theorisation of internationalisation of higher education occurred in the 1990s? How has it changed in its conceptualisation?

De Wit (2002) and de Wit and Merkx (2012) have explored the historical roots and the development of the concept of internationalisation of higher education by tracing back to the Middle Ages. Understanding the entire history of internationalisation of higher education is beyond
the purpose of this study. Instead, attention is given to the 1980s onward. In the 1980s, national, regional and global factors influenced the landscape of the internationalisation of higher education in a group of leading countries, such as some European countries and the US. According to de Wit (2002), there were three major interlocking factors that drove those countries to encourage the internationalisation of higher education. These are: the end of the Cold War; the formation of regional structures, particularly in the EU; and globalisation and the knowledge society (p. 17).

De Wit (2002) argues that political motives were a main driver for the US to head for international education in the period between the post-World War II and the Cold War (from the late 1940s to 1980s). For national security, the US protected itself from the threat of communism by flourishing the academic fields of regional studies and foreign languages at higher education institutions, with a large federal investment. Competition with the Soviet Union for the North-South academic exchanges was another feature of the international initiatives in the US. Internationalisation in the US during that period referred to the broadening and deepening of a variety of international education programs (de Wit 2002). The end of the Cold War meant a loss of the US’s target competitors in international engagement. Instead, the global economic climate played a crucial role as a next force for driving the US to conduct international education in new ways.

Meanwhile, European countries underwent some radical changes in the 1980s, too. The UK commenced full-cost fees for international students in 1979, which began the idea of ‘higher education as an export commodity’. On the European continent, a student exchange scheme gained great importance in higher education policy in the 1980s and 1990s for the purpose of academic cooperation and exchange within the European region. The launch of the European Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS) in 1987 was an epoch-making initiative by the European Communities, for the program created two important effects. Firstly, as its title literally meant, the program facilitated student exchange within the European region, which eventually caused a strengthening of the unity of European citizenship inside the area. Secondly, it initiated a systematic administration style within participating universities for the standardisation of the exchange scheme, including the development of joint curricula, credit transfer systems, distance education, the extent of language preparation, and so on (de Wit 2002). Nonetheless, as with the UK and the US, the massive impact of globalisation and rise of the knowledge society gradually

---

7 The ERASMUS program started in June 1987 with an objective of facilitating student mobility within the European region. After experiencing some minor changes, it was integrated in the framework of a new education programme SOCRATES in 1995. At present ERASMUS program is in the fourth phase called ‘ERASMUS Plus’, which is scheduled to run from 2014 through 2020 for the purpose of bringing together seven existing EU programmes in the fields of education, training, and youth. http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/index_en.htm
infused an economic rationale into the European continent, too. Participation in the fierce competition for international student recruitment with competing countries such as the UK, the US, Australia, and Canada emerged soon in a number of European countries.

The major changes that occurred in the 1980s in the US and most European countries prepared them for the next phase of internationalisation of higher education. Although to varying degrees, the most striking change seen in the 1990s was the shift in the operational practice of international engagement from piecemeal to systematic. As Callan (2000) argues, in a practical term, “a dominant concern through the 1990s has been with internationalization as a process of strategic transformation of institutions” (p. 17). While this interpretation is developed from the standpoint of the European region, it is applicable to other countries outside Europe, such as the US, Canada, Australia and even some Asian countries, including Japan as well. Many higher education institutions in those countries gradually evolved towards a systematic, integrated approach to internationalisation during that time.

In line with critical changes in practice, the development in research and theories in the field of internationalisation in higher education was flourishing by the 1990s. Indeed, the 1990s became the pivotal period for the development of research on internationalisation of higher education. Considerable effort was devoted to conceptual development of the field of internationalisation of higher education. The publication of the ‘Journal of Studies in International Education’ is one of good examples. This journal commenced publication in 1997 for the purpose of making the study of international education move from a descriptive to a more analytical phase. The journal has published nineteen volumes thus far (1997 to 2015). On the tenth anniversary of 2007, it conducted a summary of research progress. This showed that the highest proportion of authors in the journal came from the US (32.0%), followed by EU countries (30.5%), Australia or New Zealand (14.5%), and Asia (9.0%) (de Wit 2007). The cross-regional dissemination of theoretical thoughts and information between researchers and practitioners of international education has been increasingly

---

8 In a similar cord, Teichler (1999) explains the major changes in the 1990s by “three quantum leaps” in the practice of internationalisation of higher education. According to Teichler, the first leap is from “predominantly ‘vertical’ pattern of cooperation and mobility, towards the dominance of international relationships on equal terms”. The second one is the leap from “casuistic action towards systematic policies of internationalisation”. The third quantum leap is “from a disconnection of specific international activities on the one hand, and (on the other) internationalisation of the core activities, towards an integrated internationalisation of higher education” (p. 10).

9 The Journal of Studies in International Education is owned by a US-based non-profit and non-governmental organisation the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) with a cooperation of the European Association for International Education (EAIE), a non-profit association based in Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
taken place. Another example, ‘International Higher Education’, a quarterly publication by the Boston College Center for International Higher Education since 1995, has also collected knowledge and findings in the internationalisation of higher education from all over the world. Other existing major international journals related with higher education research, such as ‘Higher Education’, ‘Higher Education in Europe’, and ‘Tertiary Education and Management’\(^\text{10}\) have all had a steep increase and diversification of research areas in internationalisation of higher education since the 1990s (Teichler 2004).

Defining the internationalisation of higher education is one of the areas where insights had been long awaited (Arum and van de Water 1992). Many definitions have been proposed by various researchers of the internationalisation of higher education. Table 2.1 provides a list of representative definitions of the internationalisation of higher education by influential researchers in the 1990s and 2000s. They are of course simply selected examples. The point of attention here is that each definition is characterised by individual contexts of research fields, themes and points of focus. In the list, Arum and van de Water’s (1992) and Altbach’s (2007) definitions are activity-focused at the institutional level (Arum and van de Water 1992) or on a wider context (Altbach 2007), developed from a US perspective. Van der Wende’s (1997) conceptualisation mirrors the impact of globalisation towards higher education system mainly in European countries. Ellingboe (1998) and Teichler (2004) focus on the changing dynamics of institutional systems in relation with the impact of external environments (Ellingboe 1998) or national systems (Teichler 2004). While the variation of definitions may cause confusion in understanding, it highlights that there are quite different approaches to conceptualising the phenomenon of internationalisation of higher education.

\(^\text{10}\) Higher Education: http://link.springer.com/journal/10734
Higher Education in Europe: http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/chee20/current
Tertiary Education and Management: http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rtem20/current
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of focus</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International activities at the institutional level</td>
<td>…the multiple activities, programs and services that all within international studies, international education exchange and technical cooperation.</td>
<td>Arum and van de Water (1992, 202)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to globalisation</td>
<td>…any systematic, sustained effort aimed at making higher education (more) responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalisation of societies, economy and labour markets.</td>
<td>van der Wende (1997, 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of integration of international dimension at multiple levels</td>
<td>…internationalisation at the national/sector/institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education.</td>
<td>Knight (2004, 11), revised from Knight (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of integration for a change of the internal dynamics to respond to globalisation</td>
<td>…the process of integrating an international perspective into a college or university system. It is an ongoing, future-oriented, multi-dimensional, interdisciplinary leadership-driven vision that involves many stakeholders working to change the internal dynamics of an institution to respond and adapt appropriately to an increasingly diverse, globally-focused, ever-changing external environment.</td>
<td>Ellingboe (1998, 199)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of the internal dynamics in relation with border-crossing activities</td>
<td>…the totality of substantial changes in the context and inner life of higher education relative to an increasing frequency of border-crossing activities amidst a persistence of national systems, even though some signs of ‘denationalisation’ might be observed.</td>
<td>Teichler (2004, 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and activities at multiple levels</td>
<td>…specific policies and programs undertaken by governments, academic systems and institutions, and even individual departments to support student or faculty exchanges, encourage collaborative research overseas, set up joint teaching programs in other countries or a myriad of other initiatives.</td>
<td>Altbach (2007, 123)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given that many researchers have proposed definitions of the concept of internationalisation, an alternative method involves classifying the approaches to internationalisation. One of the well-known frameworks is de Wit’s typology of approaches to internationalisation of higher education (de Wit 2002). According to de Wit, there are four basic approaches: the activity approach; the rationale approach; the competency approach; and the process approach.

The activity approach interprets internationalisation of higher education with regard to the types of activities. The activities include academic and extra-curricular initiatives such as student, faculty and staff exchange, curriculum development, international student recruitment, branch campus development, joint research activities, and so on. From this approach, internationalisation is focused “exclusively on the content of the activities and does not necessarily include any of the organizational issues needed to initiate, develop, and sustain the activities” (de Wit 2002, 116). This approach is “most widely used in the description of internationalization” (ibid.) in both research and practice.

The rationale approach looks at internationalisation from a viewpoint of the primary motivations or purposes. The purposes include academic standards, cultural diversity, income generation, and so on (Knight 2008). Some examples of motivations are, “a mechanism for income generation through foreign student recruitment, in particular in Australia and the United Kingdom…peace education, education for international understanding, development education, and technical assistance” (de Wit 2002, 117).

In the competency approach, internationalisation is described in terms of the development of knowledge, skills and attitudes of students, faculty and staff members. This includes “learning competencies, career competencies, global competence, transnational competence, and international competencies” (de Wit 2002, 117). Recent world-wide enthusiasm for fostering ‘global competence’ in students falls under this category. As de Wit points out, the focus with the competency approach is located on the human develop dimension but not on academic activities or organisational structures.

The last category is the process approach. This approach deals with internationalisation as a process.

---

11 Knight (2008) also proposed a typology of approaches comprising six categories: activity; outcomes; rationales; process; ethos; and abroad/cross-border approaches. In light with the purpose of this study, I referred to de Wit’s (2002) typology here. However, some descriptions are cited from Knight (2008) where the designated terms are used in a similar manner with de Wit (2002).

12 As de Wit notes, they are conceptually separated to distinguish a key aspect of one category from others, however they are not mutually exclusive.
“in which an international dimension is integrated in a sustainable way into the three primary functions of an institution: teaching/learning, research and service to society” (Knight 2008, 32). The process consists of “academic activities, organizational policies and procedures, and strategies” (de Wit 2002, 118). It is considered by de Wit, Knight and other researchers to be “the most comprehensive approach to describe internationalization” (de Wit 2002, 118; Rudzki 2000). Most of the studies that focus on the strategies of internationalisation are included in this category.

Having examined the variety of definitions and approaches to internationalisation, this study adopted the definition proposed by Knight (2004) for a basic reference point for the concept of internationalisation of higher education. This definition is: “internationalisation at the national/sector/ institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (p. 11). The reasons why this is an appropriate definition for this study are as follows. Firstly, it is developed with deliberate thought in terms of value-neutrality, objectivity and flexibility (Knight 2012). Secondly, the meaning in the definition reflects “the realities of today” and is “able to guide and be relevant to new developments” of the internationalisation (Knight 2008, 20). The definition’s versatility has been verified by various research on internationalisation of higher education in different contexts, including Japan. Thirdly, this definition applies the process approach. Among the types of approaches described above, the process approach is most important element for this study in its investigation of the organisational practices of internationalisation. Focussing on the ‘process’ provides this study with a lens through which to understand the dynamics of organisations in their activities for institutional internationalisation.

By using the term ‘process’, the definition by Knight emphasises the evolutionary nature of internationalisation for the continuous sophistication of missions, goals and functions of universities. It implies that internationalisation is “not an end itself, but rather is a means to an end” (Knight 2008, iv) for further improvement of the fundamental objectives of universities and other relevant entities. This interpretation leads to a notion that an internationalisation process necessitates systematic and strategic management by institutions, so that they can integrate many initiatives of internationalisation to be aligned with their mission-oriented functions as an institution. In practice, the actions for the “integration” of internationalisation initiatives have become a main point of concern in many higher education institutions (Croom 2012). Higher education institutions in Western countries increasingly focus on the establishment of procedures and organisational structures for the purpose of integrating internationalisation engagement. Especially in the European region, this trend was accelerated by a launch of the common student exchange scheme ERASMUS program in 1987, as noted earlier. Participating higher education
institutions for the ERASMUS program built a network for standardising the procedure of the exchange program. At that time, the network started merely as a program-based systematisation but many institutions did not necessarily extend the program scheme to the institution level. However, once SOCRATES started in 1994 as a successor program of ERASMUS, institutionalisation of the international exchange scheme gained more engagement from participating institutions. That was because the new program required them to establish an institution-based strategy and procedures for the implementation. Because a new funding system in SOCRATES assigned the contract responsibility not at the program level but at the institution level, institutional coherency in strategies and structures was an imperative for participation in SOCRATES.

After experiencing the systematic reform for integration of international dimensions into institutional objectives, some research initiatives for conceptualising the process approach to internationalisation have been conducted in Europe since the mid-1990s. Especially, two models that are proposed by Davies (1992; 1995) and van Dijk and Meijer (1997) provide a logical understanding of the process approach to internationalisation of higher education. While these models are developed in different era and regions from modern Japan, they give a theoretical underpinning of the process approach as well as some insights for focussing the research questions of this study.

2.2 Conceptual models of the process approach for the internationalisation of higher education

Davies (1992; 1995) argues that careful attention should be paid to the managerial aspect of internationalisation in order for institutionalising the internationalisation engagement. Particularly, formulating the internationalisation strategy and the way of delivery of the decided strategy are regarded by him as two important phases. He provides the conceptual models of international strategies for universities in two phases (Figure 2.1). Firstly, by referring to Keller’s work (1983), he identifies six elements that are essential for developing international strategy at the institution level. These are: university mission; assessment of strengths and weakness in programs, personnel and finance; organisational leadership structure; external perceptions of image and identity; evaluation of trends and opportunities in international marketplace; and assessment of the competitive situation. These six elements have internal or external features, which form two pillars in the model.
This is a model of the development of internationalisation strategy, which shows six important factors. Davies also proposes a next model at an implementation phase. He presupposes the two parameters in institutional policy for internationalisation: the degree of importance of internationalisation to the institution’s life (from marginality to centrality); and the institutional design of international engagement (from ad hoc to systematic). These two parameters build a two-by-two matrix, which is illustrated in Figure 2.2. Four cells in the Figure 2.2 depict what extent the internationalisation is viewed as important, and what approach an institution takes for the implementation. In addition, he postulates the courses of actions which many institutions would take in the process of internationalisation by using the quadrants. At first, most universities would start their internationalisation from quadrant A in Figure 2.2, and most of them would move to C, urged by the external impacts of international entrepreneurialism and unstable financial circumstances. Some institutions may move from A to B if the situation surrounding them is not severe. Whatever B or C, institutions would step forward to D for seeking a more expanded as well as stabilised system for internationalisation. Davies suggests that the matrix can help institutions wishing more systematic involvement in internationalisation to identify themselves in one of quadrants as well as plan the quadrant where they aim to move in the future.
Figure 2.2 Institutionalisation of approaches to internationalisation in universities

Source: Davies (1992)

The value of Davies’ modelling of institutional internationalisation can be summarised in two points. In the first instance, the first model clarifies the factors of importance for the development of internationalisation strategy at the institutional level (Figure 2.1). It highlights that internationalisation strategy is built by institution’s structures and assessment whereby the institution grasps the reality in institutional settings, readiness and aspirations for more proactive internationalisation, as well as external factors which affect the institution’s international activities.

In the second instance, Davies identifies two dimensions which relate to the process of the implementation of internationalisation strategy. They are described in Figure 2.2: the degree of importance of internationalisation to institutional policy, and the design of implementation. By using the two parameters, this institutionalisation model offers insights into the institutional practice of internationalisation in many higher education institutions in European countries (de Wit 2002).

Van Dijk and Meijer (1997) develop an updated model from Davies’s for the purpose of conceptualising the internationalisation of Dutch higher education institutions. Accepting the validity and usability of Davies’ model, they argue that it does not clearly show how internationalisation is managed inside an institution. In the Dutch context, they postulate that some higher education institutions control the management of internationalisation at the central level, and other institutions manage internationalisation initiatives mostly at the department or unit levels. Therefore, they add another parameter labelled as ‘support’ to the model, in order to explain the two types of support for internationalisation activities; one-sided or interactive. The revised model categorises eight types of implementation of institutional internationalisation, referred to as ‘the...
The heart of the cube model is its introduction of the variation of internal processes of internationalisation in institutions as one of important components for institutionalisation of international engagement. While Davies’ model explains strategy development and the design of its implementation only at the whole institutional level, the cube model embeds management practice in the institutionalisation process by integrating the parameter of ‘support’. This parameter explains whether the internationalisation management is operated in a one-sided manner (from the centre to departments) or an interactive manner between the centre and departments. While the implementation parameter (ad hoc or systematic) should be essential, it is also important to know how the process of internationalisation goes inside an organisation (one-sided or interactive). By introducing the cube model, Van Dijk and Meijer give a managerial perspective to the process of institutional internationalisation.

Although the two models by Davies and van Dijk and Meijer were proposed in the mid-1990s in the European context, they provide important insights for the present study into modern Japanese universities’ internationalisation practices. Firstly, the six elements in the development of international strategy by Davies (Figure 2.1) consist of organisational structural factors and assessment. While these structural aspects are obviously significant, they are in contrast to the importance of cultural aspects. Research on institutional management of internationalisation after the late 1990s has shown that institutional cultural settings should equally be taken into account as
influential components for the operation of institutional internationalisation. Admittedly, institutional cultural factors are briefly discussed in Davies (1992), but these are regarded as an obstacle rather than a contributing factor for the development of internationalisation strategies (p. 17). In fact, research on organisational culture shows that, as similar with structure, culture can be either facilitator or hindrance for promotion of internationalisation and, as it will be demonstrated in later sections, many research and practical efforts have been focussed on utilising cultural effects for the development of internationalisation processes. Factors in institutional structures and cultures are, therefore, considered in this study as the components which have mutual values and impact on the management of institutional internationalisation.

It is always essential for research in social sciences to question repeatedly whether the proposed models reflect a state of the reality and are to be able to predict the future of the phenomena. Over the two decades since the Davies’ model, internationalisation of higher education has progressed at an astonishing pace. Most of higher education institutions in the world increasingly consider internationalisation as a primary initiative to realise their institutional missions. A large-scale international survey in 2014 conducted by the International Association of Universities (IAU) tells a proliferate aspiration for internationalisation. It provides broad data regarding institutional internationalisation, showing that 53% of responded institutions had an internationalisation policy, 22% were preparing to formulate internationalisation policy, and 16% had already integrated the internationalisation aspect into the overall institutional strategy. Combining these, 91% of responding institutions included internationalisation dimension in their institutional policy and/or strategy (Egron-Polak and Hudson 2014, 43). Given the recent attention to the importance of internationalisation for institutional development, the priority of internationalisation is obvious and its significance as a parameter appears to be decreasing.

Van Dijk and Meijer (1997) stress the importance of consideration of the regional context. Their study consistently sets the scope of examination at higher education institutions in the Netherlands and surrounding European countries. As already discussed in previous sections, internationalisation of higher education has developed in different regions in quite different ways and is context-dependent. Given the specificity of practice, regional features in background, reasons and directions of internationalisation still influence the conceptualisation of internationalisation. While the proposed models by Davies and van Dijk and Meijer can collectively explain to some extent the
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13 IAU’s international survey has provided the results of questionnaire regarding institutional internationalisation initiatives four times thus far, since 2003. In the fourth survey which was published in 2014, responses of questionnaire were received from 1,336 institutions in Europe (45%), North America (19%), Asia and Pacific (12%), Latin America and the Caribbean (11%), Africa (9%) and Middle East (4%) (Egron-Polak and Hudson 2014, 17).
organisational practices of internationalisation process in countries other than the Netherlands where they were developed, an investigation of unique characteristics of Japan in terms of its university internationalisation is essential for this study. How has the internationalisation of higher education specifically developed in the Japanese context? What factors in particular can explain the internationalisation process in Japanese universities?

After a growth in the development of conceptual models for institutional strategies for internationalisation since the 1990s, the recent analysis of internationalisation of higher education focuses more on the institutional cultures which affect the process of systematic, strategic and integrated internationalisation. As already pointed out, cultural settings should be taken into account as significant components for operation of institutional internationalisation. Equally with structure, institutional culture has been increasingly regarded as one of influential factors for the management of internationalisation of higher education. The next section focuses on the theoretical and practical significance of institutional culture for exploring the processes of internationalisation of higher education.

2.3 Institutional culture in the management of the internationalisation of higher education

The concept of culture originates in the study field of anthropology (Smircich 1983). It has been applied to organisation management in the industry and business fields since the 1980s and gradually extended to research on governance and management of higher education since the 1990s (Oba 2011a). The rising interest in institutional or organisational culture in higher education institutions stems from an increasing competitive characteristics of external environments and internal responses to these external pressures, collectively explained as the effect of globalisation (Sporn 1996). The discourse from this concern intrinsically embraces a focus on effectiveness, namely, a focus on identifying effective ways of university governance and management. Motivations for research on institutional culture in the internationalisation context are mostly in line with those for effective higher education management. This research tendency recognises internationalisation as a powerful vehicle to promote university adaptation to the changing world, which is strongly urged for contemporary universities in the global society (Clark 1998; Bartell 2003; Taylor 2004). Therefore, research emphasises tend to be put on ‘effectiveness’ in management of the institution-wide internationalisation in which integration of international dimensions with overall institutional goals is a central theme.

There are many ways to interpret the elements and meanings of institutional culture. While structure tends to be explicit, visible and materialistic, culture is rather implicit, invisible, ideological and comparatively difficult to grasp. Much effort therefore has been devoted to
conceptualising organisational culture. Researchers perceive organisational culture from various standpoints. The wide variety of interpretations created some confusion in understanding organisational culture (Tierney 1988). Nevertheless, a widely accepted conceptualisation of organisational culture has been proposed by Shein (2014) as follows: “a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (p. 18). The key feature in this conceptualisation is that culture exemplifies the behavioural patterns and values that are learnt, fostered and shared by organisational members, and transferred to new members of the organisation. This concept has been applied and tested in a broader scope of research concerns, including the area of higher education institutions’ governance and management (Sporn 1996; Maull, Brown and Cliffe 2001) as well as the field of internationalisation of higher education (Bartell 2003).

Let us firstly focus on the area of university management. In the context of higher education institutions, culture is recognised as the dominant pattern of behaviours or beliefs that are shared within organisation members, and it plays a role as a kind of “organisational glue” to integrate people in the organisation and direct them towards institutional goals (Peterson and Spencer 1990, 7). Austin (1990) enumerates a wide range of key elements that contribute to a university culture: mission and goals of an institution; governance structure and leadership style of administrators; curricular structure and academic standards; student and faculty characteristics; student-faculty relations; institutional size and location; and physical environment (p. 66). All of these elements and their interactions build unique cultures in institutions.

Given the uniqueness of university cultures and their influence on university activities, how does culture function to university management? Sporn’s (1996) research has examined this question. Assuming the uniqueness and complexity of the culture of higher education institutions, Sporn investigated the relationship between university culture and institutional management. By searching the literature on organisational culture and university management, Sporn identified two dimensions of university culture that are influential to university management. These are the degree of strength and the orientation of university culture. The first dimension, cultural strength, is the extent to which the culture fits with structural arrangements and strategic plans (p. 46). While strong culture shows relatively high integrity between values and goals held by institutional members, weak cultures tend to be subject to influences of subunits in an institution that are often incompatible each other. The other indicator, orientation of university culture, exemplifies the direction of a focus in values, attitudes beliefs, and patterns of behaviours of university members (p.
Internally-oriented cultures focus more on the internal process of the organisation. In other words, priority is put more on a controllable system and internal stability than adaptation to external challenges. On the other hand, externally-directed culture looks at the external conditions, with an attention to the institution’s adaptability towards external environment. In this situation, mission statements of the institution are taken by members as a shared recognition of the objectives of the institution. External-oriented culture seeks for adaptation to changing environment, rather than for institutional stability. These two dimensions can be used to depict a two-by-two matrix to address four types of cultures (Figure 2.4): (1) strong and internally-focused cultures; (2) strong and external orientation cultures; (3) weak and internally-focused cultures; and (4) weak and external orientation cultures. In the typology, Sporn sets two basic assumptions in terms of the relation between university culture and adaptation. First, strong cultures would have more successful results than weak cultures in their adaptation. Second, externally-looking cultures show more capability for adapting to environmental changes (p. 55).

![Figure 2.4 Typology of university culture](source: Sporn (1996))

Sporn’s model is proposed within the context of university management, not within the internationalisation of higher education. Given that the discourse in management of internationalisation has been developed in a similar line with university management, Sporn’s model should apply to the management of internationalisation to at least some extent. Bartell (2003) applies Sporn’s model of cultural types to the patterns of internationalisation of higher education by examining the practice of internationalisation in two universities in North America. Bartell investigated two institutions’ documents, including mission statements, strategic planning, job descriptions for high level officials for international affairs and other related information on
their websites. He identified one university as being ‘weak culture with internal orientation’ (the third category in Sporn’s model) and the other university as ‘strong culture with external orientation’ (the second category in Sporn’s model). He examined how the university with weak and inward-oriented culture did not succeed in gaining the institution-wide commitment to internationalisation, while the other university with strong culture and external orientation was able to arrange supportive and facilitative conditions throughout the university which eventually facilitated the implementation of strategic internationalisation. He advocated that “social integration of the variety of subcultures of the different units” in a university is essential for guiding a unified culture (p. 67). Bartell concludes that it is leadership at the central administration that leads to internal communication for the purpose of identifying cultural inconsistency and solution for integration towards institutional internationalisation (ibid.).

Bartell explored university culture from a senior administrators’ viewpoint. In contrast, Schoorman’s (1999) investigation of university culture provides findings from a practitioners’ perspective with regard to institutional internationalisation. Schoorman examined a research university in the US to investigate the impact of its university-wide mission statement for internationalisation on the operation of education in different departments, by focussing on the conceptualisation of internationalisation at each department. Using semi-structured interviews, comparison was conducted among the three parties’ perceptions of institutional internationalisation: executive administrative members; faculty and other university members in Department of Science; and those in Department of Business. Clear differences emerged in their interpretations of institutional internationalisation. While executive administrators were driven by a firm belief that internationalisation should be facilitated widely in all departments with faculty members’ much effort for its implementation, faculty in the two departments showed different degrees of commitment to internationalisation. In Department of Science, most faculty members were unaware of the university mission for internationalisation and did not hold an intention to articulate their departmental education efforts with institution-wide internationalisation policy. This attitude, Schoorman analysed, mainly came from their dominant perception that science was intrinsically international as its nature therefore additional effort for internationalisation was unnecessary. Contrasting with the science field, all faculty interviewees in Department of Business were responsive to the university-wide internationalisation mission. Most interviewees agreed with the importance of internationalisation since it was crucial for graduates to hold international attitude and readiness in the business field. However, when looking into the detail, because of this rationale, an imbalance of effort dedicated to internationalisation was evident in their teaching and learning activities. That is, their engagement with internationalisation was proactive in teaching and learning mainly at the undergraduate and Master’s level, so that students at those levels could develop
readiness for their future international career, while those efforts were less at the Doctoral level. Schoorman concludes that in order to implement internationalisation widely, its relevance to the pedagogical purpose of all fields of study have to be emphasised (p. 35). For this purpose, administrators should evoke faculty members’ awareness and agreement on “(a) pedagogical, professional, and social relevance of internationalization to their field; (b) the mission to which the university, the school, and the department have formally committed; and (c) their role in its implementation” (p. 39).

The two studies above are in some contrast in terms of the perspectives taken for looking at the relationship between university culture and internationalisation. Bartell (2003) looks at university culture from a managerial viewpoint, so emphasis is placed on the strength and orientation of culture in the case study universities. For senior managers and administrators, how to develop a university-wide unified culture for a success of the internationalisation is a main concern. In contrast, Schoorman (1999) shows a fragmented perspective of culture in the practice of internationalisation. Because Schoorman sheds light on university culture from a practitioner’s viewpoint, focus is located on the diverse perceptions towards institutional internationalisation in faculty members of different departments. In his study, faculty members carried a key role for the internationalisation in practice, and their daily behaviours were considerably affected by their own perceptions towards internationalisation, which were developed in most part by departmental rationales. Particularly, Schoorman illustrates the complexity of culture inside a university. In reality, a university is a complex organisation. A great volume of research has shown the multiple cultures that universities embrace (Tierney 1988; Sporn 1996; Dopson and McNay 1996; Bartell 2003; Taylor 2004; Harman 2007; Bergquist and Pawlak 2008). One of main reasons for this multiplicity is the multifaceted rationales and goals a university holds, such as a quest for cutting-edge research, quality education and service to the community. The variety of rationales leads to a diversity in staff in universities who have different responsibilities, professional skills and occupational concerns. Moreover, the changing economic and political trends surrounding universities increasingly compel them to change rapidly, which cause further complexity in university culture (Sporn 1996). Cultures in a university are created and developed in a mixture of such internal and external complexity at both institution-wide and subunits levels, and affect the planning and implementation of internationalisation. Given the simultaneous existence of multifaceted cultures in a university, the normative orientation to strong culture in Bartell’s research can be interpreted as an institutional effort for cultural adjustment at each unit towards all stakeholders’ holistic involvement with internationalisation.
The integrative perspective towards internationalisation of higher education has increasingly gained research prominence in the US and European countries. Since the late 2000s, this perspective has been conceptualised as ‘comprehensive internationalisation’ and ‘mainstreaming internationalisation’ to explain an inclusive feature of internationalisation activities in university functions in the modern era. These concepts are discussed in the following section.

2.4 New paradigms in the 2000s and 2010s: Comprehensive internationalisation and mainstreaming internationalisation

A new concept in relation to the process approach of the internationalisation of higher education emerged in the US in the 2000s. The effects of globalisation which brought about the cross-border flow of knowledge, ideas and people had had a massive impact on higher education institutions in the US. However, their experience of internationalisation in the 1980s and 1990s had been relatively modest (Olson 2005; Hudzik 2011). Rather, the landscape of international engagement in most higher education institutions in the US had been characterised as discrete, fragmented and marginalised (Olson 2005, 54). Numerous international education programs, such as student and scholar exchange schema, educational programs for area studies, language studies and international cooperation activities, had been scattered on campuses of many higher education institutions but they had not been orchestrated in a holistic manner, nor integrated with the overall institutional policy and missions (Olson 2005).  The diversification of practices of international education programs led to tardy response for building a systematic and articulated internationalisation planning. According to a nation-wide survey conducted by the American Council on Education (ACE) in 2006, only 23% of respondent higher education institutions had developed a campus-wide internationalisation plan (ACE 2012, 7). Given the increasing urgency in recent decades for forming strategic campus-wide internationalisation planning, the inactivity is surprising. An earnest necessity for more integrated, holistic and intensive approaches to international engagement thus emerged from these situations, which resulted in the birth of a new concept called ‘comprehensive internationalisation’ in the US higher education context.

Comprehensive internationalisation is defined in several research articles and report papers. Olson,

14 Hudzik (2011) points out two factors influencing this situation. One is that there are tremendous number of higher education institutions in the US which count to 4,600 (U.S. Department of Education 2013) with a broad variation of categories such as land-grant universities, private comprehensive universities, state universities, liberal arts colleges, community colleges, and so on. Variation in these universities and colleges in terms of types of academic degrees (Doctoral, Master’s, baccalaureate etc.), academic disciplines, source of funding can be influential for diversified degrees and manners of international engagement. The other is that an absence of national scheme for the policy and procedures on internationalisation of higher education accelerated a tremendous variance in the internationalisation approach in individual institutions.
Green and Hill (2005) define it as “infusing an international or intercultural dimension into the teaching, learning, research, and service functions of higher education. This is a highly visible and strategic approach that seeks to affect all aspects of the institution” (p. v). The Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE), a research and advocacy institution affiliated to ACE, refers to it as “a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate international policies, programs, and initiatives, and positions colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected” (ACE 2012; 3). Hudzik and McCarthy (2012) offer another definition of comprehensive internationalisation as “a commitment, confirmed through action, to integrate international, global, and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education. It is a means to advance the core learning, discovery, and engagement objectives of higher education in a twenty-first century context” (p. 2).

Although the points of emphasis in these three definitions are slightly different, they embody some common ideas. First, they stress an institutional commitment that seeks coordination, integration and alignment of international activities and perspectives with the overall mission and functions of an institution. Second, they assume a strategic element in the concept of comprehensive internationalisation so that actions for internationalisation can play a critical role for institutional transformation to be more responsive to the changing internal and external environment. Third, the scope of actions for internationalisation is widened and deepened in this concept. The value of internationalisation is ideally both “broad (affecting departments, administrative units, curriculum, programs, and co-curriculum) and deep (expressed in institutional culture, values, policies, and practices)” throughout an institution (Olson 2005, 53).

The concept of comprehensive internationalisation does not necessarily renew the theoretical meaning of internationalisation of higher education for the process approach. The essence in the definition, such as integration, strategic characteristic and pervasiveness, has already been embedded in the meaning of internationalisation of higher education that was defined by Knight (2008). Rather than theoretical contribution, the significance of conceptualisation of comprehensive internationalisation resides in its pragmatic philosophy. As mentioned earlier, the higher education system in the US embraces a great number of universities and colleges with a wide variety of sector types. Given the multiplicity and diversity in institutions, initiatives for internationalisation should naturally be conducted in different ways. Comprehensive internationalisation invites many types of higher education institutions to grapple with internationalisation planning and implementation differently in terms of their organisational structures, means and focuses. Some universities may strive for internationalisation in research initiatives, others may strive for increasing undergraduate
international students for the purpose of reforming undergraduate education. Some institutions have already experienced numerous initiatives in international engagement, others would start with modest implementation of international activities. Individual institutions have peculiar conditions and situations, as is the organisational structure for internationalisation (ACE 2012; Hudzik 2011). However, in whatever structural settings, comprehensive internationalisation necessitates one common feature as a prerequisite. That is, an institutional culture which supports and facilitates international engagement (Hudzik 2011). The concept of comprehensive internationalisation reminds that setting institutional culture is an imperative for successful internationalisation, by which institutions form adaptable patterns of organisational behaviours that provide strength, adaptability and sustainability to their institutional internationalisation process (Hudzik 2011, 24).

Also significant in the concept of comprehensive internationalisation is that it offers specific elements that can assist universities to create successful institutional culture for internationalisation. These elements are: leadership and messaging; internationalisation of faculty members; and communication among all university staff members (Hudzik 2011, 24-26). First, the leadership of presidents, provosts and other senior positions have substantial influence on facilitating institution-wide, systematic commitment to internationalisation. Senior leaders of course have a responsibility to execute their leadership for building supportive institutional culture for internationalisation. Furthermore, comprehensive internationalisation extends the scope of leadership to broad actors in universities vertically and horizontally. The concept of comprehensive internationalisation advocates that leadership should be exhibited by various levels and places in a university, such as by the international offices, academic deans and chairs, general support and service units, and individual powerful faculty members (Hudzik and McCarthy 2012, 9). Not only senior leaders, but also other university staff can become a catalyst of institutional messages of internationalisation throughout organisations, communicating to what extent and in which way internationalisation is important to their institution. In order to make the messages clear and coherent, institutional intentions for internationalisation should not cease at rhetoric but be accompanied with concrete aims and goals of institutional internationalisation (Hudzik 2011, 24-25). In other words, by setting concrete goals, many staff in universities can grasp what they are heading for, whether they are going forward on a right path or not, and to what extent they have progressed, and they can exchange their ideas for achieving the goals with other university people. Second, comprehensive internationalisation invites more faculty members to assume an important part for creating institutional culture. As is often the case in internationalisation activities in many universities, faculty members tend to be moved outside the international engagement and isolated from the centre of internationalisation initiatives. However, in the context of comprehensive internationalisation, to what extent faculty members can contribute their effort to
internationalisation initiatives is a key for a success. Hudzik points out that some institutional policies, such as a reasonable assessment and rewarding system for individual contribution to international engagement, can contribute to increasing involvement of faculty members with institutional internationalisation activities. Third, because internationalisation is not an end but a means for the institutional ends, comprehensive internationalisation requires a long-lasting, flexible and adaptable atmosphere to invite commitment of all university staff to internationalisation initiatives. Internal and external change often leads to shifts of institutional policy, priorities and strategies for internationalisation. A robust but flexible institutional culture can persevere with these inevitable structural changes, which causes a successful institutional internationalisation in the long run. In order for that, comprehensive internationalisation guarantees the crucial dialogue between diversified stakeholders. In the concept of comprehensive internationalisation, structural development is demanded to let all stakeholders in a university, from president to faculty to administrative staff members, join in conversations for better understandings of the goals of institutional internationalisation.

Hudzik’s discussion is mostly in a similar chord with Bartell’s examination, in which the comparison between two universities with strong and weak culture was conducted and the supportive conditions for strategic internationalisation was evidenced by the case of a university with strong culture. More importantly for the present study, the paradigm of comprehensive internationalisation provides an idea that institutional structures and cultures are related each other to create an environment for better institutional internationalisation. The elements mentioned above, namely leadership at various organisational layers, participation of faculty members and dialogue with wider staff of universities, can be achieved by intentional structural formation, implying that institutional culture cannot be built without concrete planning of structures in a university. Developed from the conceptual models of the process approach that were proposed in the 1990s, comprehensive internationalisation offers the idea of reciprocity of institutional structures and cultures that can serve as the two important components for the practice of institutional internationalisation.

At a similar time to the emergence of the concept of comprehensive internationalisation in the US, Europe had a rise of attention to integrated holistic management of international engagement in higher education institutions. The concept has gained increasing attention and has become known as the ‘mainstreaming of internationalisation’ or ‘mainstreaming internationalisation’ in the region (Wächter 2004; Kehm and Teichler 2007; de Wit 2011; de Wit 2013; de Wit 2015). On the whole, the meaning of the term resembles the concept of comprehensive internationalisation. However, de Wit (2015) notes that some differences are clear. First, there is a difference in a management
approach between the two concepts. De Wit writes: “(m)ainstreaming implies that internationalisation is no longer a separate pillar of university policies and strategies but integrated into all other pillars: education, research, human resources, finances, student affairs, faculties, etc.”, in contrast, comprehensive internationalisation “requires an integrated approach which involves all administrative and academic entities within the institution having to develop an international dimension” (de Wit 2015). In other words, on the one hand comprehensive internationalisation takes a specialised approach with clearly-stated internationalisation strategies whereby every part of internal organisations is involved with international engagement within their scope of responsibility, on the other hand mainstreaming internationalisation indicates a normalised approach by infusing an international dimension with every part of entity. Second, related with the first point, while comprehensive internationalisation requires a more centralised approach, mainstreaming internationalisation tends to be decentralised by rendering the ownership of international engagement to each unit. Third, as an effect of the centralised approach, comprehensive internationalisation necessitates coherent procedures and governance structure. In contrast, by permitting decentralised approach, mainstreaming internationalisation may not be able to avoid fragmentation of international engagement. While further theoretical investigation in the paradigm of mainstreaming of internationalisation is necessary, de Wit’s differentiation between the two concepts implies that there are multiple patterns of internationalisation initiatives that universities can take on the basis of their contexts. Comparison of the two paradigms suggest that while the movement of internationalisation is increasingly from peripheral to a central place in university functions, there are a variety of approaches universities can take for internationalisation in accordance with their institutional characteristics and internal and external conditions.

2.5 The significance of structures and cultures

Nolan and Hunter (2012) represent the recent trend in internationalisation of higher education as institutions getting “away from an activity-based approach toward one that is more strategic”, and that “(t)his leads to greater integration, as internationalization becomes part of vision and values and is increasingly embedded across functional areas and into policies, structures, and processes” (p. 131). Most higher education institutions in the world now take the process approach for granted. In the process approach, internationalisation is regarded as a means for quality improvement of institutional functions. Therefore, it requires institutional effort for strategic integration of various international initiatives into the whole university functions of research, education and social services.

In this regard, Davies’ (1992; 1995) conceptual models for institutionalisation clearly illustrate the essential factors for institutional development of internationalisation strategies, as well as the types
of strategy implementation. Van Dijk and Meijer (1997) improve the process-based model of Davies by adding a managerial viewpoint, which explains more about whether the internationalisation is managed by a centralised manner or an interactive mode with departments. Both research offer an understanding of the importance of the structural aspect of universities and variation in management styles for the practice of internationalisation. At the same time, both stress that internationalisation is very context-dependent. Both conceptual models were developed in the 1990s in Europe. As the present study is set in the context of Japanese higher education in the 2010s, it is necessary to undertake a historical examination of the rationale, background, and approaches of internationalisation in the Japanese higher education context. An examination of the internationalisation of Japanese universities is conducted in the following chapter.

The other insight that the Davies’ models provide for this study is the necessity of consideration of organisational culture in understanding the internationalisation of higher education. In the context of the management of higher education and internationalisation of higher education, institutional culture is regarded as one of strong vehicles for promoting effective management. In Bartell’s (2003) discussion, culture is examined from the dimensions of strength and orientation. In this term, strength means the degree of congruence in internal functions with institutional values, and to what extent subcultures at each unit is coordinated with institutional international strategies. Schoorman’s (1999) study deals with the similar issue in a different way, focussing on the fragmentation of cultures at individual departments.

The last section in this chapter examined the reciprocity of institutional structures and culture by introducing the new paradigms of internationalisation of higher education in the 21st century. ‘Comprehensive internationalisation’ and ‘mainstreaming internationalisation’ are newly developed concepts, in order to explain the contemporary world of internationalisation of higher education. Especially, comprehensive internationalisation emphasise the importance of institutional cultures that support and facilitate the institutional leadership and internal communication for integration of international engagement. The concept of comprehensive internationalisation therefore fills a gap between the relationship of institutional structures and cultures which was perceived in the Davies’ models, and provides the basis for the present study that institutional structures and cultures are two significant components to understand the process of institutional internationalisation.

Chapter Three will now examine the educational internationalisation policy in Japan. The study also necessitates examination of institutional structures and cultures in Japanese universities which are potentially influential to the practice of institutional internationalisation. Chapter Four will be allocated for this issue, to explore institutional structures and cultures through discussing
institutional responses to the national policies of university internationalisation.
Chapter Three
National intentions: A chronological review of national policies on university internationalisation in Japan

Chapter Two dealt with a concept of internationalisation of higher education in the world-wide context, providing an argument that the process approach is an appropriate perspective for this study. The conceptual models of the process approach give importance to organisational structures as well as a managerial viewpoint for an integration of international dimensions into an institution’s missions and goals. At the same time, recent debates on the new paradigms named as ‘comprehensive internationalisation’ and ‘mainstreaming internationalisation’ imply that attention to institutional culture is needed for understanding the practice of internationalisation management. These ideas are particularly relevant to the Japanese context, as this chapter will show.

Statistics show that institutional efforts for internationalisation have increasingly become recognised as one of top priorities in most universities in Japan in recent years (Yonezawa, Akiba and Hirouchi 2009). Many Japanese universities have tackled with the issue of internationalisation within the scope of their policy, missions, goals, rationales, strategies and resources. Different environments and conditions have made their trials for internationalisation vary. However, at the national level, governmental policies have had a great influence on the directions of internationalisation in individual universities. Investigating how national policy for university internationalisation is important to guide this study forward to understand the complexity of institutional practices on internationalisation. For this purpose, this chapter conducts a review of national policies on internationalisation of higher education mainly since the 1950s. Some epochal changes in the whole higher education system, such as deregulation of university establishment standards and the incorporation of national universities, are also discussed because they are highly relevant.

Much research into the development of Japanese modern higher education system acknowledges that internationality is an embedded feature of Japanese universities since their foundation in the modernised Meiji era, which started in the 1880s (Ebuchi 1989; Yonezawa 2007; Kudo and Hashimoto 2011). Before Japan opened its doors to other countries, the Edo Shogunate had been sending a small number of people to several countries. The first trial of dispatching the ‘study

---

15 According to a 2009 survey with top university managers by Yonezawa et al., 60.1% of all respondent universities set internationalisation as one of their institutional priorities. Of that, 89.6% national universities set the institutional priority on internationalisation (Yonezawa, Akiba and Hirouchi 2009, 131).
missionaries’ to other countries dates back to 1862 and the Netherlands. Subsequently, the Shogunate missions were sent four times to Western countries. The missionaries were 70 in total until the end of the Tokugawa period (Inoue 1994). At the Meiji restoration in 1868, the sending system was reorganised under the control of the central government. The Ministry of Education assumed authority of approval for representative Japanese to study overseas. The purpose of sending the elite individuals to Western countries at that time was to absorb the Western advancement in order to ‘catch up’ with high quality technology and science knowledge (Kudo and Hashimoto 2011). At the same time, the government promoted the foundation of national higher education institutions. The first university was established as the University of Tokyo in 1877, followed by Kyoto University in 1897 and Tohoku University in 1907. These universities had the sole purpose of taking a leading role in the nation’s modernisation. Under this institutional mission, sending Japanese scholars and students to advanced Western countries and importing advanced knowledge from foreign resources were the major strategies. The ‘catching-up the West’ concept was so strong that many Japanese universities followed it over hundred years, and even until today (Kudo and Hashimoto 2011).

In this manner, Japanese internationalisation of universities has been characterised as national-oriented since its beginning (Umakoshi 1997; Horie 2002; Yonezawa 2011). The government has executed a massive influence on domestic universities by publishing internationalisation policies and providing national support for institutional engagement in internationalisation. Each policy wave has had particular rationales and strategies in internationalisation policy and relationships with the changes in higher education management. Therefore, the following sections divide the periods since the post-World War II into four groups: the 1950s to 1970s; the 1980s to 1990s; the 2000s to 2008; and from 2008 onwards.

3.1 From the 1950s to 1970s: The rise of international exchange and national presence

After the end of World War II, systematic internationalisation by the government started with reform of student mobility system. The government firstly set the scholarship scheme for student mobility. Then, after the US Occupation period16, the new Japanese government launched the initiative for Japanese students to study abroad for the purpose of learning democracy, contributing to Japan’s reconstruction, and gaining mutual understanding with neighbouring countries (Ninomiya, Knight and Watanabe 2009). Reform for accepting more international students was also arranged after the end of the occupation. The government launched the Japanese Government Scholarship Program for Foreign Students from 1954. Two years later, a government discussion group the Central Council for Education prepared the first post-war national report to address the

16 The US Occupation period refers to the time from 1945 to 1951.
promotion of exchange students and researchers. Throughout these approaches taken by the government soon after the World War II, a main objective for internationalisation was to “promote a better understanding of Japan and to wipe out the image of prewar militaristic Japan who had invaded Asia countries” (Ninomiya, Knight and Watanabe 2009, 120). A government system for bilateral student mobility was gradually set up in the 1950s in this way.

Meanwhile, reform of the entire university management in the post-war era was brought by the US Occupation Forces. The principles and aims of education recommended by the occupation forces were fundamentally different from those of the pre-war period. The philosophical purpose of education in the pre-war period emphasised ‘education for the national development’. In contrast, democratisation, equality of opportunity and education for the people were at the heart of the reform in the post-war time. To create reform towards the revised philosophy, the school system was reorganised. The School Education Law (Gakkō Kyōiku Hō) was enacted in 1947 soon after the regulation of Constitution of Japan and the Fundamental Law of Education (Kyōiku Kihon Hō) in 1945. The School Education Law required all universities in Japan to take the dual management systems of academic and administrative bodies. These are: the faculty council, or kyōjukai, a deliberation body of academic members; and the administrative organisation, or jimukyoku, a management system by administrative staff. Legislatively, all universities in Japan were obliged to form kyōjukai consisting of professors, associate professors and other faculty members (Article 93, School Education Law). The Law regulated only the establishment of kyōjukai and consisting members, but did not specify its organisational structure in a university nor the scope of responsibilities that kyōjukai may take. In terms of the responsibility, the Law merely required that “important matters shall be discussed at the faculty council” (ibid.; Murasawa 2002). The determinations were therefore left to each university about how kyōjukai was to be arranged in the institution’s organisational structure and to what extent the scope of discussions kyōjukai should cover. As a result, many universities normally organised kyōjukai at each department so that academic members in individual departments could discuss and decide practical matters within their scope. As a result, a typical management form was created in many Japanese universities in the way that academic staff played a major role of management in kyōjukai and administrative staff supported academic staff of kyōjukai. Each kyōjukai at departments had become a decision-maker on most of the important issues in research and education. They also discussed and decided managerial matters, such as appointment and promotion of academics and the coordination of students from enrolment to graduation. This custom of enclosing academic administration within each department permeated almost all universities in Japan, a major force for department autonomy and decentralised management. The power of kyōjukai, which was roughly regulated by national law and reinforced by institutional custom, would affect the management of internationalisation
Japan experienced rapid economic development in the 1960s and 1970s. The country gradually became conscious of its international role and status in the world during this period. Debate on internationalisation of universities became active in these two decades, in order to demonstrate the national status not only in economic and political but also in education. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) compiled a report on Japanese education policy in 1971, in which the OECD survey group pointed out that Japan should enact more efforts in their education system to be open to international students and researchers (OECD 1971, 111). The OECD emphasised Japan’s inadequate system of acceptance of international students (Umakoshi 1997). The report requested Japan to have ‘new attitudes’ to international participation on behalf of the world (Kitamura 1984). As a response to the suggestions of the OECD report, the government announced in 1974 their clear policy for international exchange. In the 1974 report, improvement of the administrative systems for international exchange was emphasised as one of main reforms for internationalisation (ibid.). In the 1970s, the government began paying more attention to the improvement of the university educational environment for international students.

3.2 From the 1980s to 1990s: Building foundations for educational internationalisation
The literature on the internationalisation of higher education in Japan shows that Japan has implemented proactive initiatives for internationalisation only since the 1980s. Until then, international engagement in research and education in universities had been conducted sporadically, mostly at the level of individual faculty members. Scholars and research students exchanged with their friendly partners at universities in foreign countries. Basically, the networks were interpersonal. In many cases, this scholarly network was limited within kōza sei, or the chair system, which was introduced to imperial universities in the 19th century as the basic academic and administrative unit (Cummings and Amano 1977). Each kōza had a particular research field and consisted of a professor, one associate professor, one lecturer and a couple of assistants (ibid.). Because each kōza was grouped by research disciplines, international networking was utilised almost solely for research purposes and an educational purpose was given the second priority. Networks were sometimes widened to neighbouring research fields to exchange broader range of scholars and students, as well as extended purposes not merely for research but also for education or international cooperation. In such cases, the network was publicly recognised at the faculty or department level and the formal procedure was taken for concluding inter-faculty exchange agreement through a departmental approval by kyōjukai. Nevertheless, from both national and institutional points of views, the exchange scheme had been peripheral and international engagement as a whole had still been marginalised. However, as the national initiatives for
university internationalisation were activated in the 1980s, the importance of systematic internationalisation at the institutional level was gradually recognised.

During the 1980s Japan still enjoyed economic prosperity. This led to a steady increase in international students in Japanese higher education institutions. However, the then cabinet thought that the rate of increase was not enough and more numbers of international students should come to Japanese university campuses (Umakoshi 1997; Horie 2002; Kudo and Hashimoto 2011; Yonezawa 2011). The cabinet’s concern was to meet the suggestion of the 1971’s OECD report that facilitated the numerical increase of international students. With this pressure, the then Prime Minister Nakasone organised the Ad Hoc Council on Educational Reform (Rinji Kyōiku Shingikai) directly under his office with support from powerful government authorities, to discuss various educational reform and strategies including the acceptance of more students from overseas. The Council in the end compiled two proposals in 1983 and 1984 to set the goal of accepting 100,000 international students with an attainment year of 2000. These two proposals were eventually integrated into the ‘100,000 international students plan’. Many researchers into university internationalisation recognise this national plan as the first powerful government initiative for university internationalisation in Japan.

The government strongly supported the ‘100,000 international students plan’. The regarding government reports had been continuously published. The next paper, issued in 1992, approved a successful increase of the acceptance of international students in the first ten years of the plan (Ministry of Education 1992). The paper advocated universities to keep their effort for recruiting more international students. The growth rate in the international student number was approximately 20% by each year in the 1980s. Although the growth rate slowed in the early 1990s, the number of international students steadily increased to 53,847 in 1995. While the 1992 report lightly touched on promotion of international exchange for domestic students, the largest part of advocacy in the paper was devoted to the issue of accepting international students.

Meanwhile, a change occurred in university management during this period. During the 1980s and 1990s most industrialised countries experienced a worsening economic situation and much debate on reorganising public services, including education, took place. Japan was not an exception. In particular, ‘cost versus effectiveness’ for educational service has increasingly become a concern in the political and economic debate. Accountability for public expenditure to higher education became a more controversial issue. The higher education system had been treated as a measure for restoring economic success, in order to meet the demand for developing income-generating industry as well as producing high quality human resources in the economic society. Under these
circumstances, some policy debates and actions were taken by successive prime ministers and their cabinets during this period. The Ad Hoc Council on Education worked for three years from 1984 to 1987 to discuss a variety of educational reforms from elementary to higher education levels. The Council’s central concern was placed on the higher education system, with an emphasis on a necessity for drastic reform that was explained by key terms such as tayōka (diversification), jūnanka (flexibility), and kokusaika (internationalisation) (Okada 2005). The discussion on higher education reform continued in the same vein in successive cabinets in the 1990s and the early 2000s. With this background, University Council (Daigaku Shingikai), an advisory board to Minister of Education replaced by Ad Hoc Council on Education, issued a report in 1991 to deregulate the University Establishment Standards. The central thrust of the deregulation was that as a result of quantitative expansion of higher education institutions in Japan after the end of the World War II, the University Establishment Standards needed to be simplified, so that each university could organise their education service in an individual way (Ministry of Education 1991). Deregulation abolished some minute details in the Standards. The other important measure introduced by deregulation was the self-evaluation system at each university. While the details of University Establishment Standards were simplified by deregulation, quality assurance of education became important for securing basic educational standards. The modification of the School Establishment Standards was a national response to the economic stagnation and an introduction of the market principle to management of higher education. From the viewpoint of universities, this measure meant more freedom and independence from national regulation. The framework in the report was taken into action in the same year. The impact of deregulation would lead to the subsequent reform of national universities to incorporation in 2004.

There was also a change in the international student exchange scheme in Japanese universities. The government initiated a new scheme for further recruitment of international students in the mid-1990s. This initiative stemmed from a suggestion by the United States-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange (CULCON), a joint meeting between the two countries for further promotion of student exchange between the two countries. After this meeting, in-campus offices for international education activities were established one after another in some national universities (Yokota and Shiratsuchi 2004; Ota 2014). The establishment of an international office was then regulated by the Ministry of Education that permitted national universities to create one if they accommodated over 200 international students (Yokota and Shiratsuchi 2004). The international offices in universities were mostly named the ‘international student centre’ for

---

17 For example, category of class subjects, number of credits by each class subject and rules for assignment of faculty, were omitted from the regulation.
identifying themselves as a support function for international students. The government successively announced the establishment of the Short-term Student Exchange Promotion Program in 1995. This program included two types of support for international students. These were: study opportunity in national universities; and scholarships for the period of exchange. The core aim of this program was to augment the number of international students, especially from English-speaking countries or other OECD countries, in Japanese national universities. This measure was introduced because national universities were regarded as failing in providing rich educational services to international students than some large-scale private universities and this required intense improvement by national intervention (Hashimoto 2003; Ota 2014). The basic plan in the programs for international students under this scheme was to provide classes with English as a medium of instruction. Teaching staff offering classes in English in the programs were accommodated to an international office in each of the implemented national universities. Because this program targeted only middle- to large-scale national universities, the impact across the whole landscape of the advancement of international student appeared to be small (Hashimoto 2005). However, the organisational facilities and settings, including an international office and teaching staff for international education programs, have gradually been arranged in more and more Japanese universities following this national scheme.

The goal of ‘100,000 international students plan’ was finally attained in 2003, three years after the targeted year. While a series of government policy papers had focused mostly on the numerical goals of international students, these actually brought heavy pressure on the practice of internationalisation at individual universities (Horie 2002). In particular, these policy papers helped administrators and practitioners of internationalisation to promote internal reform in terms of international education as well as the system for acceptance of international students. Having experienced the two decades of increase of international students, the essential reform of the internationalisation systems gained more attention in many universities in the following decades.

3.3 From the 2000s to 2008: Restructuring the management of internationalisation

After the national project ‘100,000 international student plan’ was achieved, the government promoted a drastic shift in policy for university internationalisation. The first policy paper by the Central Council for Education (Chūō Kyōiku Shingikai), a consulate body for the Minister of

---

18 The international offices changed their names frequently in accordance with the changes in their organisational responsibilities. A search through the websites of all 86 national universities revealed that 76% of national universities have set up an international office in their institutions, and 75% of them have changed their names to ‘centre for international exchange’ or ‘international education centre’ etc., to demonstrate the expansion of their duties from merely supporting international students to supporting domestic students’ studying abroad and organising university-wide international education programs.
Education, entitled ‘Development of New International Student Policy’, stated a clear change from the quest for quantity of international students to quality improvement in the university management system in educational and research areas (CCE 2003). For this new goal, the Ministry of Education urged individual universities to adopt a proactive attitude to the promotion of internationalisation by building a strategic management system tailored to their own distinctive features. It was the beginning of emphasising institutional ‘strategic planning’ in the internationalisation of Japanese universities.

The promotion for strategic planning in internationalisation bore a close relationship with the national initiative for university reform. In line with the deregulation of university system in the early 1990s, the incorporation of national universities was enacted in 2004 as another introduction of the market principle to the higher education system. Since the 1980s, the independence of national universities from governmental administration had been discussed as a countermeasure to continuous austerities in the national budget (Kitamura 2001). This reform was eventually introduced in the new millennium. The influence of incorporation reached not only national universities but also other sectors, too. As for local public universities, incorporation has become possible since 2004, corresponding to national universities. Whether these become incorporated or not depends on a decision of local governments. Some have not become incorporated. However, the incorporation of local public universities has gradually progressed and 68 among 86 local public universities (79%) became incorporated by 2014 (Asada 2015). As for private universities, although incorporation did not have a direct impact, another national regulation was revised in the same line with incorporation. A partial revision of Private Schools Act (Shiritsu Gakkō Hō) was conducted in 2004 which required private universities to strengthen their governance system and improve business transparency. In whichever sectors of universities, a major change occurred through the incorporation to assume greater responsibility for the entire university management. Each university became required to reinforce central leadership for setting distinctive policy and missions.

One of the national trials for developing institutional strategies for holistic internationalisation in this period was the five-year promotion project, started in 2005, that was titled ‘Strategic Fund for Establishing the International Headquarters in Universities’, or ‘SIH’ for abbreviation (JSPS 2010). This nationally funded program created international headquarters at each university, in order to form international strategies at the central administration level. This was the first trial by the government to facilitate institutional reform of the management in internationalisation. 68 universities from all over the country applied to this competitive funding project, and 20 universities were selected as the model cases for implementing campus-wide internationalisation.
with clear strategies. All seven former imperial universities, eight other national universities, one local public university, three large-scale private universities and one research institute comprising the 20 successful universities.

3.4 2008 and beyond: Aiming for centrally-led internationalisation in university management

In 2008, the then Prime Minister Fukuda and his cabinet announced a scheme to follow the ‘100,000 international students plan’. It was titled ‘the plan to accept 300,000 international students by 2020’ (hereafter the ‘300,000 international students plan’). The basic framework of the ‘300,000 international students plan’ was discussed by six ministries: Ministry of Education; Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Ministry of Justice; Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare; Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry; and Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (MEXT et al. 2008). This complex body of ministries for promoting the ‘300,000 international students plan’ signified that the international student policy became no longer only an educational promotion initiative but a theme to be treated under a wide umbrella of the national government. Although the plan emphasised again the number of international students in the title, its main concept is differed from the former plan. While the ‘100,000 international students plan’ focused on educational aid to neighbouring countries and development of international presence of Japan, the new ‘300,000 international students plan’ focused on a domestic purpose. That is: to revitalise “Japanese political economy, society and universities” (Kudo and Hashimoto 2011, 346-347). Because of this rationale, the quality of international students was regarded as a core theme to be improved beyond a simple quantity target.

The strategy that the Fukuda cabinet adopted for strengthening the internationalisation of university education was to support a small number of universities as model cases. This strategy was realised as the ‘Global 30 Project’ in 2009. The Global 30 Project aimed to improve the academic environment in Japanese universities for their further internationalisation by accepting excellent international students, especially undergraduates, onto the campuses of Japanese universities (JSPS 2009). Among 22 applications from universities, 13 universities were selected.\(^{19}\) The selected universities implemented a variety of trials for internationalising their academic and educational systems. The most distinctive initiatives in many selected universities were: the development of degree programs conducted in English at both undergraduate and graduate levels; open branch offices overseas for student and research promotion; and reform of the management system for acceptance and support of international students’ life and study in Japan. All these initiatives were strongly suggested by the government which urged universities to introduce fundamental

\(^{19}\) The breakdown on the selected universities by types of sectors is as follows: six former imperial universities; one national university; and six private universities.
reorganisation of internationalisation management. Overall the Global 30 scheme brought a great pressure on the management of internationalisation at each participating university. The impact was experienced in several parts of university management. For conducting degree-granting undergraduate programs taught in English, curriculum reform and recruitment of teaching staff who could offer various classes taught in English was required. Branch offices overseas could never open without organisational linkage between the central administration office and an international office. In order for recruiting high quality international students from all over the world, the admission office and the international office were directed to organise jointly a new admission system at an internationally standardised level. All these efforts necessitated engagement of a wider range of organisational units in a university, which had never occurred during previous national projects before the Global 30 Project.

The Japanese government has increasingly regarded university internationalisation as the core scheme for revitalisation of national economic and social power. The national agenda ‘New Growth Strategy’, which was introduced in June 2010 by the then governing party, the Democratic Party of Japan, pointed out the specific 21 national projects for the recovery and development of Japan economy with a ten-year timeline. In the Strategy, a role was rendered to higher education to produce human resources which can support the world and Japan (Prime Minister of Japan and His Cabinet 2010). In particular, the Strategy set the following three main targets to be tackled: to internationalise university education and improve foreign language education, including English and Chinese; to promote overseas exchanges of Japanese students and strategically acquire international students; and to develop business human resources capable of responding to internationalisation (ibid.). In addition, for these targets, four practical goals were to be achieved by 2020. These were: to increase the number of internationally top ranking universities; to accept 300,000 talented foreign students20; to dispatch 300,000 Japanese students overseas; and to enrich the international experiences of the management class in Japanese companies (Prime Minister of Japan and His Cabinet 2010; Sato 2013).

As the New Growth Strategy indicates, national policy for university internationalisation has come under the umbrella of the whole national strategy for economic revitalisation. The government actions for developing national funding projects for university internationalisation have become more active, and the purposes of the projects have become more complex. In line with this, the government commenced three budgetary projects after the Global 30 Project. The first was ‘Re-Inventing Japan Project’, which was formed in 2011. The main purpose of this project was to introduce highly internationalised university education programs. The selected universities would

---

20 This goal is equivalent to the ‘300,000 international students plan’.
build collaborative programs with one or multiple universities overseas, so that they could conduct study abroad programs for Japanese students as well as undertake the strategic acceptance of students from foreign partner universities. As with the Global 30 Project, the Re-Inventing Japan Project required selected universities to undertake educational reform for internationalising the educational content as well as the entire management in educational service.21

The second national project focussed on enabling domestic students to learn in the global environment. Again, many committees were organised from different ministries and a domestic economic organisation of Keidanren, or Japan Business Federation, to finalise the project planning. ‘Project for Promotion of Global Human Resource Development’ was the title of the project that was announced in 2012. The aims of the project were to overcome a decreasing number of outbound domestic students and foster a more internationalised mindset (JSPS 2013).22 The ambitious goals of the project required selected universities to work on educational reform, especially at the undergraduate level. Many of selected universities poured their effort in two areas: the development of more classes taught in English; and the integration of international mobility subject areas into the regular curricula. The former effort needed recruitment of more teaching staff in a wide range of subject areas who could teach their subjects in English. The latter initiative necessitated internationalisation of curriculum design and coordinating the on-campus academic activities with cross-border education activities. The project urged selected universities to reform undergraduate education content as well as in the management system. The integrated management of education across different departments and other local units was at the heart of successful results of the project.

The third and latest governmental project regarding internationalisation is named the ‘Top Global University Project’, which commenced in 2014 as a ten-year funding program (MEXT 2014a). The purpose of the project is to augment the international competitiveness of Japan’s prestigious universities and distinctive universities in international engagement.23 The characteristics of the

---

21 The Re-Inventing Japan Project was conducted by dividing the target areas of partner universities. Two types of application were provided in 2011: Type A was for the projects with universities in China and South Korea; and Type B was for those with universities in the US, Australia and European countries. In 2012, collaborative programs with universities in ASEAN countries were added. By 2013, 13 universities in Japan were selected in Type A, 12 were in Type B, and 14 were selected for the ASEAN framework (JSPS 2012a; JSPS 2012b).

22 Two types of application were set in the Global Human Resource Development. Type A was for university-wide initiatives and Type B was for faculty/school-specific initiatives. The application numbers were 41 for Type A and 111 for Type B, then 11 and 31 universities were respectively selected as a result (JSPS 2012c).

23 Again, the Top Global University Project constitutes of two tiers: tier A for top universities which aim to be ranked in the top 100 world rankings through world-class education and research; and tier B for distinctive universities which lead Japanese society in the globalised environment.
The project is to require selected universities to show clear data, plans and self-assessment of their present situation regarding internationalisation and their practical future goals for further internationalisation (Yonezawa and Shimmi 2015). The university data to be shown on the proposal and reports vary: indicators related to international and gender diversity; student mobility; systems to support student mobility; provision of classes and degree programs in foreign languages; Japanese language education; curriculum management and quality assurance of educational programs meeting international standards; flexible academic calendars; international student recruiting and alumni networks; international dormitories; information provision in foreign languages; reforms of personnel policies and university governance; improvement of teaching and learning; entrance examination reform; and information disclosure (ibid.). This requirement means that the selected universities are expected to conduct serious institutional reform over ten years of the project, involving all organisational functions, not only international-related offices and departments but also regular administrative and service functions.

3.5 Summary: The present context of Japanese university internationalisation

This chapter has stepped through national policies on internationalisation and related university management reform in Japan since World War II. The review illustrated the characteristics of each policy reform. Policy started from ‘catching-up the West’ rationale, pursuing the aim for educational aid to neighbouring countries, and then for improvement of international presence in the times of the country’s economic prosperity in the 1960s and 1970s. Universities in Japan seriously built the foundation of educational internationalisation in the 1980s and 1990s through the national initiative based on the ‘100,000 international students plan’. Since the turn of the 21st century, university internationalisation has been recognised as one of core strategies for university reform. Now in the middle 2010s, this perspective is a settled conviction by national leadership. The rapid expansion of the global economy and the knowledge-based society compels Japan to promote university internationalisation for the purpose of making universities survive in global competition.

This chapter shows the distinctive context of Japan in three ways. First, it is largely national initiative that has continuously directed university internationalisation in Japan. National initiative has controlled universities across sector types, not only through internationalisation policies but also through collective regulations for university management. Second, the current direction of

(MEXT 2014a). For tier A, thirteen universities were selected of which all seven former imperial universities and two leading private universities were granted. The other winning universities were two comprehensive national universities, two national universities in the science and technology fields, and two large-scale comprehensive private universities. For tier B, 24 universities were selected of which ten were national, two were local public, and twelve were private universities.
national policy narrows its focus to prestigious universities and distinctive universities in the field of international engagement. In particular, the recent emphasis on the nation’s economic revitalisation by the government directs assistance for university internationalisation to support only a top slice of the universities in Japan with a direct economic rationale. Third, the national initiative has emphasised the entire structural reform of universities in terms of institutional internationalisation management. Japan has recognised that institutional internationalisation intrinsically needs appropriate organisational structures which are pertinent to the entire university management system.

Having focussed on the national initiatives for internationalisation, two questions for the next chapter are pertinent. For the first, how have individual universities reacted to national initiatives on internationalisation? As will be illustrated in the following chapter, Japan has many universities with a variation of institutional size and type of sectors. To find patterns in the practice of institutional internationalisation under the control of national initiatives is one of the issues that this study must explore. For the second, how has the institutional culture been shaped by this series of national initiatives? While structural reform has been intensively emphasised by the national initiatives, the aspect of institutional culture has not been considered as clearly at the national level. However, as Chapter Two has shown, the cultural aspects of universities are equally significant with organisational structures for the effective management of internationalisation. As with structures, the formation of institutional culture must have been influenced by the impact of national policy for university internationalisation. Chapter Four will tackle with these two questions by looking at internationalisation at the institutional level.
Chapter Four
Institutional responses: The approaches and patterns of internationalisation at the institutional level

The more university internationalisation gained gravity at the national level in Japan, the more important it becomes to understand how it is imported by individual universities into their practice. How has the national intention of internationalisation impacted on institutional practice? To what extent have individual universities responded to the national initiative, applying it to their institutional strategies and promoting the practice of internationalisation? Have they constructed institutional structures and cultures for internationalisation and what are these like?

4.1 Overview of the university system in Japan and its influence on internationalisation

Before looking at the institutional practice of internationalisation, it is important to begin with an overview of the Japanese higher education system and the characteristics of universities in Japan. The features of Japan’s higher education system are often expressed in terms of diversity and hierarchical structure (Kitamura 2001; Breaden 2013). With regard to the diversity, the higher education system comprises three institutional systems. The Ministry of Education regulates higher education institutions into the following three categories: university (daigaku); junior college (tanki daigaku); and college of technology (kōtō senmon gakkō). Institutions in each category hold national, local public and private sectors as administration systems with the exception that only junior colleges do not have a national sector. Table 4.1 illustrates the number of institutions and enrolled students in each sector in 2012.

---

24 There is another category of post-secondary school called senmon gakkō in a specialised school (senshū gakkō) system, which provide qualification to students those who have completed necessary courses with transfer admission to the higher education system, for example, universities. However, the Ministry of Education includes senshū gakkō system in the secondary education category in their annual School Basic Survey.

25 To be precise, there are no ‘national’ universities in Japan since all former national universities were reformed to ‘national university corporation’ by the 2004 Act. However, this study uses the term ‘national university’ because it is still commonly used in Japan.
Table 4.1 Number of higher education institutions and students in Japan in 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Higher Education</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
<th>Number of students enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior college</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of technology</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MEXT (2013)

As Table 4.1 shows, university is the largest category in terms of both the institutional numbers and students. Universities offer four-year undergraduate courses and, according to their capacity, postgraduate courses. The number of universities in 2012 was 783 in total, of which private sector occupied the largest part (605 in number, 77.3% as ratio). Local public and national sectors follow this with 92 and 86 institutions, respectively (MEXT 2013). Universities are the major means of providing scholarly knowledge and elite education because they grant Bachelor, Master’s and Doctoral degrees by completion of courses. Junior colleges offer two-year courses, awarding associate degrees to students at the completion of their courses. Historically, junior colleges have had two major fields of study, home economics and education, because they were originally established for women’s education. The total number of institutions in 2012 is 372, which consist of only private and local public sector. Higher technical colleges are the other category of higher education institutions with the purpose of producing practical specialists mainly in the fields of technology, engineering and mercantile marine. These categories of institutions constitute the whole higher education system in Japan, which numbered 1,212 institutions in total in 2012.

The 783 universities in Japan can be further divided by type of sectors into national, local public and private institutions. Historically, private universities have occupied the largest part of the university sector in Japan and they have been increasing up to the present day. Figure 4.1 shows the changing number of universities in Japan from 1970 to 2013. The total number of institutions has been consistently increasing in the last ten years, from 702 in 2003 to 782 in 2013. This is caused by the growth of private universities that raised the number from 526 in 2003 to 606 in 2013. The increasing trend in the number of private universities is against to the trend of Japan’s declining young population, which causes fierce competition for student recruitment.
Naturally, the sources of revenue are different across the sector types. Figure 4.2 demonstrates breakdown of total revenue of national, local public and private universities. As it shows, national universities and local public universities rely largely on the grants from the national or local government. National universities gain 40% of total resources from the government as an annual operational expenditure. The tendency is the same in local public universities, as they receive 60% of total revenue from provincial or municipal governments. On the other hand, the income of private universities is heavily reliant on student tuition, entrance and examination fees. The differences in the main financial source are influential to policy-making and the practice of internationalisation. National and local public universities will perform internationalisation practice in alignment with the government policies and intentions, while private universities will respond more to students’ demands in order to satisfy their needs of international engagement during their university years.
Institutional sizes differ across the sectors, and this appears to have an impact on the management of internationalisation. Figure 4.3 shows the number of universities by sector and the capacity of student enrolment. For ease of discussion, enrolment capacity is divided into three institutional sizes, small (universities with less than 5,000 students), middle (from 5,000 to 10,000 students), and large scale (more than 10,000 students). As the graphics shows, large-scale universities are concentrated in the national sector. The majority in local public (94.6%) and private (82.1%) universities are small-scale institutions, while nearly one quarter of national universities are large-scale (24.4%). These large-scale national universities, including seven former imperial universities, and a handful of large comprehensive private universities with long histories, have been reigning on the top of the higher education system (Yonezawa 2007; Kudo and Hashimoto 2011). This hierarchical structure influences the degree of institutional internationalisation.

26 The number of universities with over 10,000 students was 21 in the national sector and 42 in the private sector (MEXT 2013).
According to a world-wide survey of internationalisation of higher education by IAU, large-scale institutions have more aspiration for international collaboration and more financial and human resources stability for its implementation (Egron-Polak and Hudson 2010, 138). The powerful large universities usually offer more complex international education programs such as dual, double or joint degree programs with partner institutions in other countries, which require intensive staff resources for in-depth and continuous engagement between partner institutions. This analysis is applicable to the present situation of Japanese universities. Many large and traditional universities in national and private sectors tend to have ambitious internationalisation policy and strategies and many of them can afford to offer complex international education and research programs to recruit international students as well as provide opportunities for international activities to their domestic students (Yokota et al. 2006).

Let us look now at the relationship between sector types and the academic fields offered by universities. Figure 4.4 shows the difference in a variety of study fields that each sector offers. In national universities, the largest proportions of students (29.9%) take engineering as their major of study. Science (7.0%) and agriculture (6.8%) are also more popular in national universities than those in local public universities (science is 2.2% and agriculture is 3.6%) and private universities (science is 2.4% and agriculture is 2.1%). In contrast, many students in private universities (38.2%) and local public universities (27.1%) study social science as their major academic field. The humanities also occupies a relatively large part in private universities (16.5%) and local public universities (16.3%) than national universities (6.9%). These differences are to a large extent

Figure 4.3 Universities in Japan in 2012 by sector type and capacity of student enrolment

Source: MEXT (2013)

Note: Institutional size is categorised by author for this study.
related with the institutional size. The smaller universities cannot afford costly facilities and laboratory equipment, which are indispensable for engineering and natural sciences. The variation in study fields by sectors influences internationalisation practice, too. Simply speaking, national universities tend to be concerned with exchanging research students at the postgraduate level in the field of engineering and science for the purpose of development in research domains, while private universities tend to concentrate their efforts on creating international education programs in the fields of social sciences and humanities, reflecting the demands mainly from undergraduate students.

![Figure 4.4 Student ratios by fields of studies in Japanese universities in 2012](image)

*Source: MEXT (2013)*

Overall, the data presented above signifies that Japanese universities, which are described as being diverse and hierarchical, point to a differentiation in the strategies and practice of institutional internationalisation. So, has a series of national policies on university internationalisation covered the diversified and hierarchical university system in Japan, for the effective development of internationalisation across the range of universities? As far the series of national policies in Chapter Three, the answer is probably negative: national initiatives have not provided guidance for internationalisation to the full range of universities in Japan. The reasons are twofold.
The first reason comes directly from the focus of national policy. As already mentioned in Chapter Three, national policy has emphasised university internationalisation in the top level universities and its support has been stronger for those universities. This is illustrated by examining the winners of competitive national funding projects. Government competitive funds for internationalisation have been increasing since the late 1990s, partly as a compensation for decreases in the regular budgets for universities (Oba 2005). The winners of these funding rounds tend to be the prestigious large national universities and a couple of comprehensive private universities, because these institutions are capable of planning challenging but feasible activities for internationalisation. Evidence for this is provided by Yonezawa and Shimmi (2015). They demonstrate a listing of universities that acquired three major national funding projects for university internationalisation since the 2000s (Table 4.2). The table shows that the winners of these national projects are mainly the former imperial universities, other powerful national universities, and some large-scale comprehensive private universities. Of course there will be several differences in the winning universities in these three funding rounds, because of the difference in the detailed purposes of the projects. However, the fundamental feature in the planning and practice of internationalisation in Japan is that those few but powerful large universities with institutional prestige have enjoyed the privileged status for conducting internationalisation with national support. The gap between selective universities and the others, many of which are middle or small scale universities, will be widened further (Yonezawa and Shimmi 2015) if the national policy direction and its strategic projects for supporting universities continue go on in the current way.

27 Those are: Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities (SIH; the project years from 2004 to 2009); Global 30 Project (from 2009 to 2014); and Top Global University Project (from 2014 to 2023). These national projects were discussed in Chapter Three.
### Table 4.2 Universities selected for recent national funding projects of internationalisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Institutional Size(^1)</th>
<th>SIH(^2) 2004-2009</th>
<th>Global 30 2009-2014</th>
<th>Top Global University(^3) 2014-2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former imperial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokkaido University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohoku University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Tokyo</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagoya University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osaka University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyushu University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tsukuba</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroshima University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo University of Foreign Studies</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo Medical and Dental University</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitotsubashi University</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niigata University</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobe University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottori University</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagasaki University</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aizu University</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keio University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waseda University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meiji University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doshisha University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritsumeikan University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokai University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Yoneyzawa and Shimmi (2015)

**Note:**

1. Institutional size is categorised by author for this study.
   - Institutional size *large* refers to institutions holding more than 10,000 students, *middle* means from 5,000 to 10,000 students, and *small* is less than 5,000 students.
2. Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities.
3. Those universities which were selected in Type A: university-wide initiatives.

The second reason comes from the institutional side. Fundamentally, institutional internationalisation is conducted not only through national policy intention but also by various other driving factors. Universities are motivated to internationalisation by many internal and external factors, including pressures from student and industry markets, the limitations of
institutional resources in finance and staff, institutional missions, reputation and traditions. As Goodman (2007) points out, individual universities mainly use the same term ‘internationalisation’ but use it in different ways:

In the case of elite national universities, overseas students are an important part of their image as institutions which participate seriously in the global research culture; at top private universities, they are part of the commercial repositioning of institutions as they seek to maintain the number of applicants they receive each year; in lower-level private universities, they can be part of a desperate policy for survival as a source of fee-income… (p. 84)

Different approaches to institutional internationalisation have been further investigated by Kudo and Hashimoto (2011). They assert that a feature of university internationalisation in Japan as characterised by ‘diversification’ and ‘stratification’ and have proposed categorisation of different approaches to internationalisation in Japanese universities. These are: global approaches; innovative approaches; ad hoc approaches; pseudo-international approaches; and no-international approaches. The global approaches include universities at the top level of research and education, carrying elite identity and taking a responsibility of flagship for the ‘following’ universities. They usually hold two rationales for internationalisation: research and entrepreneurship. Universities in this category are typically successful in gaining funding from the national and private sectors and have rich human resources in research, education and administration fields (p. 351). The second group of universities with innovative approaches tend to hold missions related to internationalisation. Some have specific fields of research to pursue its international engagement, others conduct outstanding inter-cultural academic and education programs for the sake of their institutional goals for internationalisation. They are not necessarily distinctive in all fields of research and education, but may be innovative in particular areas at international standards (p. 352). The third category ‘ad hoc approaches’ is the case where international initiatives are reactive in universities. These universities may arrange the basic programs and facilities for international engagement, but many of them are limited because policy, missions and strategies for internationalisation are not embraced fully at the whole institutional level (p. 354). The fourth, ‘pseudo-international approaches’ is the case where there are no purposeful rationales for institutional internationalisation but certain international activities are conducted merely for institutional survival. These institutions may recruit international students for the sake of meet the student capacity, however because of a lack of reasonable planning of internationalisation, the quality of education may be problematic (p. 355). The last category, ‘no-international approaches’ refers to universities which do not have international policy and activities (p. 355). Universities in
this category do exist, but the number should become decreased in recent years as internationalisation is necessary if they want to maintain and improve their research and educational quality. However, some universities, especially small-scale ones in rural areas, may struggle with conducting policy-making and the implementation of international engagement with resource limitation. The five categories of Kudo and Hashimoto (2011) explain well the variety of practices in institutional internationalisation in Japanese universities.

When the national policy intention towards university internationalisation is transferred to institutional practice, it is interpreted and converted differently by the many internal and external influences that surround individual institutions. Universities control those influential elements at the policy-making level and implement it at the phase of practice. If we look at the institutional reactions to the national internationalisation initiative, it is important to focus on both policy-making and practice. This raises a set of questions, including how the institutional policy-making process is conducted, what factors are taken into account more than others, and how those factors affect the practice of internationalisation. These questions can lead to clear understandings of a variety of institutional internationalisation approaches, and eventually refining future policy-making process at the national level. For these objectives, this study applies the two axes of institutional structure and culture to grasp the varied patterns of institutional practice of internationalisation. The next section deals with the primary components in structure and culture which can clarify the patterns of practice in institutional internationalisation in Japanese universities.

4.2 Important components of institutional structure and culture in educational internationalisation in Japanese universities

The focus now moves to the practical elements in the patterns of institutional practice in educational internationalisation. This section articulates the concepts of structure and culture, which were covered in Chapter Two. In Chapter Two, structure was discussed by focusing on the approach of internationalisation management, and culture was examined by looking at the pattern of behaviours in the distribution of expertise for educational internationalisation in the Japanese university context. How are the concepts of structure and culture applied to institutional internationalisation in Japanese universities, and how do they relate each other?

4.2.1 Structure: Approach shifts and senior leadership

The review of national policies on university internationalisation in Chapter Three revealed that the changing patterns of national initiatives for institutional internationalisation have had a significant relationship with the political and practical shifts in higher education management. The
development of the management of institutional internationalisation has been guided by national directions as well as institutional customs. By and large, Japanese universities have a long tradition of decentralised management. Kōza sei, or the chair system, has been used by a broad range of universities where many small academic hierarchical groups of kōza had been firmly built in each department. Most international exchange activities have been conducted within this minimal circle of kōza. Kyōjukai, or faculty council, has unified each kōza in a department which had controlled almost an entire sphere of management of research and education at the department level. When international exchange scheme has been needed to be extended over a kōza unit, kyōjukai has utilised a procedure of inter-faculty exchange agreement. Any other international engagements in departments have also been discussed and decided at the department level. Because international initiatives have been conducted by this ‘bottom-up’ manner in most universities, individual departmental initiatives for internationalisation had often not been organically related to the institution-wide internationalisation goals nor coordinated centrally.

However, after the new public management scheme was introduced to the higher education system in the late 1990s and national university incorporation was successively enacted in 2004, the centralisation of institutional management was an increasing emphasis in many universities. Since the incorporation, many universities aimed to shift university management from a decentralised to centralised approach by strengthening senior leadership. Although the previous chapter touched on this briefly, more detailed examination is needed here in order to grasp the impact of the incorporation on the management of institutional internationalisation.

As noted earlier, all national universities in Japan were incorporated by an enactment of National University Corporation Act in April 2004. This reform was implemented so that national universities could improve the quality of education and research by taking more flexible measures through their own institutional responsibilities (MEXT 2003). Since then, national universities in Japan departed from the status of peripheral organisations under the Ministry of Education (Kuroki 2012) and assumed a legal entity as autonomous institutions (Oba 2007). For a long time, national universities had been expected to use their management system to provide more attractive education and research environments to their students and researchers. This expectation came from long-lasting public demands to build “appealing national universities rich in individuality that actively carry out outstanding education and distinctive research” (MEXT 2003). In a practical sense, the new management system required national universities to have strong leadership from presidents and senior administrative members. The scope of leadership was expected to cover the entire management of university functions from research to education to local community service. In particular, leadership was expected in quality assurance and accountability. A national measure
after the incorporation has required each national university to publish medium-term plans and goals (chūki mokuhyō, chūki keikaku) in every six years, based on detailed data collection and analysis of every initiative throughout an institution. These reports are directly related with the main financial source, or un'eihī kōfu kin, the management expenses grants from the government for operational expenditure, because the yearly amount of un'eihī kōfu kin has become funded on the basis of these medium-term plans and goals (Yonezawa 2007). Universities implemented institutional reform for centralising information about departmental activities and their achievements, as well as for controlling departmental initiatives. The impact of the incorporation was not only stay within the national universities. As already illustrated in Chapter Three, local public and private universities were also subject to the significant influence of the incorporation. These extended measures meant that the government required every sector of universities to improve the core management for effective governance and management by a shift to a centralised approach.

However, in spite of a major break with traditional scheme, the government recognises that the incorporation seems not to have successfully improved university management. National actions for reform of university management have not yielded effective results to the degree the government intended. Why? The reason is located in a gap between theory and practice. A journal entitled ‘Gendai no Kōtō Kyōiku’ (Modern Higher Education), published by the Institute for Democratic Education (IDE), is one of the influential publications exploring critical issues and leading themes on Japanese higher education system (Ebuchi 1997, 13; Hashimoto 2003, 111). The journal has frequently examined the impact of incorporation of national universities since 2004 until now. Most of the contributors are those who have experienced presidential positions or executive managers in national, local public and private universities. Overall, these senior managers lament the difficulty in shifting to the centralisation of university management. While they cite different reasons and factors for the difficulty of centralised management in their particular contexts, most of them commonly identify the conventional power of kyōjukai as a hindrance. Kuroki (2012) asserts the persistence of kyōjukai that entrenches narrow departmental interests. He admits that kyōjukai can also work as a hub between local units and the central

28 Furthermore, this funding system by assessment of the medium-term plans and goals has become increasingly harsh, because the management expenses grants has been planned to be slightly reduced by each year.
29 “There are many instances where national universities have not examined the fundamental purpose of incorporation with the intention of smooth and amicable transition, resulting in little changes and merely taking over internal regulations that had been developed under the Government Officials Exemption Act” (MEXT 2014b, 9).
30 Although the articles in the Journal are not study papers in a strict sense (Ebuchi 1997, 13), their discussion from actual experience as senior managers vividly presents a state of confusion in universities before and after incorporation.
administration in terms of exchanging research and education practices conducted at each department and the central policies and missions. However, from an overall institutional viewpoint, he argues that it is the prerogative of kyōjukai that impedes a change in the mindset of faculty members to the new management approach brought by the incorporation (p. 15). A similar problem is evident in private universities. Shirai (2012) argues that the ‘two-sidedness’ of the responsibilities of department deans is one of the biggest issues to be tackled in the private universities in Japan (p. 20). From a viewpoint of the central administration, deans take a responsibility as one of executive officers to enforce the institutional policy and missions. However, they are not able to act effectively when conflicts of interest between the central administration and departments emerge. This is because the deans of departments are elected by faculty members of their departments, and therefore from a view of department members, deans should also assume a representative role to present ideas of each kyōjukai to the centre. In practice, deans have two identities, as a senior officer of the central administration and as a representative of his/her department. These roles and identities are potentially antithetical, and this is one of factors retarding a speed of the whole institutional decision-making (Shirai 2012, 20). Both Kuroki and Shirai clarify a gap between ideal and reality in terms of university management after the incorporation, for the conventional power of kyōjukai surpassed the institutional effort for centralisation, in spite of the formal promotion of strengthening senior leadership by the National Corporation Act.\footnote{An unavoidable issue in Japanese university management is the power balance between senior leadership and authority of kyōjukai.\footnote{The movement to centralisation management have reached into the field of internationalisation management, too. A series of national funding projects for university internationalisation since the 2000s, namely SIH, Global 30 Project, Re-Inventing Japan Project, Project for Promotion of Global Human Resource Development and Top Global University Project, has repeatedly urged}}

31 “Some cases in universities point out that even if the President would conduct fundamental reform in university management, for example, improvement of core curriculum or revision of the entrance examination system, he/she finds difficulty in making it materialised because of objections from departments” (MEXT 2014b, 29).

32 This gap is aimed to be compensated by the revision of the School Education Law in April 2015. As mentioned earlier, the former regulation in the School Education Law did not specify the scope of responsibility of kyōjukai but only described that it should discuss ‘important’ matters. The revision clarified the scope of responsibilities of kyōjukai (Hirowatari 2015). After the revision, kyōjukai became to discuss within a limit of education and research matters, and the role of kyōjukai was specified as a discussion body but not a decision-making body (Hirowatari 2015, 11). This measure aims to weaken the authority of kyōjukai so that it cannot interfere but can assist senior leadership of university management. Time is necessary to see to what extent the revisions of the School Education Law in 2015 will have actual significance. However, this amendment clearly demonstrates an increasing national concern for the improvement of senior leadership and for a centralised approach to university management.
universities to reform internationalisation management from a disconnected to centralised manner by decisive senior leadership. In particular, in terms of the organisational re-formation for strategic internationalisation, the SIH project had a specific impact on the selected universities. The purpose of SIH was to facilitate selected universities to establish and promote institution-wide international strategies. After the end of the funding, the final report of the SIH project gave a typology of revised governance and management systems for internationalisation in the selected universities (JSPS 2010, 69-90). According to the report, four types of internationalisation management emerged in the selected universities. The first typology category is called ‘headquarter-led type’. Universities under this category establish a central organisation for strategic planning of internationalisation under central administrative control. The second category is called ‘centralised management type’. While the organisational arrangement is similar with the first category, this type emphasises the teamwork of executive officers at the central administration and practitioners of academic and administrative staff members for international engagement (Yamada 2006, 37). The third type is labelled ‘supporting department type’. In this group, the central headquarters takes an assisting role for the development of departmental international engagement by providing logistical support for them (JSPS 2010, 71). The fourth group is named ‘specific project type’. The common feature in this group is the narrowing of the headquarters’ role down to a particular research project (Hirayama and Sakashita 2006, 27).

The report illustrates that the former two types represent a shift to centralisation and the latter two categories tend towards decentralised management. The common feature in the all types is the successful strengthening of senior leadership. The selected 20 universities are only a small portion in the Japanese university system. However, the results in the SIH project imply that universities can adopt either centralised or decentralised approaches for strategic internationalisation by improvement of senior leadership. Unfortunately, in reality the majority appear to retain conventional management of institutional internationalisation without distinct strategies established by senior leadership. The OECD report on higher education system in Japan in 2009 commented

---

33 For example, Keio University set up an institution for strategic planning office right under the central administration, in order to optimise the President’s leadership for international engagement.
34 For example, a private institution Tokai University established the Head Office of International Affairs to develop and coordinate an integrated international strategy throughout the group institutions. The details are introduced in the following Website: http://www.tokai.edu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=144&Itemid=144
35 In the case of Waseda University, Office of International Research Promotion (IRP) was established by collaboration of International Office and Research Promotion Division, so that the IRP could support individual international projects at each department in the university. http://www.waseda.jp/rps/en/irp/about/index.html
36 An example is Nagasaki University. They established Center for International Collaborative Research to promote specific three research fields in tropical and infectious diseases, radiology, and marine environment biological resources. http://www.cicorn.nagasaki-u.ac.jp/en/about/
that at the time of edition of the Report, “most higher education institutions do not have a clear and coherent internationalisation strategy, and the institutional internationalisation activities that can be observed are mainly the result of a bottom-up process” (OECD 2009, 85). The OECD report signifies that most universities in Japan were still struggling to establish senior leadership between the power balance with departmental authority of kyōjukai, which appears to act as impediment for a radical change of the management of institutional internationalisation.

While the significance of kyōjukai is recognised as an effective ‘discussion board’ at the local level (MEXT 2014b, 12), the important issue is how individual universities can clear the barrier of kyōjukai in terms of institution-wide promotion of internationalisation, and how they can keep a sound balance between the power of senior central leadership and that of kyōjukai at departments. Universities in Japan can take either centralised or decentralised approaches to internationalisation in light of their unique institutional features. Senior leadership is required in both approaches, with a deliberate consideration of kyōjukai. The centralised approach should not take a dictatorial manner, but rather should respect the practice of departments in order to effectively deliver the institutional messages and harmonise them with departmental policies. The decentralised approach should not make initiatives in departments disconnected but should knit them with the institution-wide policy of internationalisation. Senior leadership should be purposefully designed and executed in various ways in accordance with institutional internationalisation approaches. This study investigates different patterns in the development and operation of senior leadership in a wide variety of internationalisation in centralised and decentralised approaches.

4.2.2 Culture: Pattern of behaviours in the distribution of expertise

In Chanter Two, Shein’s work led us to an understanding that culture was the behavioural patterns that were learnt and fostered by organisation members, and transferred to new members of the organisation (Shein 2014). If this study applies the definition by Shein, what patterns of behaviours can be seen in the university staff members engaging with the practice of institutional internationalisation?

In terms of the practice of educational internationalisation, Japanese universities have often promoted it by introducing experts in the field of international education and university internationalisation (JSPS 2010; Oba 2011b). Therefore, it is important to identify those who hold the expertise in these fields. There are different types of staff members in Japanese universities who can be identified as experts of institutional internationalisation. Table 4.3 shows a list of experts in institutional internationalisation in Japanese universities who are mainly in charge of institutional internationalisation and/or international education programs. It should be noted that the
categorisation in Table 4.3 is done simply for convenience to identify the experts. In reality, there are many overlapping duties between them. Another point to note is that the categorisation of academic and administrative staff is not clear in an actual sense in the field of institutional internationalisation. It is not unusual that a position categorised as academic staff in Table 4.3 is assumed by academic staff in one university but covered by administrative staff in another university. Broadly, national universities tend to appoint academic staff for academic advising and teaching duties, and administrative staff at private universities tend to cover a broader range of responsibilities than those who are in national universities. However, the practice depends on the circumstances in individual universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 4.3 Experts of institutional internationalisation in Japanese universities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International student advisor at an international office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching staff for international education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special teaching staff for international students at departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members at departments involving internationalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of academic staff, five types of experts can be found in most Japanese universities. These are: international student advisors at international office; teaching staff for international education; special teaching staff for international students at departments; study abroad advisors at international office; and faculty members at departments involving international education. International student advisors in international offices emerged in the late 1980s when international students increased on campuses of Japanese universities after the ‘100,000 international students plan’ was announced. Their scope of responsibilities is mostly similar with those assumed by international student advisors in the US higher education institutions (Tomita 2011). Teaching staff for international education provide classes regarding international education for international and domestic students.

---

37 For example, advising for international students and for domestic students’ studying abroad can be operated by the same staff, and in many universities a Vice-President for international education may assume director of an international office.
domestic students. Traditionally, a special subject for international students was created in the 1960s in a few national universities. They offered a special subject ‘Japanese language and Japanese studies’ at the undergraduate level. 38 Academic subjects in international education have developed at a speedy pace since the early 2000s. This tide arose from the Global 30 Project, which urged universities to open subjects taught in English to international students, and the Project for Promotion of Global Human Resource Development, which promoted internationalisation of the curriculum to make the educational settings on campus more globalised. To achieve these objectives, more teaching staff who could provide classes taught in English have been appointed in many universities. Several special teaching staff for international students at departments, who have been called as ryūgakusei senmon kyōiku kyōin 39 in Japanese, have been appointed since 1984 in departments of national universities with large number of international students (Yokota and Shiratsuchi 2004). Faculty members involved in internationalisation are engaged with various research, teaching and management activities at the department level. The last category, study abroad advisors at an international office, is for academics assisting students who wish to study abroad. Not only advising, but also they usually cover other responsibilities such as liaising partner universities overseas for effective operation of official student exchange programs.

Experts in the category of administrative units are: Vice-President for international education; director of international office; administrative staff at international office; those at divisions of international relations; those at international division in departments; and study abroad advisors. In many cases, directors of international office take the role of teaching staff for international and domestic students as well as having managerial responsibility in the office. General administrative staff are distributed in various administrative units, such as division of international students, international affairs, and international exchange. Although the organisational arrangement of divisions and sections varies in individual universities, in most cases these units cover the administrative matters in international education and university internationalisation. 40 Administrative staff are also allocated in departments where many international students are accommodated. In this position, they assume an administrative duty to take care of international students in their department. Administrative staff who take charge in advising study abroad mainly

38 Kyushu University, one of the former imperial universities, set the subject and teaching staff in 1961 for the first time in Japan (Yokota and Shiratsuchi 2004, 55).
39 The former title for them was ryūgakusei senmon kyōiku kyōkan before the incorporation in 2004.
40 Examples of responsibilities of general administrative staff are as follows: scholarships for international students; accommodation arrangement; visa procedures; clerical works on exchange programs; institutional exchange agreement with partner universities; and basic planning of strategies for institutional internationalisation.
deal with the administrative matters in advising, such as to provide outlines of programs, information on partner universities, and a variety of application conditions and schedules.

The practice of educational internationalisation in Japanese universities has been advanced by these experts in universities. In a practical sense, they do not separately but jointly work for effective educational internationalisation. The differentiation in roles between academics and administrative staff stems from the traditional governance style of Japanese universities, which was described in Chapter Three as jimukyoku and kyōjukai. The administrative function for international education has been in the hands of administrative staff in student affairs divisions or international exchange sections for a long time. International offices have been intensively built since the 1990s in many universities to appoint an emerging group of academic experts for international education. Academics and administrative staff have clearly been separated in these different organisational and personnel structures. However, the increasing complexity in university internationalisation has necessitated inputs from both groups, and the different organisations have necessarily worked together. While they are independent in organisational structure, they work interrelatedly in practice. This structure brings about a characteristic practice of management in Japanese universities.

The practice of university management shows that there has been a custom of collaborative relationship between academic and administrative staff as a characteristic norm of behaviour in Japanese universities. This collaborative relationship is expressed as kyōshoku kyōdō in Japanese, and many practices of kyōshoku kyōdō have been seen in different types of universities. Several studies have been conducted to conceptualise the kyōshoku kyōdō practice and to investigate its meaning and effectiveness for university functions. A couple of studies have given definitions to the concept, such as, “a state in which academic and administrative staff work together as partners on an equal position for a common purpose” (Komuro 2011), or “cooperative actions between academic and administrative staff for the purpose of realising institutional or departmental ideals and educational goals” (Ishii 2014). These situations can be seen in university management in many other countries so are not a particular feature of Japan. It is not unusual that academics assume a full-time managerial position in an international office to conduct administration of university internationalisation with the support of clerical workers under a cooperative relationship, which is commonly seen in many other countries. The fundamental difference in the feature of Japanese practice resides in the dual system of university governance which divides internal organisations into jimukyoku and kyōjukai. In a basic sense, jimukyoku affiliates administrative staff and organises administrative sections, such as an international affairs section, to accommodate administrative staff working for international relations. Different from such an administrative section, an international office is separately established in a university where academics are
positioned who in most cases have research backgrounds and belong to a kyōjukai. Therefore, in many cases Japanese universities hold at least two organisational units which take charge of institutional internationalisation from administrative responsibilities on the one side, and relatively academic responsibilities on the other side. This dual structure of organisations has created a unique concept of kyōshoku kyōdō in Japanese universities when separated internal organisational units by the jimukyoku and kyōjukai systems are in place for sharable institutional missions, for example, internationalisation.

The fundamental meaning contained in the concept of kyōshoku kyōdō is twofold. First, equality in the degree of engagement is demanded from both academics and administrative sides. In the kyōshoku kyōdō mode, these staff should deal with internationalisation projects jointly from different working positions and responsibilities on an equal footing, by sharing a value for internationalisation to their university. Second, academic and administrative staff should have mutual respect for the responsibilities on the partner’s side, and should not overly interfere with the partner’s domain. Sometimes there might emerge conflicts when one side violates the other side’s responsible territory, however, this should be settled down by institutional practice and the structural systems not blended. In a practical sense, the detail, degree and ways of materialisation of the kyōshoku kyōdō concept vary in different types of universities (Nishikawa 2014), and the significance of the concept to the practice of institutional internationalisation is not fully examined yet.

On the basis of these organisational arrangements, experts for educational internationalisation are mainly placed in an international office and administrative divisions, and in some cases distributed in various places in a university, from the central administration office to departments, if institutional capacity permits. These staff have been the main driving force for the promotion of educational or holistic institutional internationalisation. This is because specialisation of expertise in internationalisation has been enhanced by both national and institutional promotion. In particular, it was after the attainment of the ‘100,000 international students plan’ that strengthening of human resources in internationalisation has been stressed in a loud voice (CCE 2003). Most universities have taken dual measures for the development of human resources in the educational internationalisation dimension. On the one hand, they appointed more and more specialists in international education in both academic and administrative categories. On the other hand, they have promoted staff development for the purpose of fostering knowledge and a proactive attitude to educational internationalisation in existing university staff members (JSPS 2010). The trials of staff development in this area have been conducted in many universities for administrative staff in departments and other related organisational units. In both ways, most universities have approached
the enhancement of expertise in international education and university internationalisation in both quantitative and qualitative terms. However, an unavoidable problem arose at the national and institutional levels, the approaches have emphasised only a limited group of university staff in the field of institutional internationalisation. The values and responsibilities for internationalisation have not been extended to the majority of university staff. As a result, expertise in internationalisation has remained in a small group of staff in charge of internationalisation but has not diffused. This situation has formulated a particular pattern of the practice in internationalisation in Japanese universities which has been expressed as dejima-gata\(^1\), or an enclave style. This pattern of practice is characterised as being isolated from the traditional system of a university and caused difficulty in inspiring the regular university staff to adopt international engagement (van der Wende 1999; Ashizawa 2012). This setting can be referred to in this study as ‘specialised’, signifying that institutional internationalisation is conducted in a specifically customised manner but not blended with regular university activities.

Meanwhile, another pattern of behaviours in institutional internationalisation is also evident in Japanese universities. The concepts of ‘comprehensive internationalisation’ and ‘mainstreaming of internationalisation’ imply that all the university staff are involved with internationalisation through a facilitative culture for internationalisation. Such a practice has emerged in Japanese higher education, even though it is still marginal. The idea of sharing engagement in internationalisation with all university staff for holistic transformation has been gradually introduced to some universities which have been conducting the institutional internationalisation with a participatory environment (Oba 2011b; Ashizawa 2012).\(^2\) In this situation, institutional internationalisation is executed by a ‘universal’ approach, which means that all university staff, regardless of their responsibilities in whichever positions, share the value for internationalisation and commit themselves to institutional actions for internationalisation in some form or another. To varying degrees, all university staff in this approach would possess a mindset of engagement in internationalisation in relation to their own research, educational and administrative activities.

\(^1\) The term dejima (de- refers to ‘jutted out’, and -jima is conjugation of shima which means an ‘island’) originally refers to a place of foreign trading existed in Nagasaki Port when Edo Shogunate took seclusion policy from 1630s until the enactment of its opening regulation in 1856, for a commencement of the succeeding Meiji era. In order to permit limited trading with Portugal and the Netherlands, the Shogunate built an artificial reclaimed island of 1.5 hectare at the head of Nagasaki Port. The Shogunate imposed foreigners in dejima with a curfew and banned them from interacting with Japanese who lived outside of dejima.

\(^2\) Although the cases are still rare, a couple of universities are examples of this philosophy. Akita International University, a local public university, and Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University, a private university, are the cases. The commonality in both universities is that internationalisation is their raison d’être (Kudo and Hashimoto 2011), their identity and ‘lifeline’ (Kobata 2012, 2). Therefore all the staff must share the value for educational internationalisation and take a responsibility for international engagement (Kondo 2012, 3).
Figure 4.5 demonstrates the two patterns of educational internationalisation in Japanese universities discussed above. It signifies two patterns of institutional internationalisation: ‘specialised’ and ‘universal’. In the ‘specialised’ situation, the enhancement of educational internationalisation is limited to experts of internationalisation who are listed in Table 4.3. The other university staff merely have a marginal concern for and engagement with internationalisation activities, or extremely, having no interest to it. On the other hand, in the ‘universal’ state, all the university staff, from experts of educational internationalisation to staff in any other positions, commit themselves to educational internationalisation as one of their official responsibilities. In this setting, no one shows uninterested attitude to educational internationalisation because an idea of importance of educational internationalisation for their university’s life is shared by all. ‘Specialised’ and ‘universal’ are the extreme ends of a spectrum of culture of educational internationalisation. That is, in the practice of educational internationalisation, the cultural pattern of educational internationalisation in Japanese universities can be distributed on the spectrum between ‘specialised’ and ‘universal’.

![Diagram showing the two patterns of educational internationalisation]

4.3 Conclusion: Specific features of structures and cultures in the practice of institutional internationalisation in Japan

The main aim of this chapter was to understand Japan’s national peculiarity in terms of institutional internationalisation. It is true that, as informed by Chapter Three, institutional internationalisation has been greatly affected by powerful national policies. However, this chapter demonstrates that the practice of institutional internationalisation in Japanese universities has been conducted in diverse ways which have been affected not only by national policies but also by institutional internal and external conditions. The ways of internationalisation practice can be summarised into structural
approaches and cultural patterns of institutional behaviours. This chapter described specific features in structure and culture in the practice of institutional internationalisation in Japanese universities.

Structural approaches to internationalisation in Japanese universities are explained within the scope of centralised and decentralised directions. Both national regulations and institutional customs had shaped for a long time the decentralised management of internationalisation in most universities in Japan. Kyōjukai was the small governance and management system which had customarily been organised at departments in most universities. The dominance of kyōjukai in decision-making of almost everything enclosed the process of internationalisation within each department, which caused fragmentation of international initiatives at the institution level. However, a change was introduced through the incorporation of national universities, which influenced all sector types of universities towards a centralised approach. The amendment of the School Education Law in 2015 to reduce the power of kyōjukai would promote further centralisation. However, the full effect of this measure is still unknown as universities are generally resistant to a radical change (Sporn 1996; Bartell 2003).

From the cultural point of view, the pattern of institutional internationalisation is operated in the directions between expert-led and inclusive. A national initiative in the early 1990s to establish an international office in major national universities encouraged universities to form an institutional-wide system for acceptance of international students. The system then extended to cover more responsibilities in institutional internationalisation. Over one-fourth of national universities and most private universities had established a university-wide international office by 2015. An increasing number of practitioners of academic and administrative staff have been employed in those international offices, departments and the central administration offices. These staff are known by different vocational titles, such as international student advisors, teaching staff for international education, administrative staff at international office, and so on. However, they are collectively identified as experts who conduct a variety of internationalisation activities. In most Japanese universities, they have assumed a managerial responsibility as the ‘hub’ for operation of educational internationalisation. The practitioners of institutional internationalisation have executed their expertise at each position and place of work, in order to conduct the institutional or departmental goals of internationalisation. In this situation, the majority of university staff have been usually isolated and play only a marginal part in the university’s international engagement. This study named this expert-led pattern as ‘specialised’. On the other hand, as the concepts of ‘comprehensive internationalisation’ and ‘mainstreaming internationalisation’ imply, there has emerged an alternative practice of educational internationalisation in Japanese university cultures. ‘Universal’ was the term that this study uses to describe this pattern, in which all university staff
engage with internationalisation by embracing the value for educational internationalisation in their research, education and administration activities.

This chapter also captured other important factors which appear to affect the practice of institutional internationalisation. In particular, the institutional practice of internationalisation in Japan is such that senior leadership and the concept of kyōshoku kyōdō appear to be two significant components in the practice of internationalisation in many universities. Senior leadership in university administration has been urged to be strengthened by the national government since the 2000s, and it has gradually been fostered in many universities. How senior leadership affects institutional practice and affects the construction of institutional structures and cultures becomes a significant consideration for this study. The concept of kyōshoku kyōdō, which describes the collaborative relationship between academic and administrative practitioners, has supported distinctive approaches to institutional internationalisation in Japanese universities. How this unique relationship between university staff is demonstrated for the practice in institutional internationalisation is also of much importance to the present study. The case studies which will be presented in Chapters Six through Nine will show to what extent these findings can explain the reality of institutional internationalisation in Japanese universities. Before moving to the results of case studies, the next chapter will explain the research design.
Chapter Five
Research design: Data collection, analysis and conceptual framework

This chapter explains the conduct of this study. The previous chapters proposed the purposes and questions of this study and elaborated these through a literature review on the internationalisation of higher education as a concept and practice, and how internationalisation has been developed in Japanese universities at the national policy and institutional practice levels. As demonstrated in Chapter One, the research questions of this study are to investigate the institutional structures and cultures which have an impact on the operation of educational internationalisation in Japanese universities. The main body of the research questions are to explore factors in structures and cultures which are perceived in the practice of institutional internationalisation, how the perceived structures and cultures have been formed in individual universities, how those factors affect the institutional internationalisation, and how the structures and cultures relate each other in practice. The research design was developed to explore these questions.

The next sections begin with methodology. First, the qualitative research paradigm which was applied to this study is discussed. Then, the strategies for case study and semi-structured interview are explained as the most appropriate for this study. In addition, as this study uses qualitative approach the roles of the researcher are important to be elaborated here. Following this is a section on the research procedure. The practical methods that were chosen for the study are described in detail. It is demonstrated that the process of semi-structured interview which is conducted for the main part of data collection, justification of sample cases in Japanese universities, and how the interview data were collected and analysed. Finally, the conceptual models for institutional structure and culture are explained that guided the study in the practice of institutional internationalisation in Japan.

5.1 Research strategy

In light of the purposes and research questions of this study mentioned above, I employed a qualitative approach, using a case study strategy and interview method. This section examines the overall characteristics of the qualitative approach, the case study and semi-structured interview strategies to justify why this study adopted them.

5.1.1 Qualitative research paradigm

Studies in social sciences have developed major three types of research methods. These are: qualitative method; quantitative method; and mixed method (Creswell 2009). While these three
approaches are adopted widely in the study area, their perspectives, focuses and strategies are different.

Quantitative approach seeks to identify cause and effect for a certain phenomenon. Researchers in quantitative research usually take a positivist or post-positivist orientation as a philosophical paradigm (Creswell 2009), which looks at the assured reality. In this paradigm, the reality “exists ‘out there’ and it is observable, stable, and measurable” (Merriam 2009, 8). Research through quantitative approaches basically predetermines one or several factors which are derived from related theories, builds a hypothesis deduced from the theories and tries to verify it by setting artificial contexts, such as experiments in laboratories or surveys. Because researchers seek to identify the causality of the factors and outcomes, other elements in natural contexts that may act as obstructions need to be removed in testing. The major results are depicted as numerical data, which are validated by statistical procedures. Overall, the main focuses in quantitative approach are on the ‘facts’ and their relation to a phenomenon, and on a generalisation of the results and application of the findings to future similar events.

The qualitative paradigm adopts a contrasting approach. Rather than the causality of observable factors, this approach seeks to acquire understanding of the meanings of phenomena. Typical philosophies are labelled as social constructivism (Creswell 2009) or interpretive (Merriam 2009) paradigms. These conceptions assure the reality is complex and cannot be understood without an explanation of a certain context where the reality is observed. In the constructivist view, there is not a sole reality but we see “multiple realities, or interpretations, of a single event” (Merriam 2009, 8) in phenomena. The major concern of qualitative research is to locate the meanings that individuals render to their lived experiences. Taking its roots in anthropology and traditional sociologies, the qualitative approach has been increasingly used since the late 1970s in applied social sciences fields such as education, health, administration, social work, and so on (Merriam 2009). This is because these fields of applied social sciences seek mainly to uncover phenomena for the individuals involved, rather than to determine the causality of events as independent phenomena. In addition, qualitative approach is an appropriate method when a theme of the intended research treats relatively new problems and has not been addressed as yet, or, even though a related theory may exist it still needs to be elaborated. From these features, qualitative research is recognised as an empirical and exploratory approach, and appropriate for studies that seek to uncover important variables for the phenomenon (Creswell 2009). The third approach, mixed method, is adopted for research that would be inadequate if using only quantitative or qualitative approaches.

In light of the purposes and research questions, this study employed a qualitative approach for the
following reasons. Firstly, as shown in Chapter Four, the internationalisation of education in universities is collectively a single phenomenon but embraces multiple realities. It has been developed by institutional interpretations where related people have rendered different meanings. In order to understand the features of institutional internationalisation, the study needs to investigate how university people perceive, comprehend and give meanings to their ways of internationalisation. Secondly, structures and cultures are embedded in the contexts where the internationalisation is practically conducted. Both factors entail peculiar institutional profiles and characteristics. Institutional internationalisation cannot be understood in isolation from particular situations. It needs to be investigated within the context. Therefore, rather than setting the isolated conditions apart from the reality, entering the field of practice is an appropriate way to explore the institutional internationalisation as a phenomenon. Thirdly, generally speaking, research on the institutional internationalisation has not been active in the study field of higher education in Japan. In order to uncover the phenomenon of institutional internationalisation and to theorise it, an empirical approach is appropriate to shed light on important factors for the institutional internationalisation in Japanese universities.

5.1.2 Case study and semi-structured interview

There are many types of methods within the qualitative research paradigm. Merriam (2009) summarises seven types of qualitative research. They are: basic qualitative research; phenomenology; ethnography; grounded theory; narrative analysis; critical qualitative research; and case study (p. 38). Creswell (2009) also lists some classic paradigms used in qualitative research, such as ethnography, grounded theory, case studies, phenomenological research and narrative research (p. 13). Comparing the advantages and limitations of these strategies and considering the research purpose and questions of this study, I chose the case study as a strategy for investigating the research questions of concern to this study.

The case study as a research strategy is defined by Stake (1995) as “the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances” (p. xi). This strategy is taken when a researcher wants to explore “in depth a program, event, activity process, or one or more individuals” (Creswell 2009, 13). Case study research can be categorised in three ways. First, Yin (2009) defines case study by focussing on the research process. She identifies it as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. 18). Second, Stake (2005) emphasises more on the unit of study. That is, case study concerns ‘what’ is learnt by research, rather than the study process. Third, Miles and Huberman (1994) refer to case “as a phenomenon of some sort occurring in a bounded context” (p.
Thus, research by case study should have specific units of analysis, not a theme or topic of investigation.\footnote{For example, if a researcher is interested in how immigrant children learn a native language which is the second language for them, qualitative research would be the best approach but a case study method is not suitable, because the unit of analysis is still abstract and unspecified large number of immigrant children should be chosen for the study. If this concern should be treated as a case study, specificity or particularity is necessary to set the practical unit, for instance, country of origin of children, age of children, language to be learnt, language learning program, or a particular child learner.} Because of focussing on the case, a researcher can attempt to understand the interaction of critical factors which are particularly characteristic in the phenomenon. The case, which means the unit of study, can be a single person, a program, a group, an institution, a community, or a specific policy (Merriam 2009, 40).

Punch (2005) identifies four important elements in case studies (p. 145). First, as already mentioned above, cases have boundaries. A particular situation, program or phenomenon becomes the focus of case studies, as “(t)his specificity of focus makes it an especially good design for practical problems” (Merriam 2009, 43). Because the case refers to a ‘bounded system’, boundaries should be identified as clearly as possible (Punch 2005). Second, the decided case stands for something broader context than the case itself. Therefore, it is important to identify what the case chosen represents and to grasp the relation of the case to the broader context, in order to build a logical structure of the research. Third, case studies treat the research context as holistic, and try to preserve the wholeness. As context-dependent knowledge is the central to be understood by case studies, the description of the study is holistic. Because of this characteristic, the product of case studies becomes rich and ‘thick’ descriptions of the phenomenon (Merriam 2009). Last, there is a tendency to use multiple data collection methods in case studies, and those data are likely to be collected in naturalistic settings. Interviews, observations, narrative reports etcetera are mostly used as research methods.

Given these features, case studies are suitable for research concerning “complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon” (Merriam 2009, 50). Because they focus on ‘real life’ contexts in depth, they can produce thick and holistic discourses of a particular phenomenon, providing deep and expanded insights regarding factors and those relations within the phenomenon which would not have been gained otherwise. These strong points of case studies have attracted various applied social science fields such as education, health, social work, and so on (Merriam 2009). Punch (2005) also points out a valuable contribution of case studies for research into situations where the knowledge has not been accumulated and is incomplete. According to Punch (2005), the advantages of case studies are in the ways where a case under studied is “unusual, unique or yet understood, building an in-depth
understanding of the case is valuable”, and where the case involves complex social behaviour, to
discover the important features in it, construct an understanding and conceptualise them for further
study, by in-depth approach of case studies (p. 147-148).

Some limitations have been identified for case studies that should be considered at the data
collection and analysis. Conducting a research in a specific context and producing rich and thick
descriptions requires a certain amount of time and financial resource, as the researcher should visit
certain site(s) of the case(s) for enough periods of time to collect data. In addition, in keeping with
other qualitative research methods, the researcher’s skill affects data collection and analysis.
Researchers using the case study strategy should prepare for implementing research with adequate
skills for investigation, including the skill of observation, interviewing, and writing, because the
researcher is the primary tool for data collection and analysis. Other than these skills, it is also
important to understand that the researcher’s background, the prior experiences of the researcher
and his/her role in the research, will influence the collection and analysis of data to a certain extent.
Because some case studies treat negative or very unique cases, ethical problems should be taken
much into account to protect the actors, too. Furthermore, some critiques put stress on a question of
generalizability (Punch 2005; Merriam 2009). Punch (2005) asserts that generalizability is not
intrinsic to case studies as well as other qualitative research, because in some qualitative research
particular cases that are clearly different from the general pattern of other cases are worthy of
research and the peculiarity itself is important for them. However, if the research is to quest for
broader applicability, a case study can bear generalizable results by conceptualising or developing
propositions (Punch 2005). Through attempting conceptualisation of one or more of new findings
by in-depth research of case study, a researcher can provide some general aspects identified by the
study and which are applicable to broader situations. In addition, through case study research, a
researcher also can develop propositions, or hypotheses, by which factors or concepts are linked
together and tested its applicability in other situations.

Flyvbjerg (2006) presents another point of view towards the generalizability criticism. According to
Flyvbjerg, the criticism derives from a strong belief in natural scientific research fields such as
larger and anonymous data samples outweigh specific and context-oriented samples, or, “general,
theoretical (context-independent) knowledge is more valuable than concrete, particular
(context-dependent) knowledge” (Flyvbjerg 2006, 221). However, the long history of qualitative
research has shown that context-dependent knowledge is highly valuable in relation with human
activities, and Flyvbjerg (2006) asserts that “(s)ocial science has not succeeded in producing
general, context-independent theory and thus, has in the final instance nothing else to offer than
concrete context-dependent knowledge” (p. 223). He goes further to conclude that case study is a
method well-suited to produce this kind of knowledge.

Having gone through the discussions on definition, features, advantages and limitations of the case study, it is reasonable to conclude that this research appropriately uses the case study method for data collection and analysis. This study takes up the development of institutional structures and cultures which are built by people engaged with educational internationalisation in Japanese universities. The purpose is to understand how they perceive and interpret institutional structures and cultures through the practice of educational internationalisation. With regard to the unit of the case, university people who are involved in the particular international education programs at the institutional level are employed.

Although different qualitative research use different types of methods in accordance with their purpose and research questions, there are three major methods seen in the field of qualitative research: interview; observation; and document analysis (Punch 2005; Creswell 2009; Merriam 2009). These three methods are commonly used in the case study strategy (Stake 1995). In particular, the qualitative interview is a method of interaction of perspectives “between two persons conversing about a theme of mutual interest” (Kvale 1996, 2). According to Merriam (2009), interview is ‘the most common form of data collection in qualitative studies’ (p. 86). The interview method is the best for researchers who have interest in understanding the concerned peoples’ lived experience, because it enables them to “access to the context of people’s behaviour and thereby provides a way for researchers to understand the meaning of that behaviour” (Seidman 2009, 9-10). Interviews guide a research to collect and interpret “people’s perceptions, meanings, definitions of situations and constructions of reality” (Punch 2005, 168). Among many methods for collecting data sources, interview becomes a primary technique when a research needs to know “behaviour, feelings, or how they interpret the world around” of the actors and researchers are not be able to know them through other tactics, such as observation (Merriam 2009, 88). It is also essential if the research concerns past events which cannot be reproduced (ibid.). Since the purpose of this study is to explore the actors’ belief, values, knowledge, way of thinking and also their past experiences, interview is a suitable method to be adopted.

In principle, the interview method is to ask questions relating to the purposes and questions of the research, and to receive answers from interviewees. Although this may sound simple, approaches in interview varies. A wide range of interview styles has been devised in the past qualitative research and they are roughly categorised as structured, semi-structured and unstructured interviews (Punch 2005; Merriam 2009). Although categorisation is helpful to understand the variety of interview methods, in practice, many research use interview technique by moving between structured and
unstructured manners of questioning. Which manner should be adopted and how to arrange and deliver interview questions depend on the research purposes, questions and environments. Considering the characteristics of the three above mentioned styles of interviews and relating them with the purposes and questions of the present study, this study adopted a semi-structured interview as the more appropriate method. Semi-structured interviews allow researchers to prepare interview questions to focus more on the research concern than unstructured interviews, and more flexible than structured interviews in conducting the interview sessions that will promote interviewees’ free-flowing responses. This method makes it possible to elicit important points to be explored which are unexpected until the sessions are conducted. While this study pins down the primary elements in structure and culture by literature review and building concept models, it is also expected that other influential elements would be elicited by interviews with practitioners of educational internationalisation.

5.1.3 Roles of researcher
Because the purpose of qualitative research is to describe, understand and interpret phenomena, researchers enter the fields where the phenomena occur, rather than create experimental settings in a laboratory. A researcher cannot be a neutral, machine-like person but to some extent influences the phenomenon under studied, due to his or her role in the research activities. The foreseeable influential elements of researchers are, for example, their appearance, backgrounds, past experiences, assumptions, purposes and concerns they hold for the research, and so on. Much caution is needed to ensure researchers do not distort the data collection and analysis. Rather than considering this as solely detrimental to the implementation of research, this engagement can be seen in a positive way and can contribute to a great extent to the research design and analysis in qualitative research, because as already mentioned, knowledge in social sciences is intrinsically embedded in the context, and researchers are also considered as a part of the context. In order to maximise the advantages of the researcher’s role, it is important to be reflexive about his/her identity, values, personal background of the researcher and to explicit them as much as possible (Creswell 2009).

There are at least two aspects of my own background that are necessary to declare for data collection and analysis for this study. They are positions as a researcher and an interviewer. My concerns for the research problem, the purpose of the study and my past experience in Japanese higher education scene have shaped my thinking. Especially, my personal experience of working at two universities shaped my interest in the research problem and the purpose of the study, which is to understand organisational structures and cultures of people working for international education programs in Japanese universities. My vocational experiences started with a university staff
appointment since April 2001 at one large national, former imperial university in Japan. More than three-years working experience as a secretary to the Vice-President in charge of student affairs and a subsequent position at the department of student affairs made me aware of international exchange programs in the university and efforts for the development of the programs by faculty and administrative staff members. After studying for a Master’s degree in the field of higher education policy and practice in a university in the UK from 2004 to 2005, I came back to the same university as a research associate to work with the internationalisation of university management for one and a half years. During this term, I expanded my practical knowledge and personal networking in the context of Japanese universities, especially, internationalisation of Japanese universities. I later moved to a different geographical area in Japan and resumed work at another large national university from April 2008. My five-year working experience there until April 2013 included a wide range of activities, such as, development of short-term study abroad programs for domestic and international students, promotion of the university to overseas students, operation of undergraduate degree programs for international students, establishment of an international program which aims to foster global talents with domestic students, and so on. These activities could not be accomplished without team work with other university staff, through which I realised the importance of structure building and awareness of a culture formed in related staff. Another experience in the work at this university was that I joined two inter-university research groups which studied university internationalisation in Japan. Through the engagement in the research groups which consisted of academics from different universities in Japan, I gained knowledge of the variation that exists in educational internationalisation in different types of Japanese universities. This background may admittedly bring certain biases to this study. While every effort has been made to assure objectiveness, these elements may affect my points of view in the data collection and analysis to some extent.

As for the role of interviewer, the following three points should be taken into account. First, as the research will be conducted by face-to-face interview, the interviewees may have perceived my visible identity, such as gender, age and ethnic origin, from my appearance. Most of the interviewees shared the same ethnic identity as Japanese with me, though age groups were diverse in them and some interviewees were in a different gender category from me. I tried to set off these varieties so that they would not influence the data taking as much as possible. Second, ‘invisible’ identity should also be taken into account. In addition to my vocational background in Japanese universities as described above, my status as a Ph.D. student in an Australian university was presented to the interviewees by both written format and oral communication, too. This invisible identity may have affected the interviewees in the way that they would be extremely attentive to my research purposes and speak only in accordance with my research concerns. In order to avoid those
possibilities, I attracted their attention at the beginning of the interview session to the need to talk faithfully to their views, experiences and knowledge. Third, my manner and attitude at each interview session also would influence the data collection to a modest extent. In the semi-structured interview method, the interviewer plays the role of facilitator or moderator of the sessions so that they can elicit information as rich as possible from the interviewees. For this end, I endeavoured to assume an attitude of being proactive to receive any answers, but neutral to the content of their discourses. On the other hand, the interviewer should also be careful not to press interviewees for answers. “Being respectful, non-judgemental, and nonthreatening” is a fundamental principle for the interviewer (Merriam 2009, 107). Interactive and communicative attitude is an iron law for building a healthy relationship with interviewees, and this manner of communication brings rich data which comes with validity and reliability.

5.2 Research procedure

5.2.1 Selecting cases
Merriam (2009) contends that qualitative research should select the research context “purposefully” (p. 178). This means that in contrast to quantitative research which seeks randomised large number of sample, qualitative research sets certain site(s) or participant(s) that are aptly selected in harmony with the research aim. In addition, careful consideration should be to “the setting (where the research will take place), the actors (who will be observed or interviewed), the events (what the actors will be observed or interviewed doing), and the process (the evolving nature of events undertaken by the actors within the setting)” (Merriam 2009, 178, italicised in original). Applying these points of concern to this research one by one, I chose Japanese universities and their international education programs as the setting of this study, university staff who work for educational internationalisation as the actors, and the events and the development and operation of international education programs as the process.

5.2.1.1 Typology of universities in Japan
As shown in Chapter Four, the landscape of universities in Japan is characterised by diversity and hierarchical structure. Japan has approximately 780 universities divided in national, local public and private sector. When we look at these three types of universities by student capacity, the great majority of private and local public universities are small in institutional size, with only 7% of private universities being large. National universities are spread evenly across large, middle and small size. When it comes to the study fields they offer, more national universities provide study opportunities in natural sciences and engineering than private and local public universities.
Although a small number of large private universities offer comprehensive areas of studies, many private universities provide programs of social sciences and humanities.

These differing characteristics in sector type and institutional size appear to affect the diverse practice of educational internationalisation in the Japanese universities. The following three research focus on the sector types and institutional size to propose categorisation of Japanese universities in terms of their practice of internationalisation.

As already mentioned in Chapter Four, different meanings are assured by Japanese universities when they use a single term ‘internationalisation’. By comparing international student numbers and the ratio to those of domestic students at many universities, Goodman (2007) classifies Japanese universities into elite national universities, elite private universities and middle and lower-level private universities. This typology explains different rationales of internationalisation. For elite national universities, where more graduate international students come to study than undergraduates, the recruitment of international students assists in participation in the competing international world of academic research. Elite private universities take advantage of having a large number of international students to maintain their positive image of being ‘international’, and attract more domestic students who want to study at multicultural campuses. For middle and lower-level private universities which have struggled with a shortage of applicants in Japan’s aging society, fee-paying international applicants add significantly to revenue. Goodman points out that research on institutional internationalisation should pay more attention to the rationale that different types of university adopt, and the difference in rationale can be explained to a great extent by varieties in the sectors (national or private) and institutional academic capacity (elite or middle/lower level).

Yonezawa et al. (2009) go further into the variance in national and private universities for their study of the behaviours in internationalisation initiatives. Based on a questionnaire survey to leaders who are responsible for international activities in all universities in Japan, Yonezawa et al. demonstrate characteristic difference in internationalisation between national and private universities. According to them, national universities, whose main reason for internationalisation is international competitiveness in research, tend to run exchange programs offered in English for graduate students and academics, so that they can pursue high academic performance. In contrast, private universities place importance on education in an internationalised atmosphere, and they tend to prepare international learning environments for domestic undergraduate students such as foreign language study programs. Furthermore, Yonezawa et al. also note that a small number of large comprehensive private universities have a tendency of adopting a favourable position in both
research and education. They even show higher potential advantages for the internationalisation of education than elite national universities, as they would have more financial and human resources to support internationalisation. Their analysis and discussion bring findings that sector types and institutional capacity influence institutional behaviours in internationalisation.

Kudo and Hashimoto (2011) depart from public-private dichotomisation to emphasise more complex approaches in institutional internationalisation. As reviewed partly in Chapter Four, they set five different approaches in performance of institutional internationalisation. They are: global; innovative; *ad hoc*; pseudo-international; and non-international approaches. The global approach is taken by research-oriented flagship elite universities, whether national or private. These universities hold more international research students than undergraduates, enjoy higher positions in domestic and international rankings, and tend to join in international research and educational networks such as Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU)\(^{44}\) and Association of East Asian Research Universities (AEARU)\(^{45}\), in quest of world status in research and entrepreneurship. The second category is innovative universities, which are characterised by their novel initiatives for internationalisation. They tend to be smaller than global universities and do not regard world rankings as important because of their smallness and insufficient research capacity. Rather, they have clear missions and goals for internationalisation and are relatively wealthy in implementing international activities. The rationale for internationalisation for *ad hoc* universities is simply to meet the minimum requirement and their university-wide mission and goals for internationalisation are not well-established. Pseudo-international approach is for universities which do not have clear rationales but recruit international students to cover the shortage of student quota. Lastly, universities with no-international approach do not show any strong intention for conducting international activities. In advancing their typology, they conclude that diversity in internationalisation deeply interlinks with the hierarchical structure of universities in Japan.

The discussion above raises two important conditions for selecting sample universities for conducting the case studies of this study. Firstly, institutional size is an important factor for categorisation of universities. In particular, this research selects universities of large and middle scale because earlier research points out that many small-scale universities tend to have a basic difficulty in operating proactive internationalisation because of the shortage of financial and staff resources (Goodman 2007; Kudo and Hashimoto 2011). As this study investigates the ways for effective institutional internationalisation, cases should be chosen from universities which conduct

---

\(^{44}\) APRU is an association to build a network of premier research universities around the Pacific Rim region. http://apru.org/

\(^{45}\) AEARU is a forum for the presidents of leading research-oriented universities in East Asia with an aim of mutual exchanges between the major universities in the region. http://www.aearu.org/
internationalisation initiatives with proactive policy, resources and attitudes at the institutional level. Although small-scale universities are excluded from data collection and analysis, the discussion will include them in considering the implications for future improvement in their internationalisation strategy and practice.

Secondly, the type of sectors is another important criterion which may affect the practice of educational internationalisation. Universities are operated by different institutional regulations and source of finance. National universities are guided by National University Corporation Act, and operational grant is subsidised by the national government accompanying with an annual report. Private universities follow the Private Schools Act. Their main revenue comes from students’ tuition fees, though they receive a small portion of operating expenditure from the government. Although both sectors have the same social mission as educational institutions, the differences in operational framework and those of the main sponsors must influence their different rationales and behaviours for internationalisation. Local public universities are operated under an alternative legislative system and subject to supervision from local municipal government. It is difficult to generalise for the modes of internationalisation in local public universities because different local authorities emphasise different aspects of activities for local public universities (Yonezawa et al. 2009). From these reasons, this research recognises type of sectors as an important factor for investigating the research questions and adopts national and private sectors for selecting the sample universities.

5.2.1.2 Justification of sampling universities, international education programs and interview participants

In light of the two factors of sector types and institutional size, four universities were selected for this study. These are called Hoshi University, Niji University, Tsuki University and Sora University as pseudonyms in this study. Each university typifies two factors of two levels: national/large-scale; private/large-scale; national/middle-scale; and private/middle-scale, respectively. All the universities present proactive attitudes towards the internationalisation of education at the whole university level.

With regard to international education programs in the four sample universities, the following points are taken into account for the selection:

- The sample universities provide practical international education program(s) at the institutional level for mainly undergraduate students to realise the university’s aims and goals for internationalisation of education, and
The programs seem to have a certain impact on the internationalisation of education as a whole within the sample universities’ overall scheme of undergraduate education.

In terms of interview participants, the following members at each sample university were invited for the interview sessions:

- Vice-Presidents in charge of university internationalisation, educational internationalisation and/or undergraduate education
- Directors of an international offices at the institutional level of the sample universities
- Practitioners of the selected international education programs: mainly responsible for coordination
- The same as the above: mainly responsible for administration
- The same as the above: mainly responsible for teaching
- Coordinators of undergraduate education, and
- Other staff members in departments who have fully or partially responsibility of educational internationalisation in their departments

All of interview respondents had experience of working with the internationalisation of education within their individual responsibilities. Vice-Presidents for internationalisation and/or undergraduate education have a responsibility for supervising institutional initiatives for internationalisation especially in the educational dimension. Directors of an international office organise university-wide initiatives for educational internationalisation and some particular international education programs at the institutional level. In order to put each program into practice, practitioners are assigned at the coordination, administration and teaching phases. Coordinators for undergraduate education comprehensively cope with undergraduate education, which partly but importantly includes the planning and implementation of internationalisation. Other regular academic and administrative staff members at departments are responsible for educational internationalisation and related initiatives in their departments.

5.2.2 Collecting data
I approached potential participants of the interview by the following steps. At the first stage, I contacted a director of international education programs, Vice-Presidents for internationalisation and/or undergraduate education and a coordinator of undergraduate education in the sample four universities through contact lists which were published on the official website of each university. I explained the intention of the study and asked their support for the interview research. Once an approval of participation was obtained from them, I asked a list of potential interviewees to contact.
Then I contacted each potential interviewee via email to request participation in the interview sessions and exchanged email with them after acquiring their permission of participation. In summary, 40 participants in four universities were invited to the interview sessions. All respondents received a consent form and a Plain Language Statement in both English and Japanese versions before the individual sessions were conducted so that they could better understand the purpose of the study and procedure of the interview session.

The main data collection was conducted from June to July, 2014. The interviews were face-to-face, one interviewee at one session. Only when the situation did not permit, for example an assigned interviewee would be away for business trip during the schedule, an interview over the internet phone was conducted. In the end, all the sessions were conducted on a face-to-face base and only one case was processed via an internet phone. The interviewer stayed in the sample universities for about one week to conduct interviews with interviewees on the campuses where they work. This visit and stay in the university place helped me to be familiar with the climate on campus of the universities by seeing to what extent the institutional policy for educational internationalisation is noticed to university members (for example, by looking around notice boards at different places on campus, to what extent the international education initiatives attracted students by looking at their visit to the international office, and so on).

Although the length of the interview session varied, typically these lasted approximately one hour each. All the interviewees were fluent Japanese speakers, and the language used during the session was Japanese. The interview sessions started with a short briefing on the purpose of the interview and seeking permission to record conversations. The interviewer also explained the details of the consent form and asked the interviewees to sign their signature. All the interviewees agreed to the conditions of the interview and signed the form. The consent form is attached as Appendix A.

Next, the interviewer moved to the main body of the interview session. The main part of the interview started with general issues around individual interviewees’ working environment such as their experience as a practitioner of educational internationalisation, responsibilities of their current position, and so on. Then the questions gradually narrowed the focus down into the main body of the study. I prepared the following list of interview topics to ensure the smooth conduct of the sessions. These questions were not necessarily used one by one in the interview sessions because the interviewer let interviewees talk about the topics of their interest as far as they wished. Only when I sensed the conversation should move to the next topic, I raised another question. In most cases, I provided only a few key questions to cover most of the interests of this study. Therefore, the wording and order of questions varied from session to session on the basis of semi-structured
interview method.

(1) The overall picture of internationalisation of education of your university
- What are the distinguishing characters of your university in terms of internationalisation?
- Do you think internationalisation of education is necessary for your university? Why?
- What are advantages/challenges at your university to conduct educational internationalisation?
- In your opinion, what direction will your university take for the internationalisation of education in the future?

(2) The target international education program
- What are distinguished characters of your program?
- Why was the program started and developed? Please tell me the background of development of the program.
- Do you think the program influences the whole undergraduate education at your university? In what ways is the program influential?
- Are there any things you have found as advantages/challenges for conducting the program?

(3) Impacts of university structure and culture on the internationalisation of education
- How can you describe the structure of your university in terms of the international dimension? In what conditions are the international initiatives conducted?
- Do you think the structure of your university influences the implementation of educational internationalisation? How and to what extent is the structure you described influential?
- How can you describe the culture of your university in terms of international dimension? How the international initiatives are conducted on the daily basis?
- Do you think the culture of your university influences the practice of educational internationalisation? How and to what extent is the culture you described influential?
- Do you think the structure and culture at both the institutional and program level affect each other for the practice of internationalisation of education?

Interview sessions were recorded by a digital voice recorder with permission from each interviewee. The interviewer took notes right after the conversations in individual sessions. This note-taking helped not only pick up quickly and sharply the important points of the interviewees, but also provide feedback and improvement for the coming interview sessions.

5.2.3 Analysing data

Merriam (2009) points out that data analysis straight after the data collection, or simultaneous
process of those activities, is essential in qualitative research. At the end of each session as well as each day of the interview sessions, all the data and notes which were taken on-site were intensively reviewed to gather ideas for data analysis. The recorded data were transcribed by the researcher. Some parts of the interview data which were very important for discussion and would be potentially quoted were translated in English. Translation in English was verified by a native speaker of English who could also speak Japanese fluently and had sound comprehension of Japanese.

In terms of the data analysis, I basically followed Kvale’s six steps for interview analysis (Kvale 1996, 187-190). Kvale provides the following steps in the interview session, in which the first three steps are conducted during the interview sessions and the latter three steps are done after the sessions.

1. Interviewees describe their lived experiences during the interview. There is not interpretation or explanation by either the interviewees or the interviewer.

2. The interviewees themselves discover new meanings in their experiences. The subjects start to realise the relationship of their expressed descriptions with their lived world, without interpretation of the interviewer.

3. The interviewer condenses and interprets the meanings of the descriptions of interviewees during the interview. It helps as an opportunity of “self-correction” of the meanings of descriptions between the interviewees and the interviewer.

4. After the interview sessions, the interviewer transcribes the interview to interpret what the interviewees delivered.

5. The researcher would possibly step forward to “re-interview” by giving the interpretations back to the interviewees, and

6. The interviewees and the interviewer both possibly join together for new actions which are brought by the products of the interview.

With regard to the fourth step, I conducted interpretation of the data as follows. Firstly, the researcher intensively read and re-read the transcription of the interviews. This work was conducted together with listening to the voice records at necessary timings in order to confirm nuances in discourses which might not appear on the transcribed texts. This phase helped me to be familiar with the individual interviewees’ experiences in their work and perceptions to the interviewed themes. Then, I grouped the transcription into some clusters of meanings to find major themes for coding. This step assisted me to grasp the interviewees’ understandings, perceptions, rationalisation of the phenomena more in detail. The next step was to code and categorise the data by the meanings.
This step was taken for finding some important themes emerging from the interview data. The final phase was to find the specific topics that emerged from the interview data and its analysis. At this stage I read carefully the interpretation of the data and returned to the raw transcription many times to finalise the categorisation. At last, I found the following four main topics for the data analysis and discussion: (1) the approach to institutional educational internationalisation at the sample universities as structural aspects of the practice; (2) the pattern of behaviours in the practice of educational internationalisation at the sample universities; (3) other important factors in structural and cultural aspects; and (4) the relationship between the factors determined to be institutional structures and cultures at the sample universities.

In order to secure the validity and reliability of data analysis, other explicit data were utilised. These were any written statements about policy and practice in the internationalisation of education in the sample universities which were described on their official websites, formal documents including newsletters, pamphlets, records of related conferences, other informal documents such as memoranda by the interviewees, and other related academic papers in domestic and international journals.

5.3 Conceptual models: Quadrants of structure and culture in the practice of institutional internationalisation

Chapter Four discussed the variation of structures and cultures in Japanese universities in terms of the practice of institutional internationalisation. In the structural settings, Japanese universities have taken centralised or decentralised management for the operation of institutional internationalisation. And as the cultural conditions, they have fostered ‘specialised’ or ‘universal’ patterns of practice in the internationalisation management. These structural and cultural settings relate each other to build distinctive patterns of internationalisation in individual universities. To better understand and describe this situation, hypothetical conceptual models have been created to guide the case studies. Before moving to a discussion of the hypothetical models, it should be kept in mind that reducing complex organisational characteristics of institutional structures and cultures to two simple dimensions, such as in the following models, cannot represent the greater complexity that is the reality of internationalisation. However, for the sake of making comparisons and providing a simple and interpretable analysis, the models have practical utility for this study.

Figure 5.1 represents the four quadrants of the structure and culture in institutional educational internationalisation practice. The four quadrants can be labelled as ‘strategic educational internationalisation at the core’ (centralised/specialised), ‘comprehensive educational internationalisation’ (centralised/universal), ‘coordinated educational internationalisation in
decentralisation’ (decentralised/specialised), and ‘mainstreaming educational internationalisation’ (decentralised/universal). It should also be noted that the four models are constructed conceptually. In practice, the coexistence of different models in one institution can occur. However, the models are developed to help analyse and interpret the data collected for this study. Each model is discussed in the following subsections, focusing on the influential factors on the structure and culture of institutional internationalisation practice.
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**Figure 5.1** Conceptual models of the practice of educational internationalisation in Japanese universities

### 5.3.1 Model 1: Strategic educational internationalisation at the core

The first model ‘strategic educational internationalisation at the core’ is located at cell 1 in Figure 5.1. This type is characterised by strong central leadership that is tightly supported by intensive expertise of educational internationalisation at the core. In universities in this category, the central administration office develops clear policy and strategies for educational internationalisation which are planned in the light of the rationale for their international engagement. The institution-wide policy and strategies are explicit internally and externally through paper statements, university official websites and other institutional formal documents. For realising the policy and strategy, procedures for practice of educational internationalisation such as budget allocation, human
resource arrangement and decision-making system, tend to be formally and explicitly structured under the responsibility of the central administration office.

In order to reach the goals in the educational internationalisation policy and strategies, universities in Model 1 tend to set up a specialised office for internationalisation as a university-wide office. Most resources for the practice of educational internationalisation, such as financial resources, experts for international engagement and miscellaneous materials for conducting educational internationalisation, are gathered in the international office. The main role of an international office in this category is to embody decisions taken at the central administration office for the whole-of-institution internationalisation initiatives. For this purpose, the organisational relationship between the central administration and an international office must be close and open, and communication between these organisations is guaranteed by both formal and informal mechanisms.

Leadership at the centre is executed to affect educational internationalisation policy and initiatives across every part of the institution. A university-wide international office helps the central administration operate leadership, or it undertakes leadership of the central leadership as the occasion demands. Ownership of educational internationalisation process is at the central administration office, with an international office assisting. A deep understanding of educational internationalisation may not be held by the central executives, but its importance is fully informed by responsible staff in an international office. Because the functions for decision-making and practice of educational internationalisation are intensively gathered at the centre, the institutional value for educational internationalisation might be shared only within a small circle of the central administration office, an international office and a few practitioners of educational internationalisation in departments. Large numbers of staff members of the university might not fully understand it.

As described previously, most universities selected by the SIH Project are represented by Model 1.

5.3.2 Model 2: Comprehensive educational internationalisation

As Hudzik and McCarthy (2012) identify, comprehensiveness in internationalisation should be secured by “institutional leadership, governance, faculty, students, and all academic service and support units” (p. 10). Thus, the central administration office takes educational internationalisation initiative with clear policies and strategies and has ownership of educational internationalisation process. As with Model 1, procedures for practice of educational internationalisation are formally organised, too. The difference from Model 1 is that the scope and responsibilities of a
university-wide international office is rather small or, in an extreme case, no international office is established at all. This is because expertise for educational internationalisation is embedded with all staff members at the every level of the institution as an important dimension of their vocational responsibilities. Every part of an institution can steer educational internationalisation initiatives in a coordinated manner with the central educational internationalisation policy. Therefore, widespread educational internationalisation initiatives are evident in different places and levels in an institution, but these are organically coordinated by the central control. Horizontal relationships between local units are taken as effective as hierarchical relationships, because of the needs for broad and deep value-sharing for the holistic educational internationalisation. Building open and flexible internal relationships throughout a university with effective communication are crucial for comprehensive educational internationalisation to thrive.

Powerful leadership is taken at the senior level for spreading internationalisation policy, so that internationalisation actions at local units can align with the overall institutional policy and mission for educational internationalisation. Deep understandings of educational internationalisation are secured in the centre as well as every part of the institution. In the same manner, institutional value for educational internationalisation is pervasive in every part of the institution. Effort for sharing the value for educational internationalisation is everyone’s responsibility, rather than a task for the core international units.

Universities in this category allocate the largest part of finite resources and efforts to the internationalisation engagement. Therefore, in the Japanese context small- to middle-scale universities which set international education as the main function of their service generally fit this Model 2. If applying the categorisation by Kudo and Hashimoto (2011), universities in Model 2 are ‘innovative universities’ with intercultural approaches (p. 353). Although the cases are limited in number, a few examples are seen in Japanese universities where the comprehensive internationalisation with centralised approach and inclusive pattern of practice is successfully conducted.

5.3.3 Model 3: Coordinated educational internationalisation in decentralisation

The characteristic of Model 3, in cell 3 in Figure 5.1, is that while manifold educational internationalisation initiatives emerge at different units in an institution, these are for a large part in coordination with the institutional policy, missions and goals of educational internationalisation under managerial control at the central administration office and an international office. Educational internationalisation is operated in a decentralised way, nevertheless the central administration may form clear institutional policies, ownership of educational internationalisation
process resides in individual units. In a similar way, leadership is persuasively adopted at each local unit for steering departmental educational internationalisation initiatives. Resources tend to be produced, managed and carried out at local units, too.

In this model, internal communication between the centre and the local avoids fragmentation of educational internationalisation initiatives. The central administration office coordinates individual efforts for internationalisation at the unit level along with the institutional policy and goals. A university-wide international office is set up for this goal. Building open, friendly and reciprocal relationships among different local units is one of main activities of the international office. Expertise for educational internationalisation is gathered both at an international office and at departments. Internationalisation practices are conducted by specialist experts, however it is utilised in different ways. Expertise at the department level carries out educational internationalisation practices. Expertise at the international office assists individual educational internationalisation initiatives at departments and supervises them from a standpoint of effectiveness at the institutional level and blends them with the holistic educational internationalisation goals.

Because universities in this category devolve the authority for operation of educational internationalisation to departments, on-the-spot decision-making emerges which may allow distinctive educational internationalisation initiatives to develop under the policy, mission and rationale in each unit. Therefore there may be the possibility that policies and practices in educational internationalisation at the central and department level become incompatible. The capability for mediating different perspectives for educational internationalisation among units and the central is imperative.

In general, a decentralised approach works in large-scale universities where department autonomy functions well for developing policy and strategies and for embedded it in practice at locally (Komiyama 2006). At the same time, in order to orchestrate these different initiatives, the central administration office must build internal networks for gathering decentralised educational internationalisation practices, by rendering an international office a coordinating function of educational internationalisation initiatives. ‘Flagship universities’ (Yonezawa 2007), ‘elite universities’ (Goodman 2007) and universities of ‘global approaches’ (Kudo and Hashimoto 2011) can be categorised in this model as these universities tend to have adopted a bottom-up manner for a long time. Universities in the third category of the strategic internationalisation scheme in the SIH project referred to as ‘supporting department type’ are also examples of Model 3. There are many universities in Japan, not only the prestigious ones, which take a decentralised educational
internationalisation approach and embrace an international office. However, whether they can facilitate decentralised educational internationalisation with a clear intention and in harmony with holistic educational internationalisation goals depends on whether an international office can coordinate the individual educational internationalisation initiatives with their expertise.

5.3.4 Model 4: Mainstreaming educational internationalisation

De Wit (2015) recognises mainstreaming internationalisation as an institutional status in which “internationalisation is no longer a separate pillar of university policies and strategies but integrated into all other pillars: education, research, human resources, finances, student affairs, faculties, etc.”. In doing so, multiple educational internationalisation initiatives are developed at units in an institution that are articulated with their local functions of education, research and other services. Although institutional policy for educational internationalisation may be framed separately, it is by and large embedded with other institutional functions of education, research and other services. Similar with Model 2, the responsibilities of a university-wide international office are small. Alternatively, smaller international offices at departments may be set up to control educational internationalisation initiatives at the local level. Every part of an institution can exert their expertise and capabilities for educational internationalisation in coordination with other educational and research initiatives. The leadership and ownership of educational internationalisation process is dominantly at individual units.

When taking a decentralised approach without influence of a university-wide international office, a fragmentation of educational internationalisation initiatives can easily occur in universities in this category. A deliberate formation of relationships with internal organisations for the educational internationalisation operation does not tend to occur both vertically and horizontally, too. While an overall understanding of value for educational internationalisation is naturally shared by every staff member in the whole institution, the institutionally specific value for educational internationalisation may be differently understood at each local level because the policy for internationalisation at the institution-wide level has less significance than that at individual local unit level.

As mentioned in Model 3, decentralisation is effective when an institution is large and department autonomy works advantageously for policy-making and implementation of educational internationalisation. The difference from Model 3 is that Model 4 does not necessarily accompany coordination of bottom-up practices in the local units. De Wit (2015) indicates that the University of Amsterdam is one example where mainstreaming internationalisation is performed. According to the official website, the University of Amsterdam has seven faculties from humanities to medical
sciences, and its institutional size is large (about 30,000 student capacity). The characteristic of the university in terms of the governance of educational internationalisation is that there is not a vice president, senior director or any other positions in the executive board or any other central administration office who directs international affairs at the institutional level. While there is an institution-wide policy paper about internationalisation, it describes in a limited way the institutional ‘big picture’ of their aim. Practical steering and achievements of internationalisation seems to be achieved at each faculty. With regard to the operation of educational internationalisation, the organisational structure for educational internationalisation represents decentralisation. An international office is established at each faculty and Amsterdam University College, a joint teaching institute by VU University Amsterdam and the University of Amsterdam. Other than the seven international offices, the Office of International Student Affairs is installed in the central administrative unit of Student Services. However their service is specialised in the management of visa issues, accommodation arrangement, procedure for scholarships and a couple of exchange programs at the institutional level and any relation with the central administration office in terms of the institution-wide strategic planning or commitment to the decision-making for educational internationalisation policy was not seen in the structure. There may be seen other cases in other countries which demonstrate the pattern of the Model 4, however the example of the University of Amsterdam is difficult to identify among Japanese universities.

5.4 Conclusion
This study adopted a case study strategy within a qualitative research paradigm and semi-structured interview as a main method for the data collection. The cases were purposefully chosen by overviewing the peculiar features of Japanese universities. Four universities were selected: a large-scale national; a large-scale private; a middle-scale national; and a middle-scale private institution. In addition, the two-by-two models of structure and culture were formed to guide the study and the analysis of the case studies and synthesise the results of the case studies.
Chapter Six
Hoshi University: Centralised educational internationalisation and an expert-led culture

Hoshi University is an appropriate case study to begin with because it is one of flagship national universities. Since its start in the early 1900s, Hoshi University has enjoyed a reputation as one of the leading national research-oriented large universities in the country. Engineering and natural sciences have been major areas of study and the university takes pride in its research productivity, as with other large-scale national universities in Japan. Owing to its reputation in major research fields, Hoshi University had produced a virtuous cycle of external funding and high quality human resource of researchers, from professors to graduate students worldwide. Its strong presence in research has been enough to attract researchers inside and outside of the country. Therefore, the principal axis of internationalisation in Hoshi University had been located in mobility of researchers for a long time.

However, the situation changed with an announcement of the national slogan ‘100,000 international students plan’ in 1983. In contrast to the mobility of researchers, which had been predominantly carried out by personal motivation and individual networks of academics, the overarching support and intervention by the central administrative organisations became required for the initiatives to increase international students on campus. Furthermore, as outbound mobility of students and internationalisation of education at the undergraduate level had increasingly been demanded by national policies, Hoshi University needed to construct more decisive strategies for educational internationalisation at the undergraduate level through leadership by the central administration office. The study of Hoshi University is useful to understand how large-scale universities implement diversified initiatives for educational internationalisation by building effective connections with departments. As will be shown in this chapter, the fundamental components for its successful educational internationalisation are senior leadership and concentrated expertise in an international office.

6.1 Overview of Hoshi University, the Star Program and the international offices
Hoshi University is one of the largest national universities with more than 100 years of history as a leading university in Japan. It is counted as one of the most powerful research-intensive universities, with strength in engineering and physics. It attracts many domestic undergraduate applicants from throughout the country, as well as postgraduate research students from all over the world. Student volume is relatively large in the group of national universities, reaching approximately 18,000
students in total in 2013. Among these, international students totalled about 1,600. The university embraces more than ten departments including humanities, social sciences, natural sciences and practical science fields including engineering and medical science. Powered by its capability in research, the university has been successful in gaining large amount of research funds from national and private entities. It has also been blessed with winning major national competitive funds for university internationalisation over the last three decades.

Star Program, one of the biggest university-wide education programs for internationalisation, was launched in 2013 using a funding for university internationalisation provided by the Ministry of Education. The aim of the Star Program is to produce graduates with intercultural competencies to meet the demands of the globalised society. The Program consists of a combination of on-campus classes and study abroad programs. These curricular and extra-curricular opportunities are designed mainly for undergraduate students. Classes in the Program vary in terms of disciplines and learning outcomes, while they collectively embrace a common objective of fostering students’ intercultural and global competencies. The classes are provided by all undergraduate departments in Hoshi University and the Centre for Global Education (CGE), a central organisation for international education programs and educational internationalisation. In terms of study abroad opportunities in the Star Program, students can participate in any types of programs from short term (usually two to four weeks) to longer term (usually half-year or one year) under the university partnership agreement schema. These university-wide study abroad programs are organised by CGE. The Star Program is recommended to undergraduate students of any disciplines of departments to register from their junior years. At the starting year of 2014, the Program successfully captured the attention of 10%, over 1,200, undergraduate students for registration.

With regard to the management of the Star Program, CGE and International Exchange Division (IED) jointly assume the role. When the Centre for Student Exchange, a predecessor organisation of CGE, was established in the late 1990s, its responsibilities had been limited to merely running an international student exchange program that had accepted international students from foreign partner universities. After the Centre was reformed into the CGE in 2013, it extended organisational responsibilities to control the whole university-wide educational internationalisation initiatives. CGE’s duties now include planning and operation of the Star Program, international student exchange programs and other miscellaneous international education initiatives and relevant events at the whole institutional level. The number of academic staff in CGE was eight in 2013, of whom four members were newly employed when the Star Program commenced. These new staff members have full responsibility for the Star Program. The other academics also devote their efforts to the Program to a large degree, while they have other duties in the CGE’s mission, such as running
regular student exchange programs.

The other organisation which is responsible for the Star Program is IED, an administrative section where administrative staff are allocated for working with institution-wide educational international activities. Most regular staff in IED assume managerial positions, such as sub-section chief and above. The other staff in IED are non-regular practitioners with full-time or part-time contracts. They number about four times more than the number of regular staff members and cover particular projects or assistant work under supervision of regular staff. The members of IED who are in charge of the Star Program are six: a section chief; a sub-section chief; three full-time staff; and a part-time non-regular staff.

As like with other large-scale universities in Japan, Hoshi University has four departmental international offices in large departments of Engineering, Science, Economics and Arts and Letters. Each international office in the departments takes charge of internationalisation initiatives in their department, such as acceptance of international exchange students, support of domestic students studying abroad, exchange of researchers and academic staff, departmental academic agreement and other miscellaneous management with regard to departmental internationalisation. The main staff in each international office are a couple of academic and administrative staff who are affiliated with their departments. These international offices in local units have not been linked closely with each other or with the institution-wide office CGE before the commencement of the Star Program, because of the self-containment of internationalisation activities at each department.

6.2 Centralised educational internationalisation initiatives for responsiveness to national policy

Since the 1980s, the university-wide educational internationalisation in Hoshi University has followed precisely the trends of national policy. When the government-led promotion of building an international office in major national universities was launched in the late 1990s, Hoshi University arranged without delay the Centre for Student Exchange, in order to prepare for an increase in exchange students from foreign countries. When the national direction to establish central strategic planning systems for internationalisation was enacted in the 2000s, the university swiftly arranged an office for the university-wide strategic internationalisation planning in the central administration office. After that, the university has faithfully continued to meet the demands from government policies for university internationalisation. The high responsiveness to government’s policy derives from their self-consciousness as being one of leading national universities in Japan. Vice-President for Education told how Hoshi’s institutional pride relates to their internationalisation as follows:
It is a mandate for Hoshi University to make its position shine in the international settings as one of the world’s top universities. This mandate is beyond dispute and, as our past achievements show, it is also something that we ourselves aspire to. The government or Japanese public want us to be an internationalised university, and we also agree with, the need to be an internationally respected institution. I mean, for this university the reason for internationalisation is self-evident, and our goal is there without doubt.

The similar discourse was delivered by an administrative staff member of the Star Program, too. He stated that leading the internationalisation scene in accordance with national policy is their institutional responsibility as a large national university:

It is an obligation for us as a large university to lead internationalisation. We ought to promote internationalisation to provide a model case that will have a spreading effect to other universities in Japan.

Status as a national flagship university leads to their self-awareness in being visibly responsive to the country’s higher education policy. In order to operate their institutional practices along with national policy and concentrate and allocate resources effectively to particular initiatives, the operation of internationalisation at Hoshi University has been shaped in a centralised manner. The President’s vision statement philosophically shows their centralised strategies of educational internationalisation. In his vision statement, educational internationalisation at the undergraduate level is placed as a primary goal for his office. Three aims follow this educational goal. These are: reform of general education at the undergraduate level; improvement of educational structure for a more internationalised system; and enhancement of the student support system to create a rich environment for study and life on campus. To achieve these aims, the statement cites the Star Program as one of two important university-wide international education programs, both essential bodies for realising educational internationalisation. The President’s statement clearly exhibits a well-aligned connection of policy and practice for educational internationalisation.

Most of staff members in the interviews regarded the written policy by the President as an institutional commitment to serious reform of internationalisation, and as a tool for highlighting the importance of educational internationalisation through the university. In particular, the President’s manifestation invites financial flow to the educational internationalisation initiatives. The following remark by an administrative staff at IED explains the financially positive effect of the statement:

The current President appreciates the importance of internationalisation. It is greatly
significant that he places the aim of fostering globally talented graduates as a primary goal of the university’s educational policy. This commitment is manifested in budget allocations, particularly in the use of the President’s own discretionary funds.

In fact, Hoshi University would not be able to pursue the Star Program without intensive internal financial investment. Even though the university receives government funding for the Program, this serves as an encouragement but the amount of the subsidy is not enough to cover the full operation. The larger part of a budget for implementing the Star Program has been covered by the institution’s own finance, which has been annually assessed and allocated internally on the basis of the university’s priorities. An administrative practitioner at IED mentioned that since the mid-2000s, the allocation of internal budget for internationalisation initiatives had significantly increased through a strong drive from the central administration office:

I think the internal budget which the President allocates by his leadership has been used more for educational internationalisation...The portion of expenditure for support of international students and domestic students studying abroad has become larger. Before that, it seemed that more funds had been applied to research. However now the budget for education, or support for students’ learning, is growing.

The other administrative staff member at IED also mentioned the positive institutional atmosphere towards educational internationalisation since the early 2010s, when the current President’s term began. He said that this trend was especially obvious in the university’s budget allocation to the initiatives of educational internationalisation. In this manner, the explicit statement and positive financial flow by the President’s initiative convinced each department in Hoshi University to follow the road to the institution-wide educational internationalisation.

6.3 Moderate senior leadership in the practice of educational internationalisation
The President’s commitment to educational internationalisation as a prime mission of Hoshi University has a symbolic meaning across the whole institution. The President’s leadership delivers strong and decisive messages across the campus. However, some interview participants interpreted that the leadership of the central leadership at practice was not so strong. They perceived the announcement from the central administration system about the intention for institutional internationalisation was relatively diluted when it came down to the unit level. They said that the manner of leadership at practice well reflected the President’s gentle character. A middle manager in CGE mentioned the President’s character was understood throughout the university as “not dictatorial, but moderate”. Vice-President for Education mentioned in detail the President’s
personality and his behaviours as follows:

I think the President’s character works effectively for the atmosphere in the executive. He listens to what people have to say. He has ‘a good ear’ [kiku mimi wo motteiru]. Of course it does not mean that he always says “yes”, he can lead us well. He is not a man who persists in his own opinions. This is his character, and it becomes the character of the executive group currently in office. I can say that there are often cases when the character of the leader creates the university’s character to some extent… You know, he announced his vision statement, but he did not intend to force it on departments nor make it obligatory… He hopes each department will formulate its own goals and opinions and share them with the central leadership. That worked well to enable the statement to become established throughout the university.

The President’s character and his leadership are graphically illustrated in his vision statement. The statement consists of the two components of vision: the President’s vision and the departments’ visions. The President’s vision directs a set of university-wide initiatives. In addition, the departments’ own visions are also defined in the statement to be harmonious with the President’s vision. These two components form a shape of the Venn diagram in the statement paper, which explains that they are considered as horizontally significant and do not construct a vertical relationship. In practical terms, much attention is paid by the central administration office to departments’ pride for their educational goals. The office considers carefully how a rise of educational internationalisation initiatives at each department can grow and fit with the central goals of educational internationalisation. The President’s personal character of attentiveness worked well in this regard, to instruct the central administration office to have ‘a good ear’ to departments for strong linkages.

The Hoshi University case indicates that moderate leadership in practice is transferred to the program level. Many interviewees of staff members of the Star Program pointed out the leadership of director of CGE as ‘sensible’. The director’s leadership resembled the President’s behaviour. They reported that the character of the director was open-hearted. An administrative staff member in IED said that he was “easy to talk to and I can speak with him directly”. Another administrative staff in IED also mentioned that he was “trusted by everyone”, and that this trust came from “his impartiality”. He emphasised what he meant by impartiality when he described the director’s character as follows:

What makes the director distinctive is that… he never varies his attitude, regardless of
the positions of the person he is talking to. This is my personal opinion, but I think that a very important point for a person who takes a leading position is to interact with everyone in an equitable manner. The director can do that naturally. He is never high-handed or arrogant.

These quotes from administrative staff members are supported by an academic staff at CGE. She noted that the director won deep trust with administrative staff at IED because he shared in the problems that administrative staff experienced in the practice, and that his capacity came from his ability of “listening to, understanding and considering” the situations that practitioners are experienced. The reason why these impressions were emphasised by many interviewees of administrative staff seems that his attentiveness and impartiality are those of novelty for administrative staff in Hoshi University in the relationship with academic groups. Generally, administrative staff in national universities had traditionally worked in a vertical relationship with academics and a set of administrative work there was often completed behind the scenes and barely noticed by academics and other staff. The director’s sympathetic and ‘stand-by’ attitude towards administrative staff in IED has gradually affected their norms of behaviour in the operation of Star Program, which will be discussed in the later section of this chapter.

All in all, in contrast to the decisive manner of the central administration in policy-planning, senior leadership at practice level was seen as moderate and accommodating. Attentiveness and sympathetic leadership by the President was transferred to the program level owing to the sensitive behaviours of the director of CGE, which helped acquire overall agreement with university-wide educational internationalisation from departments. In this manner, Hoshi University was successful in creating a satisfactory operational structure for the institution-wide initiative of the Star Program.

6.4 The positions of the central international offices
The conceptual framework in Chapter Five proposed that there are different roles that an international office assumes in accordance with the four models. What are the main responsibilities of the Hoshi’s international office and how does it carry out its responsibilities? As with other universities, Hoshi University has two organisations for institution-wide internationalisation engagement: CGE and IED. In terms of CGE, Hoshi University established the Centre for Student Exchange in the late 1990s as the central office of educational internationalisation. It was then reorganised to the current CGE in 2013. Before the reform, the main role of the Center was relatively simple: to plan and maintain the student exchange programs between Hoshi’s partner universities overseas. These university-wide exchange programs had been arranged independently from the regular undergraduate curriculum in individual departments. Because of this, the programs
were run by so-called a *dejima gata*, an enclave style. In the *dejima* mode, the Centre could enclose participating international students within a frame of the exchange programs by arranging special curricula for them and separating them from the other students on campus. In this scheme, it was understandable that communication between the central office and departments had not been a matter of great attention for the staff of the Centre. The responsibility of the Centre was mostly isolated from the regular curricula of undergraduate and postgraduate education.

However, after the launch of the Star Program and the simultaneous organisational reform of the Centre to CGE, concern for making organisational relationships with departments significantly increased. The Star Program constituted of classes of various subjects run by different departments and this scheme necessitated continual contact with departments. The staff in the Star Program increasingly realised the significance of the relationship with internal organisational units. This scheme of a new educational internationalisation program changed the organisational communication. As the following paragraphs show, practitioners of the Star Program voiced the increasing importance of communication both with the central administration system and with departments.

On the point of inter-organisation communication with the central administration office, interviews with practitioners of the Star Program highlighted that the director of CGE had a pivotal role to connect the two organisations. In addition to the position of the CGE’s director, he assumed another title in the central administration system as Deputy Vice-President for International Exchange, for the purpose of supporting the Vice-President for Education from a management aspect of educational internationalisation. Having two positions in different organisational units helped him link the Star Program with the central administration office, in order for the Program to be operated in accordance with the holistic university policy of educational internationalisation. As a Deputy Vice-President, he met Vice-Presidents several times in a week at different meetings in the central administration office. This let him talk frequently with senior officers about the progress of the Program. His frequent communication with Vice-President for Education kept the organisational relationship between the central administration office and the Program team close. Because of this linkage, the Star Program successfully stood as a core project for educational internationalisation in Hoshi University.

Communication between the international offices and departments also became highly regarded by staff in CGE and IED after the Star Program. The following is a quote from an administrative staff member in IED who mentioned why the relationship with departments was fundamentally important, and which was not recognised before the Star Program:
I think a good relationship with departments is very important. In the end, a project of studying abroad involves students who belong to departments…Because of that, we should work for the program with the cooperation of the departments. I have finally noticed that in these past few years.

However, building sound communication with departments was not easy in reality. As is often the case in large-scale universities, both formal and informal opportunities for communication between staff members in different units do not occur if it is not arranged intentionally. Physically, huge campuses tend to hinder face-to-face communication. Frequent personnel rotations of administrative staff in a few-year cycle also tend to act negatively for familiar organisational relationships. In a real sense, their exchange has been conventional, mostly conducted via email and paper. Furthermore, some departments have formed an international office of their own using their own resources, which hindered a linkage with CGE, too. The organisational relationship between CGE, IED and departments had been neglected for a long time.

Nevertheless, recent emphasis on the internationalisation of undergraduate education after the launch of the Star Program has encouraged CGE and IED to access the core undergraduate education system at each department. They believed that a closer relationship with educational administration of departments was a primary key for achieving the aims of the Star Program. As the Star Program had progressed, the staff of the Program at CGE and IED became interested more in the day-to-day practice of international education activities at departments. Eventually, they organised a university-wide meeting where all the staff for educational internationalisation in any departments and other local offices could participate. The purposes of the meeting were to learn from the good practices of international exchange at different departments, and to share questions and problems they had in their daily practice. The first half-a-day meeting was held in May 2014 with approximately 40 members of both academic and administrative staff from across the whole university. An academic staff at CGE looked back on the meeting and valued it as “good to get feedback from on-site staff members of international exchange initiatives in each department”. In addition, building a face-to-face relationship helped international educators in all departments support each other for their practical duties. An academic staff member at School of Humanities also expressed her positive impressions about the results of the meeting, particularly because communication between staff in different departments and offices was enhanced and the participants deepened and extended their understanding of institutional policy for educational internationalisation in Hoshi University:
The meeting was good because we had not had many chances to see each other before… I think meeting each other was necessary…it was good to hear real opinions. I think when an internationalisation initiative is to be operated throughout the university, it is crucial to arrange opportunities for understanding what is the central policy, what differences can be seen in each school, and how we can share our differences.

The planning of a university-wide meeting for staff of educational internationalisation is one example of staff members’ concern for close communication between related offices and departments in Hoshi University. Obviously, the launch of the Star Program uncovered a necessity for internal communication for better management of educational internationalisation. Implementation of the Star Program brought about recognition to CGE and IED as the core agent to link different organisational units for realising institution-wide internationalisation initiatives.

6.5 A rise of kyōshoku kyōdō relationship in the international offices

This section examines the kyōshoku kyōdō manner in Hoshi University. The launch of the Star Program also changed the relationship between the two central international offices CGE and IED. These two organisations had worked together for a long time for student exchange programs since CGE was born as the Centre for Student Exchange. The pattern of cooperation between them at that time was vertical, simple and static, due to their clearly separate responsibilities. The Centre took a role of planning the exchange programs, and IED supported it by administrative duties for the planned programs. Once the exchange programs were run, the two organisations operated them as monotonous tasks in an annual cycle. The scope of responsibilities for each organisation had been ‘inviolable’, which had tended to create an ‘unconcern’ attitude each other.

However, after the Star Program started, the novelty and complexity of the Program forced the two organisations to build a relationship of more relevance to each other. The biggest change that the Star Program brought to the two offices was an increase of communication. Practitioners for the Star Program in CGE and IED began to work together on a day-to-day basis for the operation of the Program. They had to correspond frequently and made decisions jointly and quickly because new things happened one after another at the starting phase of the Program. The physical location of the offices helped their daily face-to-face communication. Because the studying rooms of academic staff in CGE were located in the same floor of a building with a spacious office room of IED, members of the Star team went in and out of the rooms and the IED office many times a day. This close communication soon let administrative staff in IED gain a favourable perception towards academic staff in CGE. Through the frequent conversations, administrative staff members began to develop new impressions on academic staff. An administrative staff in IED mentioned that CGE
staff members were closer to him when compared them with academics in traditional departments:

My impression towards academics in CGE is different from that towards academics in departments. Those who are in CGE are familiar [mijika na sonzai] to me. Generally speaking, in departments, I hesitate to talk with academics face-to-face. They wear kind of ‘crown of a professor’ [kyōju to iu kanmuri]. It makes a difference…In laboratories of regular departments, academics are organised by rank into professors, associate professors and academic assistants. We mostly talk with associate professors and academic assistants and seldom talk with professors in person. Here I talk with professors in CGE directly, and that makes my feeling towards professors more familiar.

Section chief at IED also evaluated an atmosphere between people in CGE and IED as “not bad”, and “administrative staff members have become able to speak out about anything they want to do” in front of their academic colleagues without hesitation. Another administrative staff in IED analysed that one of factors which shaped an amiable atmosphere in the two organisations was the changing attitude of administrative staff members to their responsibilities. He perceived that the conventional vertical relation between sensei and shokuin46 had gradually weakened, at least in the relationship between CGE and IED. According to him, both parties became relatively more equal under the shared responsibility for the Program. Another administrative staff member stressed that “this relationship is important for working on a single project together. We act together and do not just wait for directions from academic staff members”. In the administrative staff members’ view, it appears that increased communication influenced a possible change of the organisational relationship between CGE and IED, which led to a sign of a kyōshoku kyōdō relationship that was gradually grown in the members in IED.

However, these remarks by administrative staff were not fully affirmed by academic staff in CGE. Even though the Star Program brought about a closer communication between them, the conventional culture in organisations of administrative staff members did not change swiftly. An academic staff at CGE stated that administrative staff in IED still worked by a sense of tatewari, or sectionalism style of management.47 Another academic member in CGE analysed the difference of

46 Sensei is a generic term for researchers, teaching staff and any other academic staff members, and shokuin refers to administrative staff members mainly in public institutions including universities.
47 Tatewari as a norm of behaviour has been commonly seen in administrative organisations in many other universities as well as other public institutions in Japan which have isolated organisational duties each other and have not interfered with other organisations’ operation.
fundamental mindset between academics and administrative staff. According to her, “academics (in CGE) have a global mindset and are open to the outside world…on the other hand administrative staff members tend to leave decision-making to academics and they devote their efforts to existing tasks”. As national universities have the tradition of being as an administrative body for realising national higher education policy, university administrative staff have been trained for a long time as public officers to follow unquestioningly the national intention. Even though administrative staff in national universities no longer call themselves kōmuin, or a public officer, after the incorporation, their mindset did not drastically change. Their initial concern was whether the initiatives would conform to the regulations and whether the cost for the initiatives would be appropriately executed from national budget, rather than how they could aim for innovative approaches to their organisational missions. In a conventional attitude of administrative staff, efforts to high performance in initiatives have been a relatively second consideration for them. For academic staff in CGE, the change in an attitude of administrative staff at IED did still not appear to be sufficient for conducting innovative teamwork in a kyōshoku kyōdō style.

In this situation, it was director of CGE who tried to minimise the gap of vocational attitudes in the two groups. As the main person responsible for the Star Program, he thought that adaptation of the different climates in CGE and IED was the first issue to be settled down for successful operation of the Program. He already had sensed a sign of changing attitudes in administrative staff members in IED at the early phase of the operation of the Star Program, and tried to make the most of it. The step he took was to mix the team members of CGE and IED by arranging small ‘units’ for the operation of the Star Program. He organised eight units according to different tasks in the Program. Each unit was composed of academics from CGE and administrative staff from IED. Individual units ran their tasks in their own way. A monthly joint meeting was an opportunity to show the progress in individual units. The director’s intention for the unit formation was to have all the members share awareness of the responsibilities for the operation of the Star Program, regardless of their structural positions as academic or administrative staff members.

It was not long before an academic staff in CGE found a positive tide in the working attitude of administrative staff members in the new unit system. She recognised a sense of ownership and responsibility to the Program emerged in some administrative staff in the Start Program:

Administrative staff members had not been given decision-making responsibilities for a long time. However, in the units, they have come to speak out about their own ideas. In that sense, administrative staff members are developing a sense of ownership [tōjisha ishiki] towards the operation of the Star Program through discussion, and they are
assuming a sense of responsibility for changing the system by themselves.

She added her opinion about the importance of building a team culture which values discussion. “I think it is better to create a culture of discussion among all staff members of the Program. It is important to develop an organisation where healthy discussions and decision-making occur among members from different positions and backgrounds”. The formation of small units increased opportunities of small meetings with academics and administrative staff members, which changed the attitude of administrative staff to becoming active participants of internationalisation engagement. The changing attitude of administrative staff in the Star Program gradually spread across the whole IED office to create the foundation of the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship. Furthermore, the leadership of section chief at IED facilitated this change even more. The director of CGE argued that the section chief was playing an important role in changing the organisational climate in IED to become more assertive. The section chief showed his philosophy of engaging with educational internationalisation to his subordinates, which encouraged them to move out of the “moment of inertia”:

As with administrative staff members, what I think very effective was that the section chief presented his idea to all the members of his section about an attitude to working in IED. That is, he demonstrated that tasks they tackled with in IED were not the ones that were labelled as routine. He said that IED was a place where they had to think and act according to circumstances, and not a place where it was enough simply to follow existing rules...I think it is very important for all the related members to maintain that consciousness for the operation of the Star Program.

Changes in attitude were also seen in academic staff of the Star Program. The director saw a gradual shift of mindset in academic staff at CGE towards being more consciousness of working in the structured organisation:

Academics have gradually come to recognise that they need to discuss with other academics and administrative staff members about their responsibilities, and to gain approvals for anything between the members of an organisation. This norm of behaviour is new to them. As you know, academics used to be surrounded by a culture where they did not need to think about how things should be decided in an organisational manner. This is because they thought it was them who would take responsibility for what they want to do. However, now as we are working in a team of people with different responsibilities from different offices, academics have to follow
the idea of teamwork.

By looking at the daily communication between CGE and IED, gradual changes in organisational climates in academics and administrative staff members were seen in the management of the Star Program. Increased communication seemed to facilitate the team members of the Star Program to be more conscious with their partner organisation. The unit formation in the Program team was the practical strategy that Hoshi University devised for facilitating purposeful communication between academic and administrative staff. It helped administrative staff members feel a sense of ownership and expertise in educational internationalisation initiatives, and academics assume a sense of teamwork as a norm of behaviour. While a supportive climate in the relationship between academic and administrative staff was seen by these indications, the case of Hoshi University merely showed development of a foundation of the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship.

6.6 Senior leadership as a key for a successful bridge between policy and practice

In the case of Hoshi University, its institutional profile as a large comprehensive university and their self-recognition as one of flagship research-oriented national universities were main influential factors on the foundation of the institutional policy for educational internationalisation. The institutional proactive attitude to educational internationalisation directed the President’s decisive leadership for striving for the development of educational internationalisation, which supported the major flow of finance to the institutionally important educational internationalisation initiatives, including the Star Program. This institutional structure, namely, salient selection and concentration of institutional resources and efforts towards educational internationalisation with clear policy, represents a strongly centralised approach. The centralised orientation of senior leadership convinced departments across the whole university to take a cooperative attitude towards the institutional educational internationalisation initiatives.

The President’s leadership also had an influence on the practice of institutional internationalisation. CGE carried a high expert-led stance for educational internationalisation. In terms of the positioning of an international office, the Hoshi’s centralised approach helped the director of CGE hold an official post in the central administration as a Deputy Vice-President. This position was critical for locating CGE closer to the central administration office. His managerial ability to communicate frequently with the central executives essentially kept the CGE’s practices aligned with the central institutional policy for educational internationalisation, as well as tailored the Star Program to the central administration’s will for educational internationalisation. His structural position and behaviours illustrate an importance of close organisational relationship between the central and an international office to link policy and practice. Overall, the relationship between the
central administration office and the central international offices was close and sound largely owing to the director’s leadership. His initiatives as a middle manager was signified by attentiveness to practitioners, which acted on the expert-led culture in CGE to unite the members from different groups of academics and administrative staff to aim to make the Star Program successful. Meanwhile, departments with their own international offices promoted their departmental internationalisation initiatives by their own financial and human resources. Expertise for educational internationalisation was executed using a few experts at each departmental international office. This pattern in Hoshi University exhibits a ‘specialised’ culture.

In contrast with the relation between the central administration office and the international offices, the relationship between the central international offices and departments had been relatively distant in Hoshi’s case. On the organisational chart, CGE is separate from the main group of departments because it was established as an overarching centre to be jointly used by different units across the university. Nevertheless, communication between CGE and departments had been inactive in reality. CGE and some powerful departments had operated educational internationalisation initiatives in parallel. Motivation for communication with departments was activated in due course with the start of the Star Program, because the structure of the Program required a set of different credited classes held by each department, requiring the operating members of the Star Program to reach out to departments. Their efforts for communication resulted in an intention to build an informal network of experts of educational internationalisation beyond department boundaries. However, their communication remained limited within a small group of educational internationalisation experts in the whole university. In this term, the value for educational internationalisation was shared in a limited way within a handful of experts and not spread fully. Together these findings show that Hoshi University is located in Model 1, ‘strategic educational internationalisation at the core’.

Figure 6.1 shows the relationship of structure and culture in the practice of educational internationalisation at Hoshi University. There are two striking features in the figure. First, leadership at the senior level works for both structural and cultural dimensions. Senior leadership adopted a decisive centralised structure to the institution-wide educational internationalisation with clear financial flow to the initiative. Senior leadership also demonstrated a facilitation of ‘specialised’ culture by concentrating expertise in internationalisation in the international offices. Second, the university effectively uses the director’s position to make a virtuous circle of development of structure and culture. By providing him an official responsibility in the central administration as the Deputy Vice-President, the university connects the institutional centralised approach with the highly specialised culture of the practice. With these settings, Hoshi University
The document discusses the relationship of structure and culture in the practice of educational internationalisation at Hoshi University. The diagram illustrates the alignment of these elements at various levels: institution, unit, and leadership. Key points include:

- Structure: Centralised approach to EI
- Culture: ‘Specialised’ practice of EI
- Policy for EI
- Finance for EI
- Leadership at the senior level
- Leadership at the middle management level
- Limited communication among EI practitioners
- Administrative position of director of the international office

Note: ‘EI’ is an abbreviation of educational internationalisation.

Figure 6.1 The relationship of structure and culture in the practice of educational internationalisation at Hoshi University
Chapter Seven
Niji University: Highly centralised structure with a ‘universal’ culture for advanced educational internationalisation

The second case study was conducted at Niji University, a middle-scale private university with a relatively short history. Unlike Hoshi, Niji University was established with a clear goal of becoming the most distinctive university of educational internationalisation. The early 2000s was the time when Japanese government policy began to stress the integration of internationalisation in various university systems such as research, education and management. For this initiative, many universities struggled to reform their conventional management system to achieve new internationalised research and educational environments. The concept of Niji University was born in this national context. The university needed to be free from the conventional university management system. Innovation in the field of educational internationalisation was the aim for Niji University from the outset, and as we will see in this chapter, the structural arrangements are all designed for this aim. Given that Niji University has been characterised as a unique and peerless university in terms of the international settings and advanced educational internationalisation initiatives, the case study illustrates a set of fundamental practices for realising the institutional goal of educational internationalisation. In particular, their institutional efforts are suggestive of how a combination of structural and cultural factors in the organisational framework can effectively work for the practice of educational internationalisation. This chapter will show that Niji University is a distinctive case of Model 2 that is signified as ‘comprehensive educational internationalisation’.

7.1 Overview of Niji University, the Rainbow Program and related organisational units
Niji University was born in 2000 with a primary concept of becoming a genuinely advanced university of internationalisation in Japan. Since its establishment, the university has collected many competitive applicants from both domestic and international population to two undergraduate and two graduate programs in social sciences. While being a typical private university in Japan with respect to institutional size and disciplines offered, its institutional features look atypical in some ways. First, various subjects offered in the fields of social sciences and business administration at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels are designed to be learnt from an international, intercultural or global perspective. This is so that all Niji students in any courses and programs will be able to develop international competencies through various students in any subjects.
Second, under the institution’s primary mission to develop graduates with the skills to communicate with people from diverse backgrounds, the university stresses the creation of an outstanding campus with a rich multicultural environment. The proportion of international students on campus is deliberately targeted. In May 2013, international students from 78 different countries and regions occupied 43% of the total student population, which is one of the highest proportions in the whole Japanese university landscape\(^{48}\). Not only students but also international academic staff hold nearly 50% of positions and are from different 27 countries and regions in the world.

Third, the underlying intention for creating a multicultural campus is that the university regards any students’ experiences on campus, including those in curriculum and extra-curriculum, as learning opportunities for their academic development and personal growth. To provide more opportunities for students’ development in the intercultural environment, large housing buildings with 1,300 rooms are adjacent to the main campus to facilitate interaction between international and domestic students through their dormitory life. All international students are guaranteed a room in the buildings for their first year in the university. Dormitory life is designed to be mutually beneficial between international and domestic students. International students are able to learn the Japanese language and customs from Japanese students who live and serve there as residential assistants. The residential assistants, who owe 30% of total residents in the dormitories, would be able to develop their skills and attitudes for communication in multicultural environments through performing their responsibilities to peer international students.

Fourth, in order to secure the above-mentioned physical settings of campus and dormitories in the multicultural environment, careful attention is also paid to the educational administration system. Unlikely with many Japanese universities, Niji University adopts a two-semester scheme to admit international students twice each year. This approach enables the university to recruit international students flexibly, regardless of the different systems of academic calendars taken in other countries. A bilingual system throughout the campus is another measure in their approach. 80% of classes in undergraduate programs are offered in both Japanese and English, and students can take classes in either language on the basis of their linguistic ability. For academics and administrative staff members, all of the formal documents and meetings in the university are provided in both languages.

\(^{48}\) The average proportion of international students in Japanese universities is 4%. The figure in Niji University is also striking when it is compared with the Australian context. In 2011, the average ratio of international students in Australian universities was 22.3%. The highest ratio was the University of Ballarat whose international proportion was 47.7%, followed by Bond University of 40.5% (ABS 2011).
The case program for educational internationalisation in Niji University, which is called Rainbow Program in this study, was developed in 2011 as a new joint initiative with one of their partner universities in the US. A financial support for the first five years was provided by a government fund. The Program is a set of seven subprograms that are constructed in layers to suit students’ various learning stages from pre-enrolment to the final year of the undergraduate level. A characteristic of the Program is the complex ‘building-block style’, or tsumiage shiki, which has been planned in detail with their partner university, so that all participating students from both universities can reciprocally benefit from the Program.

The Rainbow Program comprises four main pillars: a pre-enrolment study abroad program; ‘building-block style’ collaborative programs for liberal arts study; a dual-degree program; and a group of capstone subjects. The pre-enrolment program is operated in two weeks in March for Niji’s prospective students who have completed a course in a high school and been admitted to Niji University from the following month. They study at the partner university’s campus. The main purposes of the subprogram are to improve skills in English for learning in university classes and to experience an intercultural environment, so that they can be well-prepared for Niji’s campus of the diverse culture. The next learning program in the Rainbow Program following enrolment is ‘the building-block style collaborative liberal arts program’, which is a set of four subprograms according to the participants’ home universities and their learning stages. Among the four subprograms, one is for the first or second year of Niji students to study at the partner university campus for two months. The students take credited classes in liberal arts, where they develop communication skills and multicultural understandings in a culturally diversified environment. The other two subprograms are for students of the partner university in the US, which accepts students on Niji’s campus to deepen the knowledge of Japanese language, culture and the business models of Japan and other Asian countries and regions. The last subprogram is for students from both universities. They visit for two weeks to a third university in South East Asian countries with partnerships with Niji University. The aim of spending studying time in the third university is to engage with field work and collaboration study with students from diverse cultural backgrounds.

Another collaborative learning system is the dual degree program in which students at both universities study at mutual campuses for two years to receive two degrees, in liberal arts and in their individual major academic fields. Lastly, an integrated learning scheme is prepared at the home university for the students who have completed the earlier collaborative learning programs. This framework is to consolidate the learning outcomes which they have acquired through various subprograms in the Rainbow Program, so that they can articulate their learning achievements with
their major fields of study. Academics from both universities serve as advisors to guide students in applying their acquired knowledge and skills to the higher grades of learning.

The Rainbow Program is clearly a set of complex subprograms. In order to systematically operate the seven subprograms in the Rainbow Program, the Program has introduced an e-Portfolio system. Students, academics and administrative staff who are involved in the Rainbow Program can access the e-Portfolio system at any place and time. It functions not only as a formal record of students’ learning achievements but also as a networking device between the Program members. Participating students keep journals on the e-Portfolio system to share their learning achievements, their reflections on their emotion and sentiments with other students, teachers and administrative staff members. The Program staff members can view the participants’ learning and development at appropriate stages through the e-Portfolio system to support them in progressing to the next phase of learning.

When the interview sessions for this study were conducted in 2014, there were seven core staff members responsible for the Rainbow Program. Four members were academics at Education and Learning Support Centre (ELSC), one of the internal units for student learning. Among the four academics, two members were employed full-time on the Rainbow Program. The other unit in relation to the management of the Program was the Office of Academic Administration (OAA), one of the seven administrative offices in Niji University. The remaining three staff in the core of the Rainbow Program belonged to OAA as administrative staff members.

The Rainbow Program is both inwardly and outwardly regarded as a successful pioneer initiative combining the efforts of Niji and the partner university in the US with two excellent features. First, it successfully connects study abroad experiences with the regular undergraduate curriculum offered on campus at both universities, connecting students’ significant experience of study abroad to the institutional official crediting system. Second, the Program utilises the e-Portfolio system to map the sequential development of student learning. Furthermore, while it has not been explicitly acknowledged, another salient feature in the Program that has significance for this study is its operational system. The collaborative relationship between academics and administrative staff members, which will be discussed in later sections, is recognised as one of the reasons for the success of the Rainbow Program.

The interview and document data for Niji University revealed three institutional characteristics contributing to the development of educational internationalisation. These are: a strong administration system and reduced departmental autonomy; the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship
between academic and administrative staff members; and advanced human resources in administrative staff.

7.2 Strong administration system, reduced departmental autonomy

As mentioned in the previous section, history of Niji University commenced when higher education systems around the world began experiencing the massive power of globalisation. Niji University built a clear institutional goal of becoming Japan’s first fully internationalised university. The institutional administration system was designed to align with this objective. With regard to the organisational system, the unique feature of Niji University is that they do not have a stand-alone central international office housing specialised staff for educational internationalisation. The administrative functions for international affairs, such as the procedures of student exchange, document works for visa issuing, operation of credit transferring system and so on, are all integrated with one office named OAA. The academic staff members who work with the Rainbow Program are affiliated in ELSC with other teaching staff for early undergraduate-year education. This organisational and personnel model arises from the university’s strong belief that international education, or internationalisation of education, is the core service to be provided to all students and this should be blended with the mainstream education in their major fields of studies. Because the internationalisation of education is the basic educational philosophy that is intertwined with other basic and special academic subjects, the administration of various educational categories cannot be separated in the education system of Niji University.

Due to this generalised concept of administration, there are a wide range of functions for OAA. The office holds approximately twenty different duties in relation with academic affairs in the whole educational programs of the university. According to a section chief in OAA, their responsibilities include administration for students’ class-taking and examinations, development of basic learning programs such as linguistic study and early-year education, employment and development of academic staff, planning of library service and information technology, institutional survey and statistics on students’ learning, and so on. This extended scope of duties within one large office is highly uncharacteristic of the university administration system in Japan. Most other universities in Japan tend to separate these functions in different administrative offices. A practitioner at OAA pointed out that from an administrative viewpoint, the purpose of covering broad functions in one office is to respond flexibly to students’ state of affairs. For example, because staff members can easily access students’ academic records, they can use this for screening the candidates of study abroad programs without asking individual departments. They can also handle smoothly the credit transfer procedure when students have completed study abroad programs, by comparing the class lists offered in partner universities and those in Niji University. This ‘all-in-one’ capacity within
one office eliminates the administrative obstruction between international education and specialised education in individual departments, which has been often perceived as an unavoidable barrier in large-scale institutions such as Hoshi University.

Flexibility in the usage of student data extends beyond OAA. Student information is strategically collected and exchanged between all seven administrative offices in Niji University. Various data regarding students from pre-enrolment to graduation, including the results of entrance examination, records of academic achievements in curriculum, campus life experiences as extra-curricular activities, participated study abroad programs and the employment places after graduation, are uniformly managed in the administration office. The centralised information management by connecting the internal administrative organisations enables the central administration office to play a core role in strategic planning for educational internationalisation. It is usual in Niji University that once a new plan emerges in the executive board, administrative staff can immediately develop a basic design of the plan using the abundant data stored in the administrative office. A section chief at OAA proudly mentioned that Niji University has had a basic structure for unified information management since its foundation. This was, he continued, established before the concept of institutional research, or IR, had been emphasised as an important function for university management in many other Japanese universities since the late 2000s.

Apart from the administrative structure, another unique feature of Niji University is the organisational system for academics. As explained in Chapter Four, all Japanese universities are managed by the dual organisational systems of academic and administrative bodies. These are kyōjukai, a deliberation body of academic staff, and jimukyoku, a core management system of administrative staff. Following the School Education Law, Niji University establishes kyōjukai, as with other typical universities in Japan. However, what is atypical is that its authority has been kept relatively marginal due to the transfer of several important decision-making responsibilities to the upper level of the governance body, the university senate. Moreover, unlike most other universities in Japan, the monthly kyōjukai meeting has been held as a joint meeting of academic staff members from all departments and other educational and research units. According to the institutional documents, this joint meeting formation and transfer of the council authority has been adopted to lighten the academic members’ time spent on university management and administration, so that they can devote their efforts more to education and research activities. This reasoning has some legitimacy, because education and research are the core duties of academics. However, from the administrative point of view, this ‘weight-saving’ in the faculty council reduces the opportunities to build department autonomy and idiosyncratic departmental culture. In fact, the central administration system in Niji University has been able to steer the fast top-down governance and
management of educational internationalisation in a centralised manner without serious conflicts between departments.

As seen above, the settings in the administration system in Niji University contribute to facilitating the strategic centralised management of educational internationalisation. However, even with these structural formations, the purposes cannot be fulfilled without fostering appropriate cultures for the enhancement of internationalisation practice. Let us now examine how Niji University applies the institutional culture to the practice in management of educational internationalisation.

7.3 *The kyōshoku kyōdō relationship for educational internationalisation management*

One of the striking points that make Niji University distinctive is that many interview participants mentioned the *kyōshoku kyōdō* relationship between academics and administrative staff members as vocational behaviours that are recognised as an institutional symbol. Vice-President for Education expressed the relationship between academic and administrative staff in Niji University as “a gene” that had been inherited across the entire academy. Collaboration is taken for granted as a norm of behaviour that had been shared by both academic and administrative groups since the establishment of Niji University. An administrative staff described an impressive remark she heard at her employment interview, conducted twelve years ago. At the employment interview, the interviewer told her that administrative staff in Niji University must get involved in educational activities to the equal level with academic members. This norm of behaviour in administrative staff appears to permeate every function of the university. In fact, many participants of the interview sessions, both academic and administrative staff, described that there was clear awareness of the *kyōshoku kyōdō* relationship in their working environment. The following are three examples of comments regarding the partnership of academic and administrative staff members in their working environments:

I experienced a kind of culture shock when I started my position here. I realised that administrative staff members were extremely capable. I had never experienced such an environment before, where administrative staff members joined in the field of education with the same attitude as us towards development of the program. (Academic staff in ELSC)

Typical prejudice is that academic staff members take the lead and administrative staff members assist them [in the context of development of university education]. However, I feel that here in Niji University both staff groups divide their work equally. They look at their work merely from different positions but shoulder equal responsibilities, and
both groups are clearly aware of this philosophy. (Another academic staff in ELSC)

I think in typical universities, students’ development is assumed to be realised only by the educational efforts of academics, and that area is deemed as a sanctuary for academic and teaching staff. However in Niji University, since its foundation, students’ development has been regarded as the area where administrative staff members should participate in together with academic members. (Administrative staff in OAA)

The point which should be highlighted in these discourses is that there is a condition in the culture of Niji University where administrative staff are ready to engage with the educational field at a somewhat equal position with academic staff members, including taking different viewpoints where necessary. This is fully in the spirit of the concept of kyōshoku kyōdō that was introduced in Chapter Four. However, it is still not clear from these remarks what the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship means to the practice of educational internationalisation in Niji University. How do members of academic and administrative groups perceive ‘different responsibilities’ from ‘the equal position’ in the daily practice of the management of educational internationalisation? The team of the Rainbow Program provides a good insight into this question, for the interviews showed that the process they had taken for the development of the Rainbow Program shows how the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship was built and developed between both groups of staff.

In 2011, four academic and eight administrative staff members gathered from different internal organisations to form the Rainbow Program team. Their duty was to develop and operate the seven different subprograms in the Program by mutual support with the partner university in the US. Among eight administrative staff members, four had the section-chief level responsibility to supervise the operation. The other four administrative and four academic staff had taken responsibilities for one or two particular subprograms in the Program. Eventually, each subprogram was covered by at least two members from academic and administrative groups. By adopting different combinations of members in subprograms, the team constructed a web-like structure of responsibilities for individual subprograms. The tasks each member handled in each subprogram were wide-ranging. Not only normal administrative arrangements, such as financial management and paper works for the report to the Ministry of Education, but they had also covered the planning of program content, screening of candidates for the Program, the development of outcome assessment methods, operation and maintenance of the e-Portfolio system, and the planning of any events for participating students. Although the purely administrative tasks were controlled by administrative staff, there was no differentiation in priorities for responsibility between academic and administrative staff in the Rainbow team in terms of development of the educational content.
Any issues, from minute and technical arrangements to more ideological and pedagogical practices in the contents, were jointly covered by both members of academic and administrative through thorough discussion.

All the subprograms had been developed in a parallel and sequential manner. During the development stages, the team members paid most attention to communication between team members and the partner university. Because the Program had consisted of inter-related subprograms which had necessitated the new organisational arrangements at both universities, frequent, timely and continuous communication with the partner university was crucial. Although a few important members of both universities had visited the partner’s campus several times before the launch, these visits were not enough to develop the concrete plan for the Program. They necessitated communication between practitioners. In addition, they had also needed intentional internal communication because the work locations of Niji’s staff members were dispersed around campus. Academics had been isolated in their private rooms in upper floors of different buildings. Administrative members had been grouped together in an open office room in the ground floor of an administration building. However, their desks had been randomly set among all 80 colleagues in OAA. The solution to a closer networking with the partner university as well as between internal academic and administrative members was, simply, systematic email communication. Administrative members paid careful attention to the successful development of an e-mailing list. They intensively took the lead in using and maintaining the mailing list system for the daily processes of the Program. The information exchanged through the e-mailing list was wide and multilayered, for example, practical arrangements for students’ trips to the partner university, planning of study schedules and accommodation, establishment of the curriculum to be provided at each campus, discussion on the credit transfer system, arrangement of the visiting of the Presidents and executives of both universities, and so on. Most of exchanges by emails were shared with all academic and administrative team members across subprograms. They had also used internal meeting opportunities, setting up a monthly general meeting as well as subprogram meetings as needed. Compared with frequent email exchanges, these meeting opportunities had been used for monitoring the progress in each subprogram and creating social interaction to build a sense of comradeship among the Rainbow team members. Through these online and face-to-face networking opportunities, the plans and progress in the subprograms had been widely shared with the internal team members and with the partner university. Under these arrangements, there was no considerable time lag or difference in the volume of information by vocational strata and job responsibilities. All the Rainbow team members, from director to non-regular staff members, had been able to follow the progress of every piece of the Program at any time, in any place.
Their intensive efforts to build teamwork resulted in a successful start of the Program in a short time. As mentioned above, the groundwork for the operation of the Program, such as the entire administrative preparation, such as financial arrangements and complex paperwork, was undertaken by administrative staff. The infrastructure for frequent communication with the partner university and internal team members was also developed by them. These basic but essential preparations for the development of the Program were quickly and efficiently arranged by administrative staff members in the Rainbow team. An academic practitioner at ELSC acknowledged that the strong ability with logistics by administrative staff was a key factor to make the plan practical:

This Program cannot be operated without administrative members. Logistics is the core issue when managing a program jointly with a partner university overseas, and we had to build a new system at each university where the cultures were different from each other in various senses. Idealism could not make the program a practical reality: a bridge between both universities was needed. It was only the logistical capacity of administrative staff members that brought the Program to fruition in practice.

As she noted, the skills in logistics of the administration was highly acclaimed by the academic side as one of important elements for the practice of the Program in a kyōshoku kyōdō relationship. However, on the other hand, a different recognition in the practice of kyōshoku kyōdō was asserted from by the administrative staff. An administrative staff member of the Rainbow Program stressed that a distinctiveness of collaboration in the Rainbow team was the participation of administrative staff in the development of educational content of the Program. She emphasised the adequate capacity of her colleagues of the administrative group for engagement with the joint development of the Program with academics. She indicated that all of the core administrative staff members in the Rainbow team held a Master’s or higher level of degree in the fields of multicultural education or educational technology. She pointed out that their qualifications, capacities and an atmosphere of inviting the joint working with academics eventually led to the effective collaboration of kyōshoku kyōdō in academic and administrative staff members:  

For example, the program content, its schedules, the assessment methods are things which academics would usually decide. However, in our Program the assessment system was developed by four of us, including two academics and two administrative staff… We not only did clerical work but also could participate in educational matters, for example, being involved in the work for assessment of students’ learning… We developed and operated together [issho ni un’ei suru, issho ni tsukatte iku]. Generally speaking, there is an atmosphere of collaboration in Niji University, and that tendency
is specifically strong in the Rainbow Program.

As a result of the launch of the Rainbow Program, the team received an award from the academy in 2012. The reasons for winning the award were not only the fruitful achievements of the Rainbow Program itself, but also the intense collaboration of the team members and between the partner university. The award recognised the university’s formal encouragement of the kyōshoku kyōdō development. In fact, the Program acknowledged the administrative staff members’ greater degree of involvement over the process of development and management in the working style of the kyōshoku kyōdō. The effective performance by administrative staff of multiple roles sometimes even created a sense of alienation in academic staff who felt threatened by this. Several occasions of tension between academics and administrative staff had occurred in the past, when a few administrative staff members had been perceived as having an overwhelming hegemony over the process of the Rainbow Program. The director of the Rainbow Program mentioned that the shape of the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship in the Rainbow team was not static but was always modified through the dynamics of relationships between academic and administrative staff. With an exquisite sensitivity to balancing the power, capacity and pride in both group members, the Rainbow team has built and improved the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship between academic and administrative staff members as a cognitive tool for the effective management of educational internationalisation.

7.4 Administrative human resources for the management of advanced educational internationalisation

As discussed above, the expanded responsibility of administrative staff in the Niji’s kyōshoku kyōdō relationship is evidence of their basic skills and capabilities for educational internationalisation. A series of characteristics of administrative staff is different from the previous case study of Hoshi University. What factors are behind this? How do the administrative staff of Niji University develop their vocational capacity and pride as experts? How does the university apply this ability and self-respect to the institutional operation of educational internationalisation? This section focuses on the administrative human resources in educational internationalisation initiatives at Niji University and the institutional effort for the development of human resources in administrative staff.

First of all, a clear difference for Niji University compared with other general universities in Japan in terms of administrative human resources is that internationality is one of core requirements at the appointment of administrative staff. With regard to the field of management of educational internationalisation, increasing concern has been gathered in the kokusai tsūyōsei, or international availability, for achieving educational internationalisation. The Ministry of Education uses indexes
Regarding the demography of university administrative staff for assessing the international readiness of universities. As a considerable degree of educational internationalisation management is conducted by administrative staff in many universities, the Ministry of Education considers the ‘internationality’ of administrative staff as mirroring the degree of responsiveness to performance in educational internationalisation. The latest national funding project titled Top Global University Project collects useful data on the degree of internationality of administrative staff in the selected 37 universities of the project. The data regarding the staff members’ internationality are the following: the number of administrative staff of foreign nationality; the Japanese administrative staff who hold academic degrees from foreign universities; and the Japanese administrative staff who have work or training experiences in foreign countries for more than one year (JSPS 2014). According to the results, 34% of administrative staff of Niji University fell in one of these categories, the second highest ratio among the selected universities. The distinctiveness of internationality of administrative staff in Niji University is a prominent feature in its design. As Niji University explicitly sets institutional policy to arrange the campus with multicultural diversity, it has intentionally collected students and academics from all over the world, so that these groups constitute one half of the population. The administrative population with ‘internationality’ is a carefully planned resource for the institutional goals for educational internationalisation. It is not surprising that this distribution of administrative human resources with international profile eventually creates a universal culture of educational internationalisation at Niji University, because the value for educational internationalisation is relatively easy shared by those who have sensitivity to an international aspect of every function of the university.

However, the internationality of staff members is not exactly recognised as an essential feature for a universal culture of educational internationalisation. In fact, no interview respondents made explicit comments on the high internationality in their administrative staff. Rather, this was simply taken as one of the prerequisites for effectively conducting their duties. Many participants in the interviews pointed out that the most remarkable feature in administrative staff in Niji University was their motivation to work for the internationalisation of education. The comments below show that interviewees intended to deliver administrative members’ eagerness to be proactive actors for students’ learning development:

I was very impressed with the approach to work shown by those who were categorised as administrative staff members. They have a high self-awareness [ishiki no takasa] of being engaged with education, and they work with a similar attitude [onaji kankaku] to academics… Of course they handle clerical work too. However they also earnestly think of, facilitate and actively engage with students’ development in a similar way to
academic staff members. (Academic staff in ELSC)

It may not be all of them, but certainly a large number of administrative staff members take a positive stance and use every opportunity [on campus] to benefit students’ learning. (Administrative staff in OAA)

I am sure that administrative staff members have a forward-looking idea that they are supporting Niji University [jibun tachi mo sasaete iru]… We deal with different aspects of students’ development that include not only academic learning or academic achievement, but also their development in terms of personality and behavioural changes. Administrative staff members can serve different aspects of students’ development from academic staff members. (Another administrative staff in OAA)

I really feel a sense of accomplishment when I can see students’ development and growth through experiences in our [Rainbow] Program. Even if we are complimented by Ministry of Education or people outside the university, I am never happier than when being thanked by our students with their achievements. (Another administrative staff in OAA)

This vocational attitude of administrative staff is critically emphasised when it is compared with the conventional view of university staff in administration work which can be characterised as ‘subservient’ to academics (Conway and Dobson 2003) or ‘low-keyed’ in the relationship with academics (Gornitzka and Larsen 2004). Contrary to this, the administrative staff in Niji University set their fundamental vision for work to serve their students’ development, not to merely assist academics’ teaching and educational performance. In their self-conceptualisation, they are not the ‘second actor’ for students’ learning. Rather, they are conscious of playing a partner role with academic staff to support students’ development together.

In order to consolidate and strengthen the vocational identity of administrative staff, Niji University provides quite distinctive institutional arrangements for staff development. As a section chief commented, the university explicitly encourages the deep involvement of administrative staff as an integral part of the university’s culture. The culture does not merely remain philosophical but put into practice in daily work. As mentioned earlier, the administrative office OAA covers nearly twenty functions with regard to administration for academic affairs, and regular staff each handle at least two different functions, for instance, taking charge of curriculum management and operation of the library system. By holding multiple tasks, they are expected to bring different viewpoints to
each function. Through the exercise of exchanging various ideas for individual tasks in a cross-sectional manner, they develop a ‘bird’s-eye’ view for their entire work. Moreover, the requirement to take multiple viewpoints helps them to connect their daily practice with the institutional policies and goals. On a daily basis, they frequently reflect on their rationale for work, such as “that treatment might be easier to handle in our administrative operation, but let’s think it from a view of assisting students’ development, even if it may become tricky and time-consuming for us” (an administrative staff at OAA). Conversations such as this are often heard in the Rainbow team.

Another opportunity to consolidate their attitude to work is provided by a variety of staff development programs. Niji University assists their staff members’ desire for learning in an academic environment. Four regular administrative staff in Niji University so far have applied the university’s work-leave and financial assistance system for studying in foreign universities at Master’s and higher academic levels. An internship opportunity is also provided through an international consortium networking of universities. Through this consortium scheme, they can work for one week at an international office in a member university overseas. Two administrative staff members join the internship program every year, to experience hands-on job training in an international context. Other miscellaneous training seminars are also open to non-regular staff, according to a need in relation to their tasks. All of these training experiences are shared with their colleagues, through an obligation to report at office meetings about their experience of training and implementing their practice into daily work.

As seen above, the clear connection between the institutional goals, personnel arrangements and professional development system of on- and off-the-job opportunities promotes the administrative staff members’ development in not only their practical skills for work, but also in their vocational pride as an active player of educational program development. The institutionally valued vocational motivation in administrative staff builds the foundation of the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship with academic members, which eventually facilitates the universal culture of practice in educational internationalisation in Niji University. The Niji’s case suggests that the kyōshoku kyōdō concept is not fostered by chance. It needs institutional systematisation that is planned to be aligned with institutional policies and goals for internationalisation.

7.5 A Proving ground for advanced internationalisation

The director of the Rainbow Program described Niji University as ‘a large-scale proving ground for educational internationalisation’. By this he meant that their institutional raison d’être resided in never-ending trials of unprecedented internationalisation of university education. Every aspect of
Niji’s infrastructure was arranged for this objective. Owing to this rich arrangement, the university has been able to concentrate on a variety of innovative initiatives in the field of educational internationalisation. The practices we have seen in the Niji’s case seem distinctively original, but the factors underpinning them are adaptable to other universities’ practice. These factors are summarised in nine points in Figure 7.1. They are intricately intertwined. At the institutional level, the institutional type and self-recognition enabled them to build a clear policy for institutional internationalisation that shapes a simplified administrative structure. Their policy was also influential in creating an institutional atmosphere of shared values for educational internationalisation across the whole institution. These factors all work effectively in Niji’s centralised approach in educational internationalisation.

The other four factors function at the unit level. Decreased administrative responsibility for academics and high quality administrative personnel arrangement support the centralised structure for promoting educational internationalisation. Abundant human resources in administration are also a critical factor in Niji adopting a universal pattern of practices in educational internationalisation. The motivation for effective practices in internationalisation was sustained by the institutional vigorous support for professional development. Because the merit of internationalisation is widely shared by academics and administrative staff, their kyōshoku kyōdō relationship was relatively easily facilitated. Administrative staff were aware and proud of shouldering an equal weight of responsibilities with academic staff for the results of internationalisation initiatives. An administrative staff member in the Rainbow Program proclaimed that “I don’t hesitate at all to speak my mind to academics, because we are partners. We both have equal responsibility for the Program”. The kyōshoku kyōdō relationship is founded on the basis of high quality human resources in administration, which created a virtuous circle to maintain Niji’s centralised approach and universal pattern of organisational behaviours. In addition to the uniqueness in terms of the high internationality of administrative staff members, Niji’s case indicates that their motivation to work successfully is a more important element for the internationalisation of education.

In accordance with an increase in the complexity in the university management during the past three decades, the scope of responsibilities of administrative staff and their vocational identity have changed. The changing roles and identity of administrative staff in university functions has become a noteworthy research topic. A set of research shows that the development of university administrative staff is one of the important factors for the university management in the modern century (McInnis 1998; Cornway and Dobson 2003; Gornitzka and Larsen 2004). The management of educational internationalisation is an area where professionals are greatly needed. This is
because the management of internationalisation demands a broad range of abilities, including linguistic ability, multicultural competencies, communication skills, specialty in administration of university education, and knowledge and experience of a particular university. As we have seen in this chapter, administrative staff in Niji University improved their capabilities through daily practices and training opportunities that were purposefully arranged by the university. Taking advantage of these opportunities, staff developed new understandings of their roles in the institutional aim for internationalisation. Niji’s effectiveness in internationalisation initiatives is in large part achieved by its success in the development of administrative staff.

Figure 7.1 The relationship of structure and culture in the practice of educational internationalisation at Niji University

*Note:* ‘EI’ is an abbreviation for educational internationalisation.

The two case studies in Hoshi University and Niji University reveal highly centralised approaches to institutional internationalisation. In contrast, the following two case studies in Chapters Eight and Nine examine approach shifts from centralised to decentralised due to internal and external pressures for the improvement of educational internationalisation. The approach shift in both
universities shows how the behavioural patterns of related organisations in a university can be shaped by senior leadership and how the organisational behavioural patterns can consequently significantly vary the practice of institutional internationalisation.
Chapter Eight

Tsuki University: Changing structures that influence the patterns of educational internationalisation

The third case is the study of Tsuki University, a middle-scale national university of social sciences. The period from the late 1980s to 1990s was a critical time for the internationalisation of education in Japanese universities as a whole. This was the time when many national universities tried to extend their practice of student exchange initiatives in order to accept more international students. However, Tsuki University had retained their longstanding policy of an elitist education system by limiting student exchange to a top slice of students of their partner universities. Rather than educational internationalisation, the internationality of Tsuki University was exercised mainly in the advanced research fields of social sciences, in which their raison d'être at the national and international levels resided. Therefore, educational value in internationalisation had been regarded as a second priority for the institution. What aroused the sleeping lion was an announcement of a national funding project for educational internationalisation in the late 2000s. For the first time, they realised their marginal position from the major trend of university internationalisation in Japan. They swiftly turned their approach to educational internationalisation from conventional elitism to a new education system of international exchange in a short time. Their practice provides this study with key structural and cultural insights into a new educational infrastructure for internationalisation.

8.1 Overview of Tsuki University, the Moon Program and the international offices

With institutional pride as one of oldest national universities, formed in the late 1800s, the university has taken a leading position in the fields of commerce, economics and other academic areas of social sciences. The university’s unchanging educational philosophy since its establishment had been ‘to provide practical education’ in the fields of social sciences, by which they have successfully produced prominent business people who play pivotal roles in both domestic and international business.

The significance of internationality to Tsuki University is seen in its student demography. As of 2012, the proportion of international students on campus was 11%, which was the ninth highest in the context of Japanese national universities and the second in the ranking of comprehensive national universities. Another institutional strength in terms of the promotion of educational internationalisation is an alumni relationship with top business leaders in Japan. The alumni of Tsuki University create a strong graduate community, which offers a system of abundant
scholarships for students who go to study abroad under the partnership agreement scheme. According to the alumni association, nearly 800 Tsuki students thus far have benefitted from the scholarship since the 1980s. The financial benefit for educational internationalisation from this alumni scholarship has been recognised by many university staff and students in Tsuki University as outstanding.

As with many other national universities in Japan, however, the systematic operation of internationalisation had been belated in Tsuki University. The university had a specific reason for this. Because Tsuki University had specified a high standard for Japanese language understanding for international students as a requirement of enrolment, most of them had been able to study and live satisfactorily in the Japanese language environment. Special institutional arrangements for campus internationalisation had not been planned in Tsuki University for a long time due to the stringent language expectations for incoming international students. This linguistic requirement was related to its special study system. By taking advantage of its middle-scale university character, Tsuki University had offered the seminar form, or zemināru, referring to a small study group of advanced students, to all domestic and international students in all departments, so that they could conduct intensive learning of specialised subjects with peers and small number of teaching staff. Therefore, regardless of different linguistic backgrounds, students needed advanced Japanese language sufficient to discuss academic topics in the seminar sessions. These seminars had helped international students with not only academic but also other miscellaneous support services for student life. In this situation, the university had not felt its necessity to construct a specific institutional assistance system for international students because the overall hospitable support was achieved within the close environment of the seminars.

However, organisational initiatives for the management of educational internationalisation gradually occurred at Tsuki University since the 1990s. Firstly, they opened the Centre for International Students in 1996. The purpose of establishing the Centre was to respond to a new group of international students who had gradually grown larger on campus since the 1990s. Under the national goal for ‘100,000 international students’, Tsuki University had begun to accept more students step by step. Student numbers increased from students who needed to enhance their linguistic level of Japanese in order to further study in Tsuki University at the Masters and higher levels. The Centre was purposed to provide them with intensive Japanese subjects for one year, to encourage them to prepare for examinations and enrolment to Tsuki’s postgraduate programs. Four teaching staff in Japanese language were accommodated in the Centre whose main responsibility was limited to teach Japanese to these students.
The first stage of the reform of educational internationalisation in Tsuki University was mild and relatively slow until the second tide of reform occurred ten years later. By the late-2000s, many of major national universities in Japan had already had a decade-experience of short-term student exchange promotion programs on the basis of partnership agreement with universities overseas, which had boomed in the late 1990s in most national universities (Hashimoto 2003). Tsuki University had not established this kind of short-term exchange scheme at that time. However, they realised the necessity to commence this kind of program due to government pressure for systematic internationalisation. They took advantage, as a latecomer, to investigate the existing programs of student exchange in neighbouring universities to learn from the reality of their operation. The findings from such investigation convinced them to plan a new type of student exchange program. This resulted in the establishment of the Moon Program that was launched in 2010.

The Moon Program was developed to create a multicultural learning community of students on campus, to benefit both international and domestic students in Tsuki University. The Program consists of three pillars of classes: specific subjects in social sciences taught in English; Japanese classes for international students; and classes for basic academic skills for both student groups. International students in whichever enrolment categories, degree-seeking or under the exchange scheme, can participate in the Moon Program. In the first pillar of the class types, participating students can learn their academic specialty in English from a series of discipline subjects provided in the Program. The content and activities in classes allows them to communicate with each other in an environment of English conversation. The second pillar, the Japanese classes, is offered for international students on a basis of their linguistic levels. The third pillar is the classes for development of basic academic skills intend to strengthen students’ skills for writing and presentation in English. The target students in this category are mostly domestic students as well as students from non-Anglosphere countries. Among the three pillars of the classes, those in the first pillar are provided from all undergraduate departments in Tsuki University. The other two categories are offered by academic staff at Global Education Centre (GEC). Unlike the other three case studies, the Moon Program is wholly conducted on Tsuki’s campus and does not assign transnational activities to participating students as a requirement of program completion, though experience of study abroad programs is strongly promoted with advisory support by GEC.

Organisations for the management of the Moon Program are the GEC and Office for International Affairs (OIA). GEC is a university-wide body which was established in 2010 as a renewed organisation from the previous Centre for International Students. At the time of organisational reform, their responsibilities were extended. Not only providing Japanese classes for international students, GEC has begun to take the following three new responsibilities to both student groups of
international and domestic. First, GEC provides advising service for domestic students about their study abroad preparation and experiences. Second, GEC develops and operates the university-wide short-term sending programs and long-term student exchange programs. Third, GEC assumes management and operational responsibility for the Moon Program as the central office for educational internationalisation. Seven full-time academic staff shared these responsibilities within GEC at the time of the interview. In addition, four academic staff with rich experience and speciality in the field of international education and university internationalisation came from internal different departments to GEC on a part-time basis. Their support was to offer the advising services to international and domestic students. In the organisation chart of Tsuki University, GEC is located as a jointly-use facility, as with other internal units such as the centre for health caring, student support and academic learning support. The administrative office, OIA, accommodates administrative staff in Tsuki University who were in charge of students’ international engagement. The main duties of OIA are information management for study abroad programs for in-bound and out-bound students, maintenance of study abroad scholarships procedures and administration of partnership with universities overseas. The total number of staff members in OIA was twenty-five at the time of the interview, of which two-thirds were non-regular staff members with fixed-term conditions. A non-regular staff member was fully allocated to the operation of the Moon Program on a daily basis, and a section chief for international exchange supervised her work. OIA is one of organisational units of administration office, which is situated under the Academic Affairs Department with other administrative offices for admission, education and academic management. Although the two organisations are separated in the organisation chart, GEC and OIA are physically close to each other because both offices are installed in the same building on Tsuki’s main campus.

8.2 The eve of the development of Moon Program

The process of the development of the Moon Program shows how senior leadership affects the institutional culture of practice. In order to understand this, let us start with the planning phase of the Moon Program that took Tsuki to the second stage of development of institutional internationalisation. 2010 was a turning point for Tsuki University in terms of the reform of educational internationalisation. In that year, the university restructured three internal organisations for internationalisation. The Centre for International Students was reorganised into GEC, the Office of International Students was regrouped into OIA, and Headquarters for Strategic Internationalisation, a central strategic planning office for institutional internationalisation, was reformed to Headquarters for Promotion of Internationalisation (HPI).
Many factors influenced this major reform of organisational units. Firstly, the national goal provoked Tsuki University to activate further initiatives in international student exchange. As noted in the previous section, Tsuki University had set a high standard of linguistic ability for international students in order for them to participate in seminars carried out in Japanese. Under this policy, Tsuki University had selectively monitored the quantity and quality of partner universities for student exchange. Because the exchange program went under the reciprocal scheme, it naturally meant that Tsuki could send only small numbers of its students to their partner universities. Therefore, their exchange scheme in the late 1980s and 1990s was on a small scale, merely for a top layer of students in Tsuki and its partner universities. This institutional policy of selective recruitment of exchange students was in contrast to the national agenda at that time, which was an imperative to increase international student numbers. In order to respond to the national priority, the university needed another measure to augment international students on its campus. Tsuki University eventually announced in a university-wide mid-term plan that they turned their approach to actively accept more international students. The first step was to relax the requirement of Japanese language skill for exchange students to accept a wider range of international students. However, they soon realised that this strategy was not as successful as expected. In fact, the university had not recognised the negative consequence of lowering the enrolment requirement of linguistic levels of international students. Along with the relaxation, the university did not prepare a sufficient acceptance and teaching environment for students who were less skilled in Japanese. At that time, there had not been any undergraduate programs in Tsuki University operating in foreign languages. The shortcomings in transition for international students made partner overseas universities feel mistrust. An academic staff at GEC looked back on that time and remembered when some partner universities refused to send their students because of a lack of preparatory programs in Tsuki University to take satisfactory care of international students. Some senior leaders and GEC members fully realised that relaxation of the linguistic requirement was merely a superficial measure for the institutional reform of international education. Institutional support for a new group of international students was finally demanded by the middle 2000s.

Second, a more massive external factor shook Tsuki University in the late 2000s. In April 2009, the Ministry of Education announced a new funding project called the ‘Global 30 Project’ to assist universities aiming to create degree-offering undergraduate programs taught in English (Global 30 2014). For application to the project, the Ministry required candidate universities to collect all institutional achievements regarding institutional initiatives for university internationalisation, such as the number of inbound and outbound students, number of programs taught in English, variety of partnership universities, proportion of teaching staff with foreign nationality, and so on. The application format also required applicant universities to set ambitious but realistic goals for
building an advanced educational internationalisation system based on their past results. These were the screening standards for the Global 30 Project. When the senior administrators and a few experts for international affairs in Tsuki University read the application documents, they believed that making a success of the application may be an unreachable goal for them to be required. The then Vice-President for International Exchange, Advisor to the Vice-President and a few practitioners at GEC, who all participated in the interviews, thought back to that moment and unanimously mentioned that the government’s announcement of the Global 30 Project was a critical trigger to direct the university to serious institutional reform for improvement of educational internationalisation. Tsuki University experienced, almost for the first time, a sense of crisis in its future for educational internationalisation. People in charge of internationalisation of education in Tsuki University came to confront the reality of their situation that the university stood at a marginal point in the national trend of university internationalisation. Senior leaders and experts in GEC decided to take serious steps to improve the system of educational internationalisation in the university.

8.3 A centralised approach and mutual respect of members in the planning of the Moon Program

Many challenges faced the institutional systematic reform. First, the university needed to activate student exchange. It wanted to increase the number of both international students to host and domestic students to send overseas. A new on-campus scheme for student exchange awaited. Second, an exploration seeking more partner universities overseas also had to be conducted to broaden opportunities of student exchange. These issues had to be handled together by strategic planning at the institutional level. What helped Tsuki University at that time was they were able to devote good human resources to the strategic planning of the new scheme. Five staff members who had different but relevant responsibilities for university-wide internationalisation initiatives came together to constitute the core members of the strategic planning for the internationalisation reform. They were: the Vice-President for International Exchange; Advisor to the Vice-President; director of Strategic Planning Office for Internationalisation; an academic practitioner at GEC; and a section chief at OIA (all titles at that time). The Strategic Planning Office for Internationalisation, a central office under the direct control of the central administration office, took the role for controlling the functions of planning and development of the reform.

What the core members did first was, as mentioned, an investigation for the experiences of existing short-term exchange promotion programs in other national universities. Many national universities in Japan had already begun short-term student exchange programs in the late 1990s under the financial support by the Ministry of Education. However, most of those programs resulted in
casting merely small effect on the mainstream of their educational systems. The main reason for this result was that in most cases the curriculum in those kinds of exchange programs was specifically arranged as the *dejima gata* style, without any positive influence to traditional regular curricula. That scheme restricted participating international students to take advantage of interaction with domestic students (Hashimoto 2003) and had almost no impact on the basic educational system. The core members in Tsuki leaned from this reality and wanted to avoid it happening in Tsuki University. They convinced that their university-wide program under planning must let international students expose to domestic students by combining some parts of regular undergraduate curricula of all departments. By doing so, they thought that a collaborative studying environment where international and domestic students learn from each other could be expected. At the same time, the core members also started a plan to explore more partner universities in other countries. Considering the institutional academic advantage of Tsuki University, they decided to narrow a focus down on overseas universities of middle-scale institutional size which had remarkable achievements and institutional pride in the fields of commerce and economics. This was clearly a significant turning point for Tsuki University to experience a strategic shift, from elitism to realism in partnership planning. The five core members speeded up discussions for planning, by using even their weekends for meetings, in order to shape a concrete plan quickly.

In parallel with elaboration of the reform planning, a next step was to acquire an institutional approval for the new plan. For this purpose, they organised a special panel for the planning and development of educational internationalisation. At the institutional level, formal approvals from the central decision-makers were normally required to implement any university-wide initiatives. However, the existing institutional committees had not been suitable for the planning, as there was not much time to the launch. The core members aimed to start the program to coincide with the commencement of the national Global 30 Project. They had only two months for preparation for the implementation of the new program. Instead of following a regular approval process through the existing formal committees, they decided to organise a new panel specifically for the planned program. The small membership of the panel contributed to rapid institutional discussions, consensus and approvals for the program scheme, such as development of the group of new credited classes as well as confirmation of new partnership agreements with universities overseas for student exchange. Other than the five core members above, some academic members from departments and three section chiefs of administrative offices for academic affairs, student affairs and international student affairs were constituted as the members of the specialised panel.

As a result, the plan took shape as the Moon Program that started in April 2010 after nine months of development. An academic staff interviewee acknowledged that it was unusual for national
universities to establish a university-wide program of educational internationalisation in such a short time. Another academic staff member acknowledged that the institutional size as a middle-scale institution positively affected the rapid decision and establishment of the Moon Program. However, what many interviewees agreed was a more important driving factor for the successful implementation of the Moon Program was the team work of the core planning members. On the basis of the team work, they were tied with a mutual respect for individual responsibilities. Many of them had not frequently met each other until the planning of the Moon Program had started. During several months of planning, the members became to understand and respect each other’s backgrounds, knowledge and abilities, beliefs and to shape the values for the Program. The then Vice-President for Education mentioned how much professional attributes in the field of university internationalisation were respected for planning an educational internationalisation program as follows:

Leave it to specialists. Through the planning I realised that university staff members with speciality in a particular area were really important… International exchange in universities is one of the fields where professionalism is demanded.

His observation may be a matter of course, because experts and practitioners who have good knowledge of university internationalisation know necessity of expertise in internationalisation in miscellaneous aspects, not only specialised knowledge and experiences in research and practice in internationalisation of higher education in the world-wide context, but also some basic skills for university management. However, as the following remarks by an academic staff at GEC reveal, in the reality of the Japanese university context this notion is not widely shared and few university staff members recognise the significance of professional expertise in the field of educational internationalisation:

Little importance is attached to expertise in international education [in Japanese university environment]. The majority of universities in Japan regard international education as a field where anyone can easily become involved.

In contrast with many practices in Japanese universities, the team planning the Moon Program successfully developed the mutual trust of team members. The academic staff member at GEC cited above continued his remarks to express how the core members united for a single aim of their internationalisation development:
But [the then] Vice-President acknowledges that international exchange cannot just be picked up by anyone—it should be done by professionals. Few top managers can say that… I think we [the planning members of Moon Program] respected each other and shared an ultimate understanding that we were heading in the same direction to really improve education in Tsuki University.

In spite of a very short period for its development, the Moon Program became a well organised institution-wide project with a strong centralised approach and closely tied membership of the planning team of central administrators and internationalisation experts. This was achieved by purposeful investigation and strategic planning by the core members within an atmosphere of professionalism and enthusiasm. Some simple numerical data on international student exchange in Tsuki University after the implementation of the Moon Program supports the effectiveness of the Program. The number of undergraduate exchange students from overseas partner universities increased by 160% between 2009 and 2014. Domestic students who went to study abroad boomed by 85% between 2009 and 2013. The number of partner universities also increased by 41% from 2009 to 2014. After the reform, partner universities sent more students because the Moon Program as a proper scheme for their sending students. The annual data in the Moon Program also shows significant success. The number of students who took classes in the Moon Program was 525 in 2010, increasing to 1,400 in 2013 (168%). The number of classes taught in English in the Moon Program increased by 83% from 2010 to 2013.

8.4 Changing approaches and positions of the international office
As seen above, the plan of Moon Program was realised through a highly centralised strategy with a strong bond between senior administrators of the central office and experts of educational internationalisation in GEC and OIA. The core members of the Moon Program prepared the Program without a break to put it on a path of sustainable growth. The primary revision for the next year was to stabilise the financial resource base. As the plan had been developed in an unusually short period, the revenue for the Program in the first year was managed by a temporary budget. It was not difficult, the core members believed, to acquire a regular budget for the Moon Program from the next academic year because of the successful implementation.

While everyone in Tsuki University knew that an election of a new President would be conducted in the starting year of the Moon Program, as a customary practice of university governance, not many of them would have imagined the extent it would have an impact on the future operation of the Moon Program. When we consider the effect of the relationships between internal organisational units on the practical management of educational internationalisation, Tsuki
University over this change period provides an insightful example. As with other national universities, Tsuki University uses the election system of a new President every four years. As a result of the election, a new President started his office from 2010 with new members of the executive board. The new central administration office followed the goals of internationalisation which had been declared in the institutional mid-term plan by the former administration. However, the approach they took to attain of the goals was very different from that of the former office.

The new office’s policy for promoting internationalisation went back to a birth of the university. The university would develop internationalisation policy on the basis of its institutional self-recognition as a traditional higher education institution in social sciences with a sense of high internationality. Under this institutional profile, they intended to return to quality-conscious internationalisation. Some organisational changes were made for this purpose. The President assumed the head of HPI to take the strong leadership for strategic planning of institutional internationalisation. HPI became supported by Office of Promotion of Internationalisation (OPI), where a new Vice-President for International Exchange took a position of the head. The new central administration office paid more attention to the institution’s standing in the world university rankings. Under the top office’s initiative, OPI extended its mission as an office directly supervised by the executive board. By installing a new director, the main responsibilities of OPI became research and analysis of the different world university rankings and of possible partner universities. As the university placed more emphasis on their traditional identity as a leading research university in the field of social sciences, their selection criteria for partner universities was raised to ensure partners were top-rate in similar study fields.

The numerical goals for student mobility became more demanding. The new office aimed for 300 international and domestic students to be exchanged. Considering their international and domestic student mobility at that time was 160 inbound international students and 140 outbound domestic students at that time, this was to be a doubling. The central administration office also explored institutional internationalisation in other areas. In summary, the main achievements of the new administration office were: an undergraduate program for fostering future leaders in the globalised society, which was subsidised by a national funding project; a scholarship system for sending undergraduate students to top universities in the UK and the US; and the establishment of a research centre for the international validity and mobility of students’ studying abroad. The new administration office sought to upgrade and diversify the internationalisation activities of education by giving implementation authority to OPI and some powerful departments.
The planning of these initiatives was undertaken within a small circle of the central administration office and the supporting office OPI. Most of these activities did not rely on the expertise of people in GEC. The central administration office and GEC became disconnected during the development phase of educational internationalisation. In the new office, the organisational relationship between the central administration office and GEC became small, and organisational significance of GEC gradually became marginalised in the whole institutional internationalisation of education. An academic staff member at GEC described that the scope and volume of responsibilities of GEC decreased after the start of the new central administration office:

At that time [of the former central administration office], GEC was recognised as an organisation that could share a part of decision-making for university internationalisation with the central administration office. But in the last few years, the heavy responsibilities have been concentrated in HPI, which organises the decision-making functions at the Vice-President level. The functions of GEC and OIA have narrowed. In other words, GEC has backed out of the decision-making process and become an implementation unit. [Our responsibility] changes in accordance with the leadership at the top. The degree of distance between us and the central administration office is different between the last two years and the previous two years. We are farther apart [now].

As he aptly noted, the relationship between GEC and the central administration was “farther apart [hanarete iru]”. The distance in operations led to a psychological gap between the central administration office and the educational internationalisation offices of GEC and OIA. Accordingly, communication between the organisations lessened. In the time of the former office, the then Vice-President for International Exchange held weekly meetings on Mondays with middle managers in GEC and OIA for the purposes of sharing and discussing important issues regarding the on-going and future institutional management of educational internationalisation. After the change to the new administration office, these meetings were cancelled and since then there were no regular opportunities for practitioners at GEC and OIA to meet and talk officially with the Vice-President. Major university-wide policy on educational internationalisation became discussed within HPI with senior administrators, and the role of GEC shifted from one of decision-makers to an operational organisation of educational internationalisation under the decisions of the central administration office.

With regard to the Moon Program, most of the core members at the development stage departed or left their positions after the new administration office. The Vice-President for International
Exchange and his Advisor left their positions with the change of the President. The then director of HPI also left the university in the year after the new administration. The section chief at OIA moved to another office which was not related to internationalisation. It was only a single academic staff member at GEC who remained. In contrast to its vigorous launch, the position of Moon Program became modest in the whole institutional initiatives for educational internationalisation and out of the spotlight of the central initiatives. The budget for the Moon Program remained unstable, too. The developing staff thought that the Program budget would be allocated from the regular budget of the university from the second year. However, in spite of the persuasive and positive results of the Program, funding was not made from the regular budget. The Moon Program had to apply to the special budget every year to acquire the funding for its operation. The major expense of the Program is the salary costs for the non-regular staff for operations and sessional teaching staff for some classes. If the budget application were to be rejected, the Program could not continue due to a shortage of human resources for administration and teaching. Although this study does not provide a clear answer to why Tsuki University continued allocating casual budget to the Moon Program, the financial situation invites the presumption that the Program is seen as a relatively lower priority in the overall institutional internationalisation policy of the new central administration.

Some staff in GEC had expected that a ‘backlash’ might occur against the rapid reform of educational internationalisation initiatives after the change in the senior administration office. After GEC has been isolated from the university-wide internationalisation management, some staff members at GEC recognised their role had changed from promotion to ‘maintenance’ of the operation of educational internationalisation. Since then, staff in GEC have seen the relationships with departments as important for their organisational life. Their past patient efforts bore fruit in two ways. First, the personnel structure in GEC influenced the improvement of communication with departments. When GEC was born in 2010, they officially invited one academic staff member from each of four departments as an advisor for international and domestic students. The advisors were asked to come to GEC one day per week. In addition to two advisors in GEC and OIA, six staff began sharing the advising responsibility to students from all departments. Each of five academic advisors waited at an advising room in GEC by taking turns at day-of-the-week shifts, and an advisor in OIA stayed at the office for the advising duty. They organised a monthly meeting of advisors to share their advising activities, which eventually brought about an opportunity of communication among advisors. This assignment of personnel across departments contributed to creating a more communicative relationship among GEC, OIA and departments. That communication contributed to understanding the actual operation of educational
internationalisation at each department which was otherwise almost invisible to the central international offices.

Secondly, the design of the system of the Moon Program gradually strengthened the departments’ motivation to engage with the overall student exchange system in Tsuki University. As already mentioned, the Moon Program was designed to enrol international exchange students in departments of their academic interests so that they could study with regular students on campus. This structure made academic staff in departments aware of the existence of international exchange students, because they began to see more international students in their department’s buildings on a daily basis. An academic staff member at GEC acknowledged that the physical visibility of international students in departments evoked a positive attitude in local academic staff in departments to the institutional student exchange scheme as a whole. This alerted them to the significance of study abroad for domestic students and made them more aware of encouraging domestic students to go to partner universities.

These two different channels for reaching out to departments opened a gate for GEC members for communication with departments, which contributed to stabilising the operational foundation for the steady development of the Moon Program. However, this communication effort was not systematically connected with the central initiatives for a devolved approach to institutional internationalisation. It was, as it were, independently systematised by the GEC for the sake of maintenance of existent international education programs. As a result of the change in the central administration office, the overall initiatives for internationalisation in Tsuki University became ill-aligned, with the central devolving approach and the basic operation of the Moon Program at the international offices being conducted in parallel by different lines of authority.

8.5 The kyōshoku kyōdō relationship: Administrative human resources for educational internationalisation

As we have seen above, Tsuki University conducted rapid reform of internationalisation with the launch of the Moon Program. During that initiative, Tsuki showed a successful application of the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship to the development of the Moon Program. Mutual trust in members’ responsibilities and a shared aim for improvement of its institutional internationalisation were the main force for educational reform of Tsuki University at that time. The planning team of the Moon Program, which comprised senior leaders and experts of educational internationalisation, demonstrated a fine practice of the kyōshoku kyōdō concept. However, in terms of the relationship of academics and administrative staff in other internal organisational units, the concept was not as clearly evident. In the conventional operation style, academic staff members in GEC had led the
institution-wide internationalisation process and administrative staff in OIA had supported GEC’s activities. As with the case of Hoshi University, many interview respondents pointed out administrative structure as the next big challenge for the development of the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship. An academic staff member at GEC mentioned one of the problems he felt was the overall administrative system that remained old-fashioned and inflexible:

I think what stands in the way of promoting internationalisation in Tsuki University most is the administration system. I mean, the administration system is slow to respond to the aim of institutional internationalisation. There is still a sense in common across the whole university that any matters in relation to international students, studying abroad and correspondence with foreign universities should be forwarded to OIA to be settled within the office. Administrative organisations in this university have been developed in the domestic context, and they still remain the same to a large part.

The decisive organisational reform in the last decade suffered from a lag in overall administrative systems to support the rapid change. An administrative staff member at OIA recognised a lack of awareness in most administrative sections to the reform the university had been experiencing. He illustrated an example of what occurred at the Academic Relations Office in the first year of the Moon Program to explain to what extent the administration procedures had remained outdated at that time. Because the Program was developed in such a rapid manner, administrative units and systems could not respond quickly enough:

For example, the online class registration system became a problem because it did not provide the service in English. Instead international students had to make a line in front of the Academic Relations Office to complete the procedure face-to-face with administrative staff members in the section. It resulted in misunderstandings between international students who could not understand Japanese and administrative staff members who could not understand English. This happened in the first year of the Moon Program. The administration system had not prepared for it. It [administration system] appeared to be unable to respond fully to international students.

A different example was offered by another administrative staff member in OIA. He argued that the Moon Program should be administered not by OIA but by the Academic Relations Office. The Academic Relations Office is the division which takes the whole responsibility of administration of class registration and credit recording for all students in Tsuki University. Because the Program is a large group of classes in which both domestic and international students can earn credits by
completion of class requirements, it is natural, he asserted, that Academic Relations Office should
cover the management of the Moon Program, too. However, OIA continues to have administrative
control over the Program simply because the Program is operated in English. He asserted that this
operation structure was not appropriate from the students’ point of view:

[Moon Program] is an opportunity for international and domestic students to learn
together. Therefore, from a students’ point of view, it would be more natural for the
Academic Relations Office to handle it. As long as the Moon Program is operated at
OIA, students have to move between the two offices. This is not one-stop service. The
reason is that the Academic Relations Office does not provide their services in English.
They have not prepared for it. If international students go to Academic Relations Office
for any enquiries about class registration in the Program or any other questions spoken
in English, they just direct them to go to OIA…The offices are located far from each
other on the campus.

The strain of disconnected administration was experienced by the practitioners who worked in the
frontline of communication with international students and with teaching staff. A non-regular
administrative staff member in the Moon Program dealt with not only assisting the class
registration procedure for international students, but also helping administration for teaching staff
who could not operate in Japanese. When an administrative matter, such as a notice of classroom
allocation, arose and international teaching staff needed to be involved, she had to translate the
essential points for them because most of internal notices were written in Japanese that
international teaching staff could not comprehend. While being outside of her responsibilities, it
was tacitly expected she do so. These issues occurred not only in the Moon Program.
Administrative matters for international teaching staff in departments were in many cases supported
by Japanese academics who could communicate with them by English. An academic staff spoke
about her ‘hidden’ role as a go-between for international teaching staff in her department with
Academic Relations Office. Administrative documents from the office were not directly sent to
international teaching staff but transferred to her to ask her to explain them in English. She stressed
the importance of development in the structure of administrative operation for the ongoing
internationalisation of Tsuki University as follows:

Providing subjects in English is not as simple as merely appointing international
teaching staff. Once we appoint international teaching staff, it means that a series of
services necessary for their acceptance, such as visa-issuing and other support in their
life and academic matters, should be arranged at the same time. The university is still insufficient in that point. Providing full infrastructure is still a challenge for us.

In terms of the administrative structure, two issues were pointed out by interviewees as the challenges for Tsuki University. The first is the personnel system of administrative staff which has remained the same for a long time. The issue of administrative human resources in national universities derives from the appointing system under the past and present national regulations. Before the incorporation of national universities in 2004, all regular administrative staff had been employed by the national screening test. The test had assessed applicants from the view of their potential for becoming quality public servants. International skills or experience had not been included in the assessment standards. Even after the incorporation which enabled them to set their original screening standards, few universities drastically changed the employment system and many of them continued with the conventional standards for employment. Therefore, the ability and motivation for university internationalisation had remained neglected in the appointment system in many national universities. The constraints on expenditure in national universities after the incorporation were also noted as another factor. This financial limitation drove universities to gradually decrease the number of regular administrative staff, because the personnel expense occupied the largest part of overall costs. Therefore, even if there was awareness of the necessity of human resources specialising in international relations, they simply could not increase the number of regular staff for that purpose. Instead, most universities relied on non-regular staff with expertise in international affairs, by a fixed term contract. The Moon Program applied this measure by employing a non-regular staff member with a three-year contract who had rich experience in educational internationalisation in another university. Although this measure has immediate efficiency to meet urgent needs for responsiveness to internationality in administration, it is not an ongoing solution for the improvement of entire administrative infrastructure because it does not create fundamental change in the employment and evaluation system of the main body of administrative staff.

The second factor pointed out by interviewees is a cultural dimension. A bureaucratic attitude among administrative staff was mentioned by many interview participants. This attitude tended to lead to the conventional, rule-oriented working style which is not suited to, and stifles, the innovative and change-oriented manner that is demanded for reform of internationalisation. A couple of academic staff expressed their dissatisfaction that many administrative staff seemed to lack a dedication in their vocational work to the improvement of students’ learning. Such a ‘service’ attitude is relatively novel to the conventional bureaucratic culture of administration in national universities and it is not automatically evoked in the mindset of administrative staff members.
As with most of other national universities, Tsuki University recognises the significance of rethinking the employment and training system of administrative staff for the improvement of the governance and management of university internationalisation. The President’s mission statement expressed the need to diversify the patterns of employment to recruit qualified staff with a broader range of abilities necessary for university administration in this century. However, there were no practical initiatives clarified by the statement. The mission statement also declared the need to strengthen ability of administrative staff by enriching international training opportunities. In fact, Tsuki University has prepared an international training opportunity for regular administrative staff since 2006. In that scheme participating administrative staff would visit partner universities in the UK and Australia for nearly one year to acquire various skills and experiences in working in the field of international affairs. By combining a language program and an internship opportunity in offices of international affairs in host universities, the training system has produced a certain degree of outcomes in stimulating a sense of professionalism in participating staff. However, the capacity of the training opportunity is limited to a few staff per year, therefore it takes a long time to expand its influence to the entire group of administrative staff of the university.

All in all, the practice of the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship in internationalisation initiatives could not take place in Tsuki University until the drastic reform of the development of the human resources in administration was tackled. This is obviously not a unique challenge for Tsuki University but one with which many national universities are confronted.

8.6 Changing structures affecting the culture
For Tsuki University, its institutional profile as a middle-scale university of social sciences and self-recognition and a national and world leading school of social sciences allowed it to sustain a traditional institutional philosophy of selective international education for a long time. The trigger for change was an external pressure from national internationalisation policy that convinced the university to shift its strategy from ‘educational internationalisation for small but talented students’ to ‘educational internationalisation for the mass of many students’. Its action taken to meet the gap between national demands and the ‘reality on campus’ was shaped into a decisively centralised approach forged by a group of senior leaders and experts on internationalisation. The energetic core members formed a team to assertively plan and develop the Moon Program in a very short time. The hierarchical personnel positions from Vice President to experts of academics and administrative staff for educational internationalisation in the development team created an innovative formation for rapid establishment of the new internationalisation program. Furthermore, the case study provides evidence of a cultural element that supported the effectiveness of leadership
by the core team members. It was the mutual trust that built a relationship of kyōshoku kyōdō which made the Moon Program take shape.

Another important point that Tsuki’s case illustrates is the changing organisational relationship between the central administration office and the international offices. The new central administration office took a decentralising approach with the aim to create different types of internationalisation initiatives throughout the university. This change impacted the practice of educational internationalisation at GEC. The organisational role of GEC shifted from that of co-planner of institutional policy in internationalisation at the central administration to one of implementation unit for embodying the institutional policy and strategies decided by the centre. Although the formal relationship in the organisation chart had remained the same, lessened communication widened the cognitive distance between these organisations. The evidence suggests that the partnerships between the central administration office and an international office are not monolithic but these can be interactive or one-sided in accordance with the institution’s internal and external contexts. In Tsuki’s case, as a result of the change of approaches from a centralised to decentralised manner, the striking expertise in GEC was left to be fully utilised for institution-wide internationalisation policy, and the result was that complex approaches of internationalisation at the centre and at the local level coexisted.

In terms of the relationship between an international office and departments, two different channels for reaching out to practitioners at departments were systematically designed at the local level. Advisors for international and domestic students from all departments played the role of representatives from each department who could connect GEC with their departments in exchanging the ‘state-of-affairs’ at each unit. The structure of the Moon Program worked as another channel, which encouraged faculty members at each department to interact more with international students. This contributed to the gradual growth of confident and positive attitudes in faculty members of departments to the international exchange scheme. These two channels functioned well for GEC as a hub of communication with people in departments. However, this network did not work well for mainstreaming the educational internationalisation initiatives, because the central approach and local practices were incompatible.

Another issue that Tsuki’s case illustrates is that the development of human resources in administrative operation is one of the primary issues in developing the concept of kyōshoku kyōdō. In the case of Niji University, internationality was one of prerequisites for human resources in administrative staff members which contributed to the effective kyōshoku kyōdō relationship between academics and administrative staff. Many national universities, including Tsuki University,
have overlooked this factor in the appointment system, even after the incorporation. Tsuki University’s case demonstrates that the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship for the better management of internationalisation can be built in many national universities only with the improvement in administrative structures.

Figure 8.1 represents the relationship between structure and culture for the practice of educational internationalisation in Tsuki University. The institutional type and their self-recognition were the main factors for their policy for educational internationalisation, which directed a centralised approach. The core team of the Moon Program utilised the centralised approach to create a new scheme for educational internationalisation. Their formal organisational positions led to strong leadership, which interactively worked with the mutual trust among the core members. Their leadership and trust supported the growth of a specialised, expert-led culture in the practice of educational internationalisation. After the central initiative, a decentralised orientation made the communication with the international office inactive. In this situation, the international office maintained limited communication with experts on educational internationalisation across departments by their advisory personnel system and the operation of the Moon Program.
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Figure 8.1 The relationship of structure and culture in the practice of educational internationalisation at Tsuki University

Note: ‘EI’ is an abbreviation for educational internationalisation.
Chapter Nine
Sora University: Strategic shift of internationalisation approach with cultural coordination

The last case study is conducted at Sora University. As one of the oldest and largest private universities in Japan, it has produced large numbers of graduates especially in the area of social sciences. It has also been an outstanding institution in terms of its proactive attitude in attracting students. Similar to other private universities but unlike them in regard to the sense of responsiveness to the market needs, Sora University had been successful in building an institutional system by which they could develop and conduct new educational programs which well reflected the present times. With this characteristic background, it was not difficult for them to strengthen educational internationalisation when the internationalisation of higher education became the national objective in the 1990s. A large administration office for institutional internationalisation had already been established in Sora University in the 1990s to lead the university-wide international education programs. However, when they realised the necessity for rethinking the approach to educational internationalisation in the early 2000s, the university decided to swing the direction of educational internationalisation from centralised to decentralised. Sora’s striking promotion of educational internationalisation began with this approach-shift. Through the approach-shift, the actions which experts in the international offices took for a recovery of the relationship with departments are instructive for this study in understanding how to link with departments in a decentralised operation of internationalisation, and how to use the collaborative kyōshoku kyōdō partnership for effective management of institutional internationalisation.

9.1 Overview of Sora University, the Sky Program and the international offices
Sora University is one of the leading private universities in Japan with long history. Commencing as a law school in the mid-19th century, the university has attracted high quality applicants from all over the country. Since its beginnings, in order to meet the demands of the times the university has gradually widened the range of educational programs. Now the university has thirteen departments of humanities, social sciences, natural sciences and practical sciences. The number of students in Sora University grew to nearly 35,000 in 2013, making it one of the top five capacities in universities in Japan in terms of student numbers.

A sign of Sora’s quest for the development of international education was evident in the mid-1980s. It was the period when international offices were established one after another in many Japanese universities as national policy urged universities to arrange systematic services for increasing the
number of exchange students from foreign countries. As a large-scale university, Sora responded immediately to this national intention to establish a central administration office for international relations. The next step Sora University took for institutional internationalisation was to launch the school of international relations in the late 1980s to provide students with courses in international-oriented social sciences. This was followed by two large sending and exchange programs for students with partner universities overseas in the early 1990s. Continuous proactive initiatives for developing outbound programs in the last twenty years led to an increase in student numbers who experienced transnational education during their study years at Sora University. According to the data provided by Sora University, while the number of students who experienced studying abroad in the 1990s hovered at around 500 per year, it rose at a steep rate in the 2000s. The recent data on study abroad programs in Sora University shows that the participating students were about 1,700 in 2011, which was proudly the second largest in Japanese universities in that year. With regard to the inbound scheme, more than 1,400 international students studied at Sora’s campus in 2013, or 4% of the total student cohort. This dual-directional student mobility, as well as a campaign of internationalisation at home, was strongly shaped by the institutional mission. In the current university mission statement, Sora University puts stress on the cultural diversity on campus, where students from multicultural backgrounds could learn from each other. Overall, the positive attitude towards educational internationalisation permeates the whole university atmosphere, reflecting the ample resources of personnel and finance for institutional initiatives for educational internationalisation.

Sora University was not a distinctive institution in terms of institutional internationalisation when Japan’s enthusiasm for internationalisation began in the 1980s and 1990s. Its activities for internationalisation had been normal and similar to other universities. However, as shown above, the university is now recognised as a leading university that keeps exploring proactive initiatives for internationalising its education system. How did the university carry out the major development of educational internationalisation in such a short time? Looking back on the past, there was a critical moment in the early 2000s that moved Sora University to a new phase of educational internationalisation. Before the 2000s, institutional efforts for educational internationalisation had been progressed modestly by the central international office named as International Affairs Division (IAD). IAD had collectively operated the planning, implementation and management of university-wide international education programs. However, since the beginning of the 2000s, Sora University accelerated its efforts for the internationalisation of education. A trigger was a whole university meeting in 2004, where the student group claimed an increase of study abroad opportunities as the primary element to be improved by the university authority. Once the university accepted this agenda proposed by students, IAD scrutinised possible barriers to realising
the students’ study abroad experience. They found that it was not the variety of study abroad programs that created the problem, because satisfying opportunities for studying abroad had already been provided to students. Rather, the problem resided in a gap between the application standards of the programs and ability of the main body of students to undertake study abroad experiences. At that time, many study abroad programs in Sora University had not been able to draw sufficient applicants at the satisfactory level of participation because a large volume of students lacked foreign language capacity and preparation for studying in culturally and linguistically different environments. The university needed to elevate students’ learning achievements to meet the gap with the program requirements. IAD decided to provide university-wide intensive educational support for students across departments who wished to study abroad. With this background and purposes, the Sky Program was developed in 2009 as a new institution-wide initiative. A new organisation called the Institute for the Enhancement of International Education (IEIE) was established at the same time as the birth of Sky Program, in order to accommodate new academic staff who engaged with the operation of the Sky Program.

The objective of Sky Program was to motivate students who were at the medium level of linguistic and academic preparation to realise their goals for studying abroad. The program provided them with a variety of learning activities to enhance their linguistic and academic capacity to an advanced level. The Program consists of the three components: preparatory program for studying abroad; personal coaching for students before going to studying abroad; and a follow-up service for those who have completed study abroad experiences. In the preparatory phase, students take two categories of lectures held by IEIE. These are intensive English classes and academic preparation classes for study abroad. Both classes are sufficiently advanced to develop participating students’ capacity to be adaptive for middle- or long-term studying experience in universities in English-speaking countries. Personal coaching is also provided by IEIE staff members to assist students’ engagement with realistic study abroad planning. Students who have returned from their study abroad would take the follow-up classes. These classes consist of the students’ major subjects that are offered in English at Sora’s campus, so that they can maintain and improve their competencies for their specialty subjects in English within a multicultural environment. Since its start, the Sky Program has attracted more applications than the capacity to offer places. One hundred freshmen are assigned to the Sky Program each year. Director of IAD recognises the Program to be successful in helping students at the medium level to progress to the advanced level and achieve their goal for study abroad.

In its fifth year, the Sky Program was operated by four academic staff members in IEIE and two administrative staff members at IAD. In the organisational chart of Sora University, IAD and IEIE
are separately and distantly situated. IAD is one of the large administrative offices, and IEIE is one of newly posted units accommodating academic staff. Although academic staff in the Sky Program all belong to IEIE, their personal studying rooms are dispersed in different buildings across the large campus. However, there are a couple of rooms reserved for the academic staff of the Sky Program in the same floor of the IAD’s office. This small space connects team members of the Sky Program allowing them to meet and exchange at regular meetings and other occasional opportunities.

9.2 Devolving to achieve whole in institutional internationalisation
Under the slogan of generating an increase in domestic students’ study abroad experiences, IAD had been taking the leading action to develop university-wide programs of educational internationalisation since the 1980s. IAD, as a large administrative office for institutional internationalisation, had integrated various functions for educational internationalisation, from planning to implementation to maintenance. The initiatives were extremely centralised. All the financial, personnel and material resources for university-wide educational internationalisation were concentrated in IAD, the office charged with leading for the benefit of the whole institutional internationalisation. However, a concern emerged in the central administration office that if they were to pursue internationalisation initiatives at a moderate pace, they might not be able to achieve the numerical goal set at the 2004 university meeting. The anxiety in the central administration office led to the idea of devolving the operational initiatives of educational internationalisation to local departments. The central office decided to facilitate departments to strengthen their management capacity for educational internationalisation. The central administration office invited each department to set clear policy and strategies for educational internationalisation. Since then, individual departments were required to manifest their original education policy for internationalisation and arrange a variety of actions under the policies. A couple of powerful departments could soon organise their original departmental policy for educational internationalisation and created their own international education programs to provide their students with opportunities for study abroad. Other departments were influenced by the pilot practices of the forefront departments. As a result, a wide range of competing initiatives for internationalisation emerged in the departments of Sora University. The recent menu of study abroad programs in Sora University totalled 61 in 2014. Among them, 14 were owned by IAD, and 47 were designed and operated by individual departments. Many interview respondents characterised the last decade of Sora University as the years for decentralising the operation system of educational internationalisation. In this manner, both the central international office and individual departments have independently strengthened their initiatives for educational internationalisation in parallel.
The institutional strategy of devolving the educational internationalisation to departments was successfully achieved. However, it was not long before a tension was evident between IAD and departments in the operation of competing initiatives of educational internationalisation. Interviewees in IAD and IEIE spoke all agreed that the Sky Program acquired a basic understanding from departments as one of the important institution-wide initiatives. The significance of educational internationalisation as an institutional high priority was also clearly shared among most people in departments. However, when they looked at the practical content and procedures of the Program, many departments could not agree. The major barrier pointed out by departments was simply a practical one. The Program partly interfered with the class schedules of departments. The operation went like that: students should register the required subjects to complete their departmental curriculum and to gain the designated academic degree. On the other hand, though the Sky Program was a non-degree program, classes in the Program were mandatory for participating students to take if they wanted to complete the Program and to study abroad under the university partnership scheme. Therefore they had to refer to the two different class schedules, to satisfy the requirements of both programs of department and the Sky Program. Although the Sky Program had arranged its class schedule to be held in the evening to avoid interference with departments’ curriculum, it was hardly possible to be absolutely free from clashes with any timetables of all departments in the university. From a departments’ viewpoint, it was problematic if students chose the classes in the Sky Program at the same time slot with the compulsory classes in departments, because it would negatively affect their graduate requirements. This problem illustrates a typical difficulty in the operation of institution-wide internationalisation initiatives in large-scale universities.

The conflict that was evident in the class arrangement gradually developed an unacceptable climate in the attitude of some departments towards the central initiative of the Sky Program. For some departments, the policy and practices of the Sky Program seemed to be extraneous to their own policy and practices for educational internationalisation at the department level. An administrative staff in IAD reported the department’s impression of the Sky Program he once had heard:

It has become hard for each individual department to accept university-wide educational programs that involve students across different departments… The reason is that educational goals of those university-wide programs are common to all departments and they are perceived as incompatible [ishitsu] with the individual educational goals of the department.
After the devolving of authority of policy and strategies for educational internationalisation, many departments became self-contained in their initiatives for international programs. Most departments had successfully developed their own policy for internationalisation under their particular disciplinary characteristics, and many of them could provide their own educational internationalisation practices within their departmental curriculum. Some powerful departments could even secure a national funding project for internationalisation in their own capacity. These departments did not feel a strong necessity to rely on the central initiatives for educational internationalisation. Instead, the central initiatives for educational internationalisation came to be seen as obstructive to their own departmental policy and practices. The aspiration in departments for developing their own initiatives for educational internationalisation led to a decrease in engagement with the central initiatives for internationalisation. As a result, many departments withdrew from the participation of the Sky Program.

9.3 Practitioners’ ‘grass-roots’ actions for networking internal organisational units

In accordance with the shift of approach from a centralised to decentralised manner, the international offices gradually lost their central authority to take leadership for educational internationalisation. IAD and IEIE faced ‘the period of transition’, from which they had to discover of create new roles in a decentralised context. The motive for change emerged internally. They understood that the decentralised approach did not mean less important responsibilities of the central internationalisation offices. They had to find new another meaning for their office, which meant orchestrating the decentralised educational internationalisation. This could be a harder task than operating leading initiatives by top-down control. However, they realised that Sora University in the 2010s needed to integrate piecemeal practices at individual departments, from small to large ones, so that they could coordinate the initiatives for educational internationalisation at the department level as a whole-institutional trial. The institutional size mattered again in this point, because internal networking became more difficult in a large university. An administrative staff member at IAD mentioned that an important point for a large comprehensive university is to have a high sensitivity to access to up-to-date information from each department:

I think this [difficulty in information exchange] is a peculiar challenge that all comprehensive universities have, because they have huge campus and their disciplines vary. The important points in managing educational internationalisation are to be attuned to collect information from departments anytime and anywhere, and to prepare for linking with them.

Many staff members in both IAD and IEIE recognised that they needed to improve the system of
communication with individual departments. At the same time, they also needed to be recognised by departments for their value as the university-wide organisations for educational internationalisation. They realised that the last twenty-five years of the IAD’s unilateral leadership in educational internationalisation initiatives had brought about a psychological distance between the centre and the local. This distance limited proper communication. The mechanism for conquering this problem was, they thought, to improve the internal networking. What the practitioners at IAD and IEIE did was instructive for understanding the management of educational internationalisation in decentralised approaches. They learned from the experience in the operation of the Sky Program and concluded that formal requests from the centre to departments using the official structural line were not effective and simply often met with refusal from departments. Alternatively, they decided to take a ‘grass-roots’ way by a few staff members at IAD and IEIE visiting each department ‘door-to-door’. An academic staff at IEIE who took a leading role for this ‘visiting’ trial noted that “we elaborated a plan of how to approach departments systematically. In the end, we decided to take a grass-roots [kusunone], bottom-up strategy”.

They met with a range of people in departments, from senior administrative officers to teaching staff to administrative staff members. Not only departments were visited, but they also visited related offices in campuses, such as such as public relations office and student office, which were partly involved in aspects of internationalisation. The purposes of the visiting tour were four folds. First, they informed the staff in departments and offices of their genuine intention to reform the institution’s educational internationalisation. Second, they tried to promote the educational value of the internationalisation with people in departments and other offices. Third, they let partners know of the rich resources in IAD and IEIE for assisting the departments’ initiatives for educational internationalisation. Fourth, they listened to department needs and expectations of IAD and IEIE. It took over one month to complete the intensive round of visits to departments and related offices. A deputy director of IAD (at that time) mentioned that basically the point of attention in the visit was to build a reciprocal relationship to disrupt the past vertical relationship between them. After completing all of the visits, the members noticed some productive outcomes. They learned that there were surprisingly many initiatives for educational internationalisation that were designed and implemented in each department. Most of these had been operated so locally that they had not been noticed at the whole institutional level. In addition, a number of cases were found in which only few inspired but solitary staff members planned and operated those educational internationalisation initiatives in departments. They struggled with limited resources and information for incubation and development of those initiatives. A typical style of the operation of educational internationalisation they found in individual departments was where a small numbers of experts led educational internationalisation initiatives despite little interest and involvement from the other members in
their departments. In these cases, activities at local units were not only left out of the institution-wide internationalisation initiatives but also further localised in departments because of the expert-led manner of practice. Soon the members of the visiting event in IEIE and IAD realised that measures were necessary for the better operation of educational internationalisation in individual departments. They decided to develop a study meeting, where participants could learn the significance of educational internationalisation for students’ learning, its practical applications to their initiatives in departments, and possible challenges to be shared and discussed for further development of educational internationalisation. The first trial of a study meeting brought together 90 staff from different departments and offices, followed by six other successful meetings in 2013.

As a result, the ‘grass-roots’ actions by experts in IEIE linked the central international offices with departments. This developed effectiveness in the operation of the decentralised internationalisation in three ways. First, the central international offices came to realise the high level of motivation and capability for the development of educational internationalisation at the department level. The devolved approach ignited attention to internationalisation in departments. At the same time, IAD and IEIE also understood that many efforts for educational internationalisation were conducted by small numbers of experts in departments. These initiatives were mostly operated on limited resources, which might have resulted in unsatisfactory outcomes. They believed it might have been improved if they could provide departments with richer theoretical and material resources they had in the central international offices.

Second, intensive conversations with departments and offices on the visiting tour lessened the cognitive distance between the central international offices and departments. An academic staff at IEIE provided the detailed results of the visiting events as follows:

People we talked with at the visits to departments and divisions had very sharp awareness of university internationalisation… They spoke of many ideas for educational internationalisation, such as intentions to create dual-degree programs, joint classes with universities in foreign countries via teleconferencing systems, and so on. But they also told us that they had been uncertain whether or not IAD was the right place to consult and ask for support in materialising their ideas.

The study meetings had the benefit of building an internal networking of practitioners of educational internationalisation. By exchanging the motivations and practices at the meetings, they gradually develop a horizontal relationship which was based on their identity as experts. The networking also contributed to mutual understanding between the central international offices and
departments, which gradually minimise the cognitive gap between them.

Third, the internal networking made institutional decision-making easier. Needless to say, official meetings for international education have been held in Sora University along the structural lines of the institutional administrative system. There was a monthly meeting for institutional internationalisation to which all deans and deputy deans of departments and executive administrative officers attended. In these large-scale meetings, most proposals in the agenda were usually put ‘on hold’ to be brought to each department for further discussion. Because most of participants of the meeting were senior administrators, they did not know the details of resources in their departments and needed to confirm with practitioners in their departments whether or not they had enough capacity for implementation of the proposals. With prior consultation between people in IAD, IEIE and departments in the practitioners’ network, these proposals at the formal meetings were properly well discussed much sooner. The ‘grass-roots’ actions by experts of the central international organisations successfully connected the central international offices with departments, in order to maintain the decentralised approach of internationalisation in a harmonious way at the institutional level.

9.4 The kyōshoku kyōdō relationship: The leading role of administrative staff
As with Niji University, the case of Sora University demonstrated the clear practice of the kyōshoku kyōdō manner between academics and administrative staff members in the central offices. The nimble actions for reforming the network of experts of educational internationalisation in Sora University were firstly planned by a few academic practitioners in IEIE. Nevertheless, the development of networking necessitated patient preparation. The interview data revealed that the networking plan owed a lot to a collaborative relationship with administrative staff at IAD. As experienced administrators with deep knowledge of internal organisations, they knew well who to reach out to for this purpose of the visits. They arranged each meeting session, in terms of persons and times at individual departments. Once administrative staff at IAD understood the intention for the visit by the staff members at IEIE, they properly organised the schedule. The success of the visiting tour was a result of the collaborative relationship between internationalisation experts in IEIE and administrative experts in IAD. Overall, the kyōshoku kyōdō concept was not a new idea in Sora University, for it was one of the institutional cultural customs. The director of IAD told about the shared culture of collaborative relationship of staff in Sora University as follows:

Sora University has a concept of collaboration between academic and administrative staff. Our university holds a strong culture of management based on discussion among both parties and participation in a democratic process.
Some interviewees mentioned that the benefits of the kyōshoku kyōdō concept for the development of internationalisation are not only the shared responsibility from different duties but also an environment of respecting discussions beyond vocational positions. It had been the norm in Sora University for administrative staff to be encouraged to engage themselves with discussions on educational planning, such as curriculum design, by providing academics with their managerial resources for conducting education programs. An administrative staff member at IAD offered an example of collaboration in educational areas as follows:

Our university creates an environment where administrative staff can partake in curriculum design. We join from the phase of designing of education programs by providing information we have, such as information on other universities and the empirical realities of our students’ learning. I have always thought that this was naturally expected of us.

He added that he had assured this culture of cooperative discussion to be “quite ordinary” [futsū dato omotte ita], as he did not know how the similar activities would go in other universities. Another administrative staff member, who knew some cases outside of Sora University, told of the critical difference in the working attitude of administrative staff members in Sora University compared with those in national universities. She emphasised that most of administrative staff members in her university took it for granted that they should engage with the planning of educational internationalisation initiatives. She provided an example by mentioning the planning of the Sky Program. The basic plan of the Program had been composed by administrative staff members, not by academic staff, since its early phase. Administrative staff left academics out of administrative work as much as possible and allowed them to concentrate on teaching. The main role of academics was to offer knowledge of experts from academic and pedagogical viewpoints and theoretical meanings for the purpose of teaching, in order to put flesh out the basic idea. It was the administrative staff who had taken the initiative for making the blueprint. During the period of planning, discussions between administrative and academic staff members built the fundamental understandings of educational value of the Program, which eventually provided the ‘glue’ for them to perform as a team.

In order to explain how the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship had been fostered in Sora University, many respondents of administrative staff noted the importance of the development of their professional identity as university administrators. In relation to this point, interviewees gave examples illustrating systematic and environmental supports in Sora University for the development of
professional identity. First, Sora University allocated senior administrative staff from the central administrative office to each department to play the role of administrative leaders in departments. By this assignment, each department in Sora University had two deans: an academic dean and an administrative dean (or a deputy dean). They were equally responsible within the organisational structure to operate department governance and administration with different viewpoints. Most departments held a monthly meeting by convocation of two deans, where academic and administrative staff members participating equally in discussion of basic departmental policy, planning and management on various directions, including educational internationalisation. This formal opportunity helped them introduce not only educational and academic, but also richer administrative viewpoints, into the practice of educational internationalisation.

Second, various vocational training opportunities were provided to administrative staff in Sora University to cultivate their professional skills and capacity for university management. Increasing numbers of administrative staff have benefited those opportunities. Some of the staff took paid leave to study at universities in other countries for Master’s and higher levels of study. The university has encouraged their aspiration for further study in university management, with warm support in their working environment. In particular, a couple of administrative staff members in the interviews cited a staff development program as a distinctive scheme in Sora University. It is a program of training opportunities for young university administrators, with the objective of fostering the core administrative human resources for future university management. An intended outcome was the acquisition of critical viewpoints in their work in university administration. Up to ten participants have been selected every year, to study for eight months about university governance and administration by lectures and a thesis on university policy. Started in 2005, the program has had more than 100 participants, of which 20 have promoted to managerial positions. According to an interviewee who experienced the program, it was worth devoting much time in evenings and weekends, though studying while working was challenging. As the program had been widely acknowledged within his working environment, he received positive support from his supervisor and colleagues.

All the above-mentioned systematic and environmental supports for administrative staff have helped them assume a sense of ownership of their responsibilities for institutional internationalisation. This has eventually led to building their professional identities as university administrators, fostering the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship with academic staff to get involved in educational internationalisation with an equal degree of responsibility.

In this kyōshoku kyōdō environment as the institutional context of Sora University, the roles of
academic and administrative staff members in IAD and IEIE are somewhat overlapped. An academic practitioner in IEIE mentioned the bridged responsibilities of academic and administrative staff members in IAD and IEIE:

The clearest difference between academic and administrative staff members is just whether they assume a responsibility for teaching in classes or not… Many of them [administrative staff members] hold related educational backgrounds and have an educational viewpoint on their work. And they like students. Therefore the two groups cannot be differentiated in those terms. I think the roles of academics and administrative staff members overlap with one another in a kind of gradation.

However, what is a characteristic in the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship at Sora is that even though boundaries seemed to increasingly be dissolved by their overlapping profiles, their vocational responsibilities were not integrated. Rather, they would make clear demarcation of each role to full advantage of the kyōshoku kyōdō relationship. Their fundamental approach to educational internationalisation remained unchanged: administrative staff firstly built a basic plan; and academic staff elaborated the educational and pedagogical content. Administrative staff monitor the revised plan to see whether the plan satisfies institutional regulations, and whether the plan is practically reasonable for student’s participation. Administrative staff also contribute to the planning by introducing a variety of informed viewpoints as they regularly move to different departments and offices throughout the university through the personnel system. They have multiple sights of different organisational units. While academics normally stay in a particular department for all of their employment in a university, administrative staff are able to introduce multifaceted viewpoints into the plan of educational internationalisation programs.

9.5 Practitioners’ local leadership for successful institutional internationalisation

Sora University’s motivation for the development of educational internationalisation was motivated by the needs of its students. The impetus for the strategic change for higher performance in educational internationalisation in the late 2000s was driven by students’ voice, which called for further opportunities of study abroad experiences. This is contrary to most national universities, as we have seen in Hoshi University and Tsuki University where national policy directions were the major drive for their promotion of educational internationalisation. For private universities, the critical factor for planning institutional policy and goals for educational internationalisation is the needs of the student market. Sora’s outstanding system of ‘listening’ to the students’ demands aligns with its institutional profile as a large-scale private comprehensive university and institutional self-recognition as being a critical model for large private universities in Japan.
The development of educational internationalisation in Sora University can be divided into the two phases. In the first stage, because of a necessity to create and control increasing educational internationalisation initiatives at the institutional level, an umbrella office of administration IAD executed strong leadership to keep a centralised approach. Finance and expertise for educational internationalisation was concentrated in this office. This scheme worked well until the late 2000s when the central administration office shifted their approach of internationalisation from a centralised to the second phase of decentralisation. The new approach was a natural decision for Sora University to improve overall institutional performance. Devolvement envisaged an introduction of an ‘open competition’ scheme between departments. As a result, the intention of devolvement was successful because Sora University could cover many different programs for internationalisation across departments. The successful approach-shift in Sora University illustrates its strength in management and senior leadership.

However, what made Sora further distinctive in its decentralised structure was sensitiveness in the international offices. In fact, as a negative consequence of strengthened departmental authority, Sora faced the problem of a parallel structure in which the central international offices and individual departments ran different internationalisation programs. This situation invited disconnected practices in different places in campuses, which eventually caused conflict and uncertainty. What lessened the cognitive gap between the international offices and departments was organisational awareness to the change in the roles of the international offices. They understood that the roles of the central international offices should be revised in accordance with the changed institutional approach to educational internationalisation. They shifted from a focus on the top-down initiatives to supporting departments’ effort for educational internationalisation as the ‘stage crew’. It was a decision taken for institutional benefit, rather than holding on to organisational pride as the leading office of internationalisation. With a shift to the new role, the decentralised approach became organically controlled at the institutional level. In the end, by constructing reliable reciprocal relationships with experts of educational internationalisation across the university, the central international office found a positive solution for ensuring a communication with departments. As the Sora University case shows, a sound relationship with local units is vital for universities that adopt a decentralised approach.

Figure 9.1 illustrates the relationship between structure and culture in the practice of educational internationalisation at Sora University. The institutional profile and its self-recognition generated a policy for striving for extending initiatives of educational internationalisation through a centralised approach. The policy influenced leadership at the centre, which encouraged a large international
office to lead the specialised, expert-led culture. After the change in the institutional approach, departmental autonomy in the planning and operation of educational internationalisation was strengthened and IEIE practitioners adjusted their role to play a strong part in the decentralised approach. Their bottom-up initiatives with the help of collaborative relationships with administrative staff at IAD were critical factors in constructing a reciprocal network of experts of educational internationalisation across different units in the institution. Their communication and networking were, however, developed with a limited number of experts across different units but not extended to the whole university. Their practice of educational internationalisation remained specific and did not become a ‘universal’ mode. To summarise the practice of Sora University, their initiative for educational internationalisation can be located as Model 3 and titled ‘coordinated educational internationalisation in decentralisation’.

Figure 9.1 The relationship of structure and culture in the practice of educational internationalisation at Sora University

Note: ‘EI’ is an abbreviation for educational internationalisation.
Chapter Ten
Finding factors in structures and cultures for educational internationalisation

This chapter discusses how the findings of the case studies guide us towards insights into the main research questions: ‘how do institutional structures and cultures affect the implementation of internationalisation of education in Japanese universities?’ Three arguments are advanced in this chapter. First, the conceptual models of the practice of educational internationalisation indicate four broad patterns in the practice of internationalisation in Japanese universities. Second, institutional size, senior leadership, the roles of international offices and internal communication are important factors that affect the structural and cultural aspects of the practice of educational internationalisation. Third, intentional efforts at the institutional level are necessary for building supportive cultures in combination with structural improvements if internationalisation is to be advanced.

10.1 Mapping the cases on the conceptual models
Chapter Four demonstrated that there were two important dimensions in the structure and culture of Japanese universities for understanding the management of internationalisation. These were: centralised or decentralised structural approach and the patterns of cultural behaviours that were labelled as ‘specialised’ and ‘universal’. These structural and cultural factors were conceptualised by building hypothetical models (Figure 5.1). These conceptual models were proposed to explain to what extent the approaches, which are defined by centralised or decentralised, and the patterns of institutional behaviours, namely ‘specialised’ or ‘universal’, can explain the practice of management in educational internationalisation in Japanese universities. It should be noted again, as already cautioned in Chapter Five, that the realities of university internationalisation are more intricate and complex than can be depicted in a two-by-two conceptual model. Nevertheless, this modelling offers a simple means for making comparisons, insights and interpretations of the phenomena of university internationalisation in Japan.

For the purpose of investigating the utility of the models, the case studies in Hoshi, Sora, Tsuki and Niji Universities are summarised in Table 10.1 and these results are plotted against the conceptual model in Figure 10.1. The results in Table 10.1 and Figure 10.1 represent snapshots that define the case study universities’ educational internationalisation at a certain time. It is noted, as in Chapter Two, that university internationalisation is not static, however, but a dynamic process that is affected by changes in internal and external contexts.
Table 10.1 Summary of the case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoshi</td>
<td>Centralised approach - effective central leadership shifted from a traditional decentralised to centralised EI approach</td>
<td>‘Specific’ pattern - limited networking of EI practitioners - leader-follower relationship between academic and administrative EI experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niji</td>
<td>Centralised approach - simple and flat structure of administrative offices - lessened department autonomy in administration</td>
<td>‘Universal’ pattern - preparedness and a sense of ownership for operation of EI by administrative staff - kyōshoku kyōdō in collaboration between academic and administrative staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsuki</td>
<td>Decentralised approach - new decentralisation policy emphasising advanced EI of individual disciplines</td>
<td>‘Specific’ pattern - limited networking of EI practitioners - leader-follower relationship between academic and administrative EI experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sora</td>
<td>Decentralised approach - lessened central authority to devolve EI management to departments</td>
<td>‘Specific’ pattern - limited networking of EI experts but possibly effectiveness in promoting the value for EI to other university staff - kyōshoku kyōdō in collaboration between academic and administrative staff in the international offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ‘EI’ is an abbreviation for educational internationalisation.

Figure 10.1 Mapping the practice of educational internationalisation in the four case studies of Japanese universities
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10.1.1 Structure: Centralised and decentralised approaches

Discussion of structures in Chapter Four revealed that centralised and decentralised approaches were two broad patterns in the approaches to the management of internationalisation in Japanese universities. Because of the tradition of decentralised university management, which had been systematised by kōza sei in each department, most Japanese universities have conducted internationalisation through decentralised approaches that have not been coordinated by the central administration. However, in accordance with the introduction of the market principle in the Japanese higher education system since the 1990s, many universities have been encouraged to reform university management in a centrally controlled fashion. The management of educational internationalisation is not an exception. A series of national projects for university internationalisation compelled universities to establish centralised management systems to promote systematic and strategic internationalisation. Under the influence of these government policies, some universities shifted to centralised approaches, others tried to do so but quickly reverted to decentralised approaches. In other words, no single model for internationalisation management emerged. This was the preliminary conclusion of the discussion in Chapter Four. So, what approaches did the case study universities adopt, and what factors directed the universities to adopt the particular approaches revealed in the case studies?

First, the case study research indicates that both Hoshi and Niji University adopted a centralised approach for educational internationalisation, though the detailed mechanism is different in each case. Niji University had employed a centralised approach since the establishment of the university. As described in Chapter Seven, Niji is a new university with a strong core aim to be an outstanding institution for international education. Every single function of the university is designed to achieve this. The case study revealed two distinctive aspects of its centralised approach. First, the Niji’s institutional size facilitates its centralised management. Being compact scale enables Niji to build a simple and concise structure of administrative offices. The central administration intensively collects student information from eight administrative offices, which allows the university to use up-to-date student information for the planning and operation of educational internationalisation initiatives without delay. The central integration of information supports a centralised approach to management, especially when we compare this with the approaches of other traditional universities, such as the cases of Hoshi and Tsuki. While there has been a long tradition of a sense of tatewari (sectionalism) in administrative offices in most Japanese universities, Niji offers an alternative administrative structure.

Second, Niji University lessened departmental autonomy in the management of educational
internationalisation. This has led to relatively strong power located with the central administration office to plan and implement internationalisation initiatives without conflict between the central office and departments in terms of policies and customs. This is also Niji’s device for avoiding excessive power for departments, which can present a blockage for institutional goals for educational internationalisation. Niji has learned from the traditional governance and management systems of other Japanese universities to implement an alternative way of centralising.

Hoshi University has quite different characteristics to Niji University. The institution is large, the number of students being the seventh largest of all national universities. The institutional history is relatively long in the Japanese context, commencing in the 1900s. Hoshi has a long tradition as a research-oriented university with strong department autonomy in every aspect of research and education. The administrative offices adopt the conventional culture of sectionalism, as with other large universities. However, Hoshi University is also a fine case of conversion to a centralised model of educational internationalisation since the 2000s. Chapter Four described how the centralised management model has been introduced in the management of educational internationalisation in Japanese universities. In particular, the SIH was the first national project that triggered a centralised approach to university internationalisation. Hoshi University was one of the selected universities for the SIH project. Certainly a quest for a centralised management model for educational internationalisation in Hoshi University began with this project. Ten years after implementation of the SIH project, the findings of the case study of Hoshi indicate the effectiveness of central leadership for educational internationalisation. At the most senior managers’ level, the President’s decisive leadership led to a change in financial allocation for institutional initiatives for internationalisation. This financial lever demonstrated his proactive attitude to the promotion of internationalisation, and focused departments on the importance of institutional missions of educational internationalisation and engagement. On the other hand, a highly significant aspect in Hoshi’s case was the President’s attitude to developing a harmonious relationship between the centre and departments. The President’s attitude was demonstrated in his mission statement, in which the central and departmental policies were respected equally and expected to complement each other. By encouraging departmental autonomy to a certain degree, management at the centre was successful in acquiring departmental cooperation for the institutional goals of internationalisation. Hoshi’s case is an example of how large-scale comprehensive universities can align a centralised management approach with departmental autonomy. Moreover, the role of the director of the central international office assisted the uptake of the centralised approach at the unit level. His position positively assisted in connecting the institutional mission with the local practice for educational internationalisation.
Second, the other two universities, Sora and Tsuki University, illustrated decentralised structures. Coincidentally, both universities had experienced a changing structural emphasis from centralised to decentralised approaches over the last decade. The reasons for this change differed, however. Sora University shifted its approach because it sought to increase the number of students who experienced study in universities abroad, which necessitated more specialised international programs in each department. In contrast, Tsuki University changed its approach through a shift in institutional policy for internationalisation when a new central administration took office. Both, however, shared a common necessity to strengthen departmental initiatives for the overall institutional promotion of internationalisation. Sora University recognised that it was time to lessen the authority of the central international office for the planning and operation of educational internationalisation and to devolve full authority for policy-making and management to individual departments. The new central administration office of Tsuki University decided to decentralise the internationalisation initiatives with the goal of promoting a new policy that emphasised the advanced internationalisation of individual disciplines. Both universities aimed to achieve diversification of internationalisation initiatives by becoming more decentralised. Nevertheless, the two universities have had different outcomes for the impact and effectiveness of their changed approaches. While Sora University achieved a notable strengthening of departmental initiatives in a coordinated manner, Tsuki University, by comparison, experienced a fragmentation of internationalisation initiatives between the centre and departments. The case studies of the two universities reveal two important elements for achieving effectiveness in decentralised approaches. These are: the significance of redefining the roles of an international office; and strategic reform of the communication structure between relevant internal organisational units. These elements will be discussed in the later subsections (10.2.3 and 10.2.4) in detail.

10.1.2 Culture: ‘Specialised’ and ‘universal’ patterns

Chapter Two examined Knight’s definition of internationalisation of higher education, which is based on the ‘process approach’ (Knight 2004). The process approach is where higher education institutions infuse the value for educational internationalisation throughout campus and the effort for internationalisation is blended with every function of university. Hudzik (2012) supplements this idea with the concept of ‘comprehensive internationalisation’, by which he asserts that for successful institutional internationalisation a supportive and facilitative climate must be developed among all university staff. These ideas suggest that there is a generally preferred direction in the culture of educational internationalisation. That is, in accordance with the advancement of educational internationalisation, a university would show a cultural change from ‘specialised’ to ‘universal’ patterns in which university staff holding any positions hold supportive attitudes and demonstrate engagement with their institutional practice for internationalisation. Based on this
assumption, how do the case study universities compare in their behavioural patterns in the practice of educational internationalisation?

The findings of the case studies demonstrate that only Niji University approaches the culture of ‘universal’, while Hoshi, Tsuki and Sora University performed educational internationalisation with a ‘specialised’ culture. These results mirror typical patterns of behaviours in Japanese universities for the management of educational internationalisation, which were introduced in Chapter Four. Many Japanese universities have steered educational internationalisation by an expert-led and ‘specialised’ approach. Furthermore, a careful investigation of the case studies shows that the degree of internationalisation in the expertise of administrative practitioners is a key to the difference in the cultural patterns in Niji and the other universities. In the discussion by Hudzik, the internationalisation of faculty is listed among the important components for leading a successful, comprehensive internationalisation on campus (Hudzik 2012, 24-26). However, this study suggests that in the context of Japanese universities, development in the internationalisation of administrative staff is probably more critical than that of faculty members. This is because the balanced relationship between academic and administrative staff is a key factor for many Japanese universities in creating the ‘universal’ culture of educational internationalisation.

Niji’s case suggests that a basic competence for international engagement and a sharp sense of ownership for the operation of educational internationalisation made administrative staff become highly responsible contributors to institutional internationalisation. In terms of the basic competencies for internationality, Niji University appointed more administrators on the basis of their competence in internationality than other Japanese universities. This arrangement stemmed from the institutional mission to create an international campus environment with students and faculties from multicultural backgrounds. For this purpose, Niji University needed to have administrative human resources responsive to such a multicultural campus environment. Moreover, Niji University made an institutional effort to cultivate a sense of ownership in administrative staff of the goal of educational internationalisation. A most distinctive system in Niji University was a combination of a broad range of administrative functions. The university integrated practices of educational internationalisation with different kinds of administrative duties by organising a large administrative office for student affairs. This required regular administrative staff to hold more than one responsibility at a time, such as taking charge of library service and international education programs. This mixture of responsibilities brought a positive international perspective to different kinds of administrative works. This appears to have facilitated administrative staff permeating every university function with a sense of internationalisation, thus achieving a ‘universal’ pattern of culture for internationalisation. Some might attribute Niji’s inclusive culture to their unique
institutional mission as an advanced international university, and presume that the majority of other Japanese universities cannot follow their case because not all universities can strive for internationalisation as a primary goal. However, the case studies in the other universities suggest that a basic competence and sense of ownership for educational internationalisation among administrative staff are essential to any Japanese universities which seek to advance internationalisation.

Chapter Four introduced the concept of kyōshoku kyōdō, or collaborative relationship between academic and administrative staff, as a distinctive norm of behaviour in Japanese universities. In order to implement educational internationalisation under the kyōshoku kyōdō concept, both groups are required to carry out their respective responsibilities on an equal footing. The interviews in Hoshi, Sora and Niji University revealed that administrative and academic staff jointly operated educational internationalisation initiatives under the kyōshoku kyōdō concept. However, the degree of stability of the kyōshoku kyōdō custom differed in these universities. Hoshi University only recently started to adopt a kyōshoku kyōdō manner in a limited fashion within the central international office, by forming small units of academic and administrative groups in order to steer the Star Program. In Sora University, the kyōshoku kyōdō custom was relatively well established as an institutional tradition. By this tradition, the members of the Sky Program respected different responsibilities for academic and administrative staff to operate the program. Niji University demonstrated an advanced practice of kyōshoku kyōdō. The management of the Rainbow Program in Niji University was similar to that of Hoshi in the unit style, but administrative staff took a greater leading role in the operation of the Rainbow Program under the concept of kyōshoku kyōdō through which they actively worked with their counterpart academics.

The kyōshoku kyōdō concept appears to be a peculiar norm of behaviour in the practice of educational internationalisation in many Japanese universities. This concept emerges from the traditional structural system of university administration that divides internal organisations between academic (i.e. kyōjukai) and administrative (i.e. jimukyoku). However, the concept of kyōshoku kyōdō is more than a simple structural matter. Many administrative practitioners in the case studies said there was a clear separation of vocational identities between academic and administrative staff under the concept of kyōshoku kyōdō. In their daily practice of educational internationalisation, they utilised distinctive vocational identities to develop their expertise. This intertwined relationship between academic and administrative staff worked as a driver for not only developing their expertise but also sharing the value of educational internationalisation among different job categories. Because Niji University had already had an advanced kyōshoku kyōdō mechanism in every element of university functions, it was easy to share the institutional value for educational
internationalisation with broader groups of academic and administrative staff to create a ‘universal’ culture.

Sora University is in a transition period in moving to the ‘universal’ culture. Because the main drivers of educational internationalisation in individual departments in Sora University were practitioners of educational internationalisation, the culture remained expert-led and ‘specialised’. For this reason, the institutional value for educational internationalisation tended to be shared in a limited way between experts of internationalisation. However, the experts have tried to spread the value for educational internationalisation to wider university staff by networking. The decisive step was the practitioners’ voluntary effort to build a university-wide network of experts across departments and related offices. This network brought together a mixture of academic and administrative practitioners of international education and other internationalisation activities. The purpose of networking was to share practices of educational internationalisation within each department and learn from others about the meaning of educational internationalisation for students’ learning. This trial for networking has the potential to spread the value of educational internationalisation across the university. An academic practitioner in the international office noticed the importance of value-sharing with extended university staff for the entire institutional development of internationalisation:

I think university internationalisation is a process of creating a culture. There are many goals of educational internationalisation such as facilitating co-learning among students, respecting cultural diversity, and fostering a challenging spirit. These goals are able to be realised with a shared value among university staff members in terms of how international education is important for our students’ learning. I think that what is important is for both academic and administrative staff members appreciate the value of international education, and to communicate that value to many different levels and spaces within the university.

She argued that the network of experts of educational internationalisation has the potential to ‘message’ the value of educational internationalisation to other university members. This turns otherwise invisible efforts by limited numbers of local practitioners in educational internationalisation to more visible performance. As Hudzik (2012) asserts, messaging the effort for educational internationalisation throughout the university makes campuses more inclusive and more engagement with internationalisation. Sora’s trial is an example of messaging from the leadership of local units, not only from senior leaders.
In terms of Hoshi and Tsuki University, both demonstrate a typical ‘specialised’ culture in the management of educational internationalisation. Moreover, the ‘specialised’ situation in Hoshi and Tsuki universities is conducted mostly by practitioners in academic roles. The leading influence for internationalisation is on the academic staff side, and administrative staff contribute by assisting academic staff initiatives. Both universities did not show a clear pattern of kyōshoku kyōdō. As national universities, they have followed the national government’s guidance to foster academic experts for the development of internationalisation. Both universities have made great efforts to arrange academic experts in the field of international education since the 1990s, and have built a relatively high quality human resource of academics in the area. However, the development of administrative staff is a dimension of internationalisation that is more difficult for national universities to tackle, due to the rigid personnel system for administrative staff. General administrative staff in national universities, who are the main administrative practitioners of educational internationalisation, are hired with general competencies but no specific capabilities for management in educational internationalisation are required. Once appointed, they are constantly rotated to different administrative offices in a university. This personnel system operates in most national universities, aiming to foster general university administrators with wide knowledge and experience of university management. However, this system inhibits the development of administrative human resources in the fields where specific expertise is called for, such as information technology service, library service, and international relations (Fukudome (Miyamura) 2005). This personnel practice is not only evident in Hoshi and Tsuki but also in many other national universities. These universities generally suffer a shortage of expertise in administrative human resources in the management of educational internationalisation. As many interview participants in Hoshi and Tsuki University pointed out, the well-balanced relationship between academic and administrative staff is an intrinsic factor for further operation of educational internationalisation to grow a ‘universal’ institutional culture.

10.1.3 Examining the conceptual models
The previous sections discussed the case studies by focussing on structures and cultures independently. In this section, the conceptual models of the practice of educational internationalisation are examined by relating the structural and cultural factors identified in the case studies.

First of all, the practice of institutional internationalisation in Hoshi University is characterised as a centralised approach through executive initiatives in policy and system arrangements, and a ‘specialised’ culture that concentrates specialised personnel and financial resources in the central international office CGE. This case is situated in the first model as ‘strategic educational
internationalisation at the core’. In universities of Model 1, the ownership of institutional internationalisation is held at the central administration office and leadership at the central office is vital for policy-making and systematisation of practice. Hoshi University is a fine example of the execution of central leadership. The President’s mission statement was well drafted and effectively published at the time of launching the current office. The written statement was exposed to a broad range of university staff by publishing papers and uploading to the university website. The essential messages in the statement were also delivered by holding briefing sessions with the President for the whole university staff on several occasions. The President’s firm decision to financially support educational internationalisation effectively convinced many university staff of the emphasis on institution-wide educational internationalisation. Initiatives at the central administration office were effectively executed to direct a wide range of university staff attention to the institution-wide internationalisation activities.

While the top-down leadership was conducted effectively, one of the challenges for Hoshi University, as a large-scale comprehensive university, was to guarantee communication between different organisational units. In Hoshi University, because of the systematic centralisation, communication between units in the university was limited to networking among practitioners of educational internationalisation. While there are multiple organisational units in campuses of Hoshi University which are related to internationalisation activities, these organisations are not organically linked but function in parallel. Communication between the central international office CGE and departments is weak, too. Hoshi University may benefit from exploring how to involve more university staff in institutional internationalisation initiatives.

Second, the practice of educational internationalisation in Sora University and Tsuki University is characterised as decentralised with a ‘specialised’ culture. These features lead the two universities to being located on the third model ‘coordinated educational internationalisation in decentralisation’. Sora University recognised the necessity for strengthening departmental initiatives to achieve a short-term goal within a brief period. Tsuki University was motivated to decentralise when they conducted a regular change of the central administration office. While the triggers for the shift to decentralisation in the two universities were different, both universities reinforced educational internationalisation in local units. These cases show that in contrast to the national policy intention for centralised internationalisation management, there are ways for successful decentralisation of internationalisation with careful intervention by the central administration. In this approach, the coordination of individual local units by the central office is essential so that practices at the whole institution level and at local department level are compatible. The effectiveness of the coordinating role of international offices influenced the outcomes of the
approach-shift in the two universities. Sora University embraced this challenge and took action to conquer the operational and cognitive barriers between the central international office IEIE and departments by networking international educators. This gradually moved the institution from an extremely ‘specialised’ climate closer towards ‘universal’. On the other hand, Tsuki University struggled with uncoordinated initiatives for educational internationalisation within different local units which resulted partly from insufficient expertise in the international office GEC for effective central management. The case studies of Sora and Tsuki University suggest that devolving internationalisation authority to departments is a potentially effective structural approach. However, this should be accompanied by well-planned strategies in the central office for coordinating initiatives at local units, aiming to create a facilitative institution-wide culture.

Third, in contrast to the three cases above, Niji University in its management of educational internationalisation exemplifies the second model ‘comprehensive educational internationalisation’. In this model, the centralised approach is adopted with a ‘universal’ culture of practice. Niji’s policy and mission were clearly focused on advanced international education engagement, and a set of conditions such as governance structure, campus facilities, arrangement of administrative offices and human resources, contributed to the embodiment of the institutional mission under strong central leadership. There is not a single international office in Niji University, but instead every part of the institution operates its activities in education and research with attention to the international dimension. This strategic approach and inclusive practice mirrors the Hudzik and McCarthy’s ‘comprehensive internationalisation’ model.

According to Kudo and Hashimoto (2011), the Niji University approach is suited to universities that are smaller in institutional size and which embrace internationalisation not as a path to being a world-standard university but as “an objective itself” (p. 353). However, they point out that regardless of institutional size and primary missions, smaller universities need to secure strong financial support to properly maintain internationalised environments. Kudo and Hashimoto (2011) comment that “(c)onsidering the tremendous running cost that necessitates additional expenses for staff and student recruitment and support, these universities will have to be able to bear potential criticism or rigorous evaluations about the rationales and outcomes of creating the intercultural environment” (p. 354). Among miscellaneous trials by many universities for conducting comprehensive internationalisation, Niji’s initiative is regarded as one of the successful cases in overcoming the difficulties in maintaining the quality of outcomes for educational internationalisation, through combining strategies in structure and culture. The case study of Niji University highlights the keys for their success, which can be summarised into nine factors. These are: (1) the institutional type as a middle-scale private university of social sciences; (2)
self-recognition as an innovative university for international education engagement; (3) clear policy for educational internationalisation; (4) simplified formation of the administrative structure; (5) a shared value for educational internationalisation throughout the university; (6) administrative human resources holding strong professional identities; (7) decreased administrative responsibility for academics; (8) a supportive atmosphere towards the development of administrative human resources; and (9) a collaborative relationship between academic and administrative staff in the institutional culture.

A distinctive feature in Niji’s case is that these factors interact to form a combination of centralised structure and ‘universal’ culture for the operation of educational internationalisation. While some factors, such as the administrative structure, human resource arrangement and decreased administrative responsibility for academics, are achievable by strong-willed leadership at the top, other factors, such as the shared valuing of educational internationalisation across local units, institutional supportive atmosphere for human resource development and collaborative relationship between academic and administrative members, can only be developed through the strong involvement of a wide range of university staff. As Hudzik and McCarthy (2012) point out, comprehensive internationalisation can be realised only where the combination of systematic leadership at the centre and a supportive climate throughout the institution is guaranteed.

The synthesis of the case studies supports the validity of the conceptual models to a large extent. The models can explain a variety of internationalisation approaches in Japanese universities, and can help them identify ‘where we are now’ in terms of a university’s practice of management in educational internationalisation as well as indicate ‘where to go next’ should they choose to do so.

10.2 Other factors in structures and cultures found in the case studies
While the conceptual models demonstrated the significance of structural and cultural factors respectively, there are other notable factors identified by the case studies. It is worth examining the effects of these factors. The factors for discussion are: (1) institutional size and sector types; (2) senior leadership; (3) the roles of international offices; and (4) internal communication.

10.2.1 Institutional size and sector types
This study employed institutional size and type of sectors as variables for selecting the case universities, because the literature showed a possible impact of these structural factors on the practice of educational internationalisation. As a result, the four case studies demonstrated the influence of these factors in the development of institutional policy and strategies for internationalisation. In terms of institutional size, all the cases showed that it influenced the
establishment of their institutional profiles that helped develop the structure of policy-making and strategy-planning at the centre. In terms of sector types, the variety of approaches to educational internationalisation in the four cases generally followed the findings of previous research focussing on sector types. Consistent with what Goodman (2007) and Yonezawa et al. (2009) have argued, different rationales and approaches to internationalisation between national universities and private universities were evident in the four universities. The nationals, Hoshi and Tsuki University, historically focused mainly on the development of internationalisation policy and strategies at the postgraduate and researchers’ level and they began more intensive internationalisation at the undergraduate level only from the 2000s. On the other hand, the private university Sora had longer experience in the development of educational internationalisation at the undergraduate level. The other private institution, Niji University, has been emphasising the internationalisation of undergraduate education from its establishment. These differences confirm obvious institutional goals for national universities that stress international competitiveness in postgraduate research. Private universities tend to emphasise improvement in undergraduate education. However, this research indicates that differences in the sectors may be less significant in the future. First, as discussed in Chapter Four, national universities must cope with decreasing funds from national budgets and will have to seek more external financial support. They will have to pay attention not only to national orientations but also to other influential stakeholders, including students’ and industrial markets, as does the private higher education sector. Second, as the review of the recent national projects shows, national policy has been increasingly emphasising the development of educational internationalisation at the undergraduate level for overall quality improvement of university education. National universities will have to devote more institutional efforts to the development of internationalisation in undergraduate education, which may lead them to becoming more competitive with private universities, which hitherto have taken the lead in the field of internationalisation.

10.2.2 Senior leadership
Until the late 2000s, many Japanese universities had not demonstrated clear leadership in the central administration of internationalisation. This resulted in bottom-up processes and often incoherent outcomes for internationalisation initiatives between the centre and local units (OECD 2009, 85). However, since the incorporation of national and local public universities, an increasing number of Japanese universities have made efforts for management reform and improvement of the central leadership for internationalisation. The case studies reveal some institutional experiences in this regard following incorporation. Hoshi University developed central leadership in the last decade, which led to a stable financial allocation to university-wide educational internationalisation initiatives. Sora University had a long tradition of top-down approaches of the central
administration office for institutional internationalisation. This was effective enough, even though it permitted departments to develop independent initiatives for internationalisation in recent years. And Niji University demonstrated coherent, strong top-down leadership for the operation of advanced international education across the university, which affected both structural and cultural factors at the local level. What can we see behind these multifaceted approaches of central leadership in the case study universities?

In the challenge to establish effective central leadership at individual universities, the literature reviewed in Chapter Three indicated that the power of kyōjukai, or departmental authority for administration, was a factor that many universities in Japan found difficult to manage. The practice of central leadership in the case study universities typically embraced some strategies for coping with the power of kyōjukai of departments. In the case of Hoshi University, clarification of the relationship between the central and departmental policies for internationalisation was conducted by the President and senior leaders, in order to show respect for departmental initiatives for internationalisation and to create a supportive climate for the wider institutional goals. Sora University paid careful attention to departmental efforts for educational internationalisation too, devolving the control of internationalisation activities to improve performance at departments. In the case of Niji University, they had learned from the experiences of other older universities and decided to weaken the administrative power of departments from the institution’s creation, removing the administrative authority of kyōjukai as much as possible in order to make the central leadership more effective for the management of internationalisation. These endeavours in the three universities demonstrate their intention to create a good power balance between the central administration and departments. The central administrators in the case study universities all recognised the engagement of departments as the cornerstone for successful practice of institutional internationalisation. Therefore, the universities devoted much effort to support, or lighten, departments’ actions for internationalisation and to lower the barriers for their participation in institution-wide internationalisation initiatives.

Keeping a sound balance between the central administration and departments must be a core idea in the management of internationalisation, because these two actors are the planner and practitioners of institution-wide internationalisation. As the planner of institutional internationalisation, the central administration office in most Japanese universities has concentrated its energies on making well-crafted policy. However, it is undeniable that fewer universities have tried hard to use their efforts for communicating with departments to achieve policy goals. The directions in institutional policy must be effectively communicated to departments and other local units because practitioners need to better understand the institutional intentions. The case studies of Hoshi, Sora and Niji
University suggest that some universities have now realised the importance of internal relationships for enhanced internationalisation practice.

10.2.3 Roles of international offices

Chapter Three reviewed the widening roles of international offices in Japanese universities in accordance with the complex development of internationalisation in many universities. Among the varied roles of international offices, their principal role in the management of internationalisation is internal liaising. That is, to connect multiple organisational units in a university for the purpose of conducting institution-wide internationalisation. While Niji University did not have a single international office, multiple practices for liaison for the international offices are found in the other three case study universities.

Hoshi University exhibited a supporting role for the international office. The director of the international office CGE assumed an official responsibility as Deputy Vice-President for International Exchange in the central administration office to connect the related three units, the central administration office, CGE and departments. This formal positioning of the director clarified the connection between policy and practice and facilitated the smooth implementation of the institution-wide internationalisation initiative, the Star Program. Under his responsibility, the international office CGE successfully liaised between the central administration and departments in delivering institutional ideas for internationalisation to local units of the university. As shown in Model 1, the main role of an international office in a university with a centralised approach and ‘specialised’ culture is to embody the central decisions for institutional internationalisation. The practice of the CGE in Hoshi University exemplifies the role of an international office in Model 1.

By contrast, the international offices in Sora University and Tsuki University were cases of Model 3. To respond to the renewed needs of the central administration, a primary issue for the international offices in the two universities was to tackle the heterogeneous characteristics of departments in terms of their policies and practices in educational internationalisation. The international offices responded to this by redefining their main responsibilities. In Sora University, practitioners in the international office IEIE executed their new roles as coordinators of departmental initiatives of educational internationalisation. They began to build an informal, flat-structured networking with practitioners of educational internationalisation throughout the university. Through this effort, the institutional intention of decentralisation in internationalisation was organically coordinated and formed a foundation for a facilitative and inclusive climate for the entire institutional internationalisation. In Tsuki University, practitioners in the international office GEC recognised the necessity for a shift of their role from that of co-planner to that of executor of institutional
policy during the change of the central administration office. They then made more intensive effort
to develop practical relationships with practitioners of educational internationalisation in each
department. These examples of the roles of the international offices in Sora and Tsuki University
demonstrate the organisational responsibility in Model 3 in the conceptual models, showing that
international offices should work to coordinate individual internationalisation processes at the unit
level within an overall institutional policy and goals framework.

Over the last three and a half decades, many Japanese universities have established international
offices and used these to expand their organisational capacities. With the growing importance of
internationalisation policy and increasing complexity of internationalisation initiatives, they have
assumed the existence of an international office to be a matter of course. However, few have
earnestly investigated the actual organisational meanings and effective functions of these offices for
better practice in institutional internationalisation. The case studies suggest that institutional efforts
for redefining organisational roles of international offices are now required.

10.2.4 Internal communication

Throughout the four case studies, a common feature is that great efforts were made to build
communication between organisational units. In Hoshi University, frequent communication
between the top administrators and the director of the international office allowed a path for
institutional policy to become practice. In Sora University, practitioners in the international office
explored a flat-structured network with practitioners of educational internationalisation across local
units by persistent ‘grass-roots’ interactions. The core staff in the international office of Tsuki
University had frequent communication for developing the Moon Program as a milestone
institutional initiative, and after a change of approaches the international office maintained practical
communication with practitioners of educational internationalisation in each department. However,
due to decreased opportunities for communication with the centre, the efforts by the international
office were not effectively linked with the new policy of the central administration, resulting in
relatively incoherent patterns of internationalisation initiatives between the centre and local units.
While Niji University did not have an international office, communication between administrators
and academics in Niji and a partner university overseas was intensively developed. This was
significant in the establishment of the Rainbow Program, a new institutional initiative of complex
educational internationalisation.

Some forms of communication were performed on the basis of the formal structure, others were
informal. Regardless of formality or informality, they are conducted for the purpose of building
practical and productive relationships in the institutions. The objectives of communication that
were seen in the cases were to understand the needs of counterparts, to address the expectations of counterparts, to reach mutual understandings, and to build reciprocal relationships by which each organisational unit can benefit. These objectives were essential to avoid fragmentation and to achieve systematic and holistic internationalisation. Internal communication is important to share the goals with a wide circle of staff from senior leaders to practitioners at local units.

The obvious significance of communication demonstrated by the four case studies is supported by previous research in the field of institutional governance and university internationalisation. Kezar (2004) proposes that relationships are one of more effective factors along with leadership and trust than structural process in the governance of universities. Taylor (2004) points out the effectiveness of relationship between subunits in which leadership has a great influence on successful networking. Van der Wende (1999) asserts that for optimising compatibility in institutional internationalisation, dialogue and partnerships between internal organisations are the two important factors. This study contributes to the previous research on the effects of organisational communication, by adding a finding that there are three main actors of organisations in the practice of internationalisation that should perform productive communication for educational internationalisation. These are: the central administration; international offices; and departments.

Moreover, this study suggests that different patterns of communication are highlighted in a variety of the four conceptual models. In the Model 1 dubbed ‘strategic educational internationalisation at the core’, communication between the central and an international office is most important. In Model 2, named ‘comprehensive educational internationalisation’, flat communication between units would be more evident for the purpose of inclusive of international engagement. In Model 3, ‘coordinated educational internationalisation in decentralisation’, an international office and departments would create more frequent communication to permit an international office to coordinate different initiatives for internationalisation at unit level. Although the case studies did not allow an investigation in the fourth model ‘mainstreaming educational internationalisation’ due to a lack of examples, communication should hypothetically be emphasised between the central administration and local units for orchestrating individual internationalisation initiatives. This is not to say that other communication paths in each category are unimportant and can be ignored. However, paying more careful attention to particular paths of communication within each model can contribute to the creation of more ideal and productive relationships between organisational units.

10.3 The relationship between structure and culture

The discussion above shows the relationship between structure and culture in the management of
educational internationalisation. In particular, the practices in the case study universities demonstrate that the structural mechanism in the management of educational internationalisation can produce a supportive culture. In Hoshi University, central leadership turned over a conventional decentralised approach to internationalisation to operate a centralised approach soon after the President took office. This structural power exercised by the President and senior leaders drove a close tie with an international office which led to a ‘specialised’ culture that supported experts in the international office to promote institutional-wide internationalisation activities throughout campus. Niji University exemplified its strong commitment to internationalisation by top-down leadership and strong administration power, accompanied with a uniform institutional culture of ‘universal’ which invited participation of a wide range of university staff. Tsuki University experienced structural reform through a change in the central office from a centralised to decentralised approach. While practices were dispersed and less coordinated, internationalisation initiatives of the central and departments were independently developed by a strengthened expert-led culture. As with Tsuki, Sora University reformed its structure from a centralised to decentralised approach to internationalisation by devolving the operational authority to departments. This structural initiative of the central office turned the institutional culture from extreme ‘specialised’ in a more ‘universal’ direction, resulting in the establishment of networks of practitioners of educational internationalisation across the university. These findings from the case studies illustrate how structures help foster institutional cultures that are suitable for implementing and advancing policy and strategies. They indicate that structural change might precede cultural change, and that appropriate structures can foster institutional cultures to be more ‘universal’.

However, it is not clear from the case studies to what extent a recognised linkage between structure and culture was used to intentionally facilitate the better operation of internationalisation. Not only the case study universities but also many other universities in Japan have made continuous efforts to build enhanced frameworks for internationalisation over the past three decades. The efforts include development of policy, strategies and goals with rich data and considered analysis and arrangement of pertinent organisational units for realising institutional goals. Admittedly, these institutional efforts and structural reforms in many universities have been significant, however I would like to argue that fewer universities have recognised the importance of institutional culture and the extent to which institutional efforts in reforming structures have affected the development of culture. As universities are a mass of loosely-coupled organisational units which are operated independently by diverse academic and educational rationales, it is challenging to acquire overall consensus for institutional internationalisation. Many universities have evaded the painstaking task of forming supportive cultures, which requires the active engagement and involvement of a wide range of university staff. However, institutional effort for reforming or modifying cultures is
unavoidable, because internationalisation is a process of institutional transformation that cannot be achieved only through structural reform but needs a wider institutional paradigm shift. It necessitates an environment on campus which ignites a supportive mindset among diverse people for active participation in internationalisation activities. A neglected point in institutional efforts for internationalisation in many universities lies in access to the hearts of their university members. University leaders and internationalisation experts should try to reach out diverse staff members in their universities by delivering institutional messages, listening to their realities and expectations, exchanging conversation to lower the barriers for cooperation, and seeking reciprocal relationships. Some institutional strategies found in the case studies, such as redefining the roles of international offices and establishing formal and informal internal communication networks, are examples that are born from structural reform and facilitate a process of transforming institutional culture to be a ‘universal’ mode. The next steps for many universities in Japan involve to intentional connection of structural reforms with a plan for cultural transformation.

10.4 Key factors in the interaction of structures and cultures
We have discussed the case studies of the four universities’ practice of educational internationalisation by plotting them on the conceptual models in Figure 10.1 to examine the validity of the models. While further verification is necessary, the discussion in this chapter demonstrates that the proposed conceptual models can explain the practice of educational internationalisation in universities in Japan. So many different initiatives for educational internationalisation in various types of Japanese universities have been conducted under the influence of national policy, institutional features and particular internal and external factors. The models can summarise these initiatives of educational internationalisation by indicating the four broad categories of approaches and institutional behavioural patterns. History shows that university internationalisation in Japan over the last three decades has been intensively guided and driven by a national intention which has firmly facilitated a centralised approach and a ‘specialised’ pattern of practice as a single ideal form. Here, by demonstrating the models, I would like to argue that there is not any inherent superiority or inferiority in the type of approaches and the patterns of practice. Each model addresses particular characteristics in the way of decision-making and practice in institutional internationalisation that would provide individual universities with an analysis of current state (where they are now) and a planning strategies for future directions (where they want to move and how this can be done) in accordance with their specific internal and external conditions.

In addition to the approaches and patterns, the results of the case studies highlighted the other influential factors, including institutional size and sector types, senior leadership, roles of an
international office and internal communication. As for institutional size and sector types, the case study universities showed the influence of these on developing policy and strategies for internationalisation. However, while institutional size will remain significant, the sector types will have less future impact on the policy and practice of educational internationalisation because of the introduction of the market principles in the management of national universities. In terms of senior leadership, it should primarily be executed to harmonise the autonomy of departments with the central policy and goals for internationalisation. The findings also suggest that senior leadership works better when identifying the appropriate functions for an international office and allowing the office to work in a right way. Depending on the approaches, an international office can work as a conductor of the central policy in cases of centralised internationalisation or as a coordinator of departments and other local units in cases of decentralised internationalisation. Working effectively with an international office is intrinsic to effective central leadership. For internal communication, the study identifies the central administration, international offices and departments as the three important organisational actors. While the points of communication in the relationships of these three actors vary in each model, the importance of organisational links is common in all models for coordination of initiatives towards holistic goals of internationalisation. The institutional effort for facilitating internal communication can never rest because internationalisation is a process of value-sharing to ensure heterogeneous policies and climates co-exist in harmony. This means that a centralised approach does not mean a dictatorial climate; a decentralised approach is not equal with disconnectedness; a ‘specialised’ culture is not synonymous with an association of like-minded people; and a ‘universal’ culture is not equivalent to a state of chaotic irresponsibleness.

This study contributes to the theoretical development of internationalisation of higher education in two important ways. First, it brings a distinctly Japanese perspective to the research field. As presented in the introductory Chapter One, this study aimed to propose a conceptual base that explains the specific practices of university internationalisation in Japan, because Japan has not seen active theoretical development in university internationalisation so far. As examined in Chapter Two, the accumulation of research in the internationalisation of higher education since the 1980s has mainly developed in the European and North American contexts. This trend of largely Western influenced theory development stimulated the present study to introduce a Japan’s perspective. Based on the empirical study, the product of this research took the shape of four conceptual models by adopting organisational approaches and norms of behaviours to the process of internationalisation. The models support a view of Hudzik (2011) which emphasises a cultural dimension to strengthen the institutional basis for internationalisation in contemporary times. As with Hudzik’s and other research in the concept of ‘comprehensive internationalization’, this study suggests that organisational culture should take an integrative direction which is depicted as a
‘universal’ mode in this research. In particular, this study of Japan demonstrates institutional culture that influences a working relationship of academic and administrative staff members in different internal organisations for internationalisation. It was illustrated as a unique collaborative co-working style called a kyōshoku kyōdō norm of behaviour. This norm has a potential for a variety of internal organisations in a university not only to foster individual organisations’ skills and abilities but also to produce synergetic effects to develop the innovative organisational self-learning system by interaction of these different groups of university staff. While other countries and regions would take different organisational styles, many practices in other contexts can refer to the potential of these inter-organisational dynamics.

Second, this study argues for the importance of the interaction between institutional structure and culture. Both structure and culture have been explained in the research of organisational theory as important factors for institutional performance, which have been gradually introduced to the management of university internationalisation. This study, from a perspective of Japanese university internationalisation, integrates the structural and cultural dimensions and focuses on the interaction of them to better understand organisational behaviours. By mapping institutional performances on the quadrants of conceptual models, it shows that the structural mechanism in the internationalisation management can produce a supportive ‘universal’ culture. Conversely, the potential of structure can be maximised by building a proactive culture among all university staff members. This modelling of integration of structure and culture contributes to the theoretical development of internationalisation of higher education consistent with Hudzik’s proposal for the concept of ‘comprehensive internationalization’ (2011).
Chapter Eleven
Directions: The new roles of national policy, senior leaders, experts and all university staff for university internationalisation

This final chapter brings the findings of the preceding chapters together and provides, based on the findings of the study, an interpretation of future directions in the management of institutional internationalisation in Japanese universities. I will first discuss possible future directions in the practice of internationalisation in Japanese universities. The second part of the chapter is devoted to the implications for future studies for institutional internationalisation that might examine areas not covered by the present study. The last part is allocated to discuss the significance of this study of university internationalisation for the further development of higher education in Japan.

11.1 Future directions for institutional internationalisation in Japanese universities
This study demonstrates that internationalisation is regarded by universities in Japan as a process through which a university builds, confirms and shares the value of international aspects in university functions for the purpose of aiming for more effective results in institutional outcomes. For this purpose, structures and cultures are confirmed as important factors to be considered by individual universities for the development of institutional internationalisation. Drawing on the results of the case studies, the essential factors, which were discussed in the previous chapter were management approaches (centralised and decentralised) and pattern of behaviours in the practice of internationalisation activities (‘specialised’ and ‘universal’). The study also found that institutional size, senior leadership, the roles of international offices and internal communication are important factors that impact on the practice of institutional internationalisation. The following sections discuss future directions of institutional internationalisation in Japanese universities as a whole. To focus the discussion, four important stakeholders are articulated. These are: national policy-makers; senior leaders; experts of educational internationalisation; and all university staff members. These are the actors who must guide and sustain the further development of institutional internationalisation in Japan.

11.1.1 National policy and policy-makers
Quite clearly, national policy has led university internationalisation in Japan since the 1980s. It still has a great impact on institutional practice. The incentives for internationalisation for universities vary, however there still needs further improvement in the design of national policy. There are five points of consideration for how national policy and policy-makers can motivate and assist universities in the further development of internationalisation.
First, the range of people involved in the development of national policy for internationalisation needs to be expanded. Practically, policy-making for the internationalisation of higher education should include more experts in this field because they can help design national policy that is more feasible and effective. Ahead of making important policy papers, the Ministry of Education has developed working groups by inviting key people for discussions, such as senior leaders of prestige universities, executives of top private corporations and international activists. These key people usually have expertise in particular areas such as university government and administration, global competitiveness in research, and industrial and economic trends, with international or global perspectives. They are useful for the foundation of policy. However, the realities of university internationalisation based on practical data and theoretical insights cannot be fully encompassed by these representatives. Rather, it is experts who can feed new theory and convert practice into policy discussion. These people can guide working groups by providing their experience and ideas and contribute to feasible plans that prevent policy from resulting in ‘a castle in the sky’. Although much research on university internationalisation in Japan has repeatedly criticised the lack of participation of experts in the development of national policy (e.g. Horie 2003; Hashimoto 2005) and some working groups of national policy in the past have invited a few practitioners of university internationalisation, their involvement and influence on the discussion have still been very small. In relation to this point, the national effort should be stronger in the coordination and development of research and analysis function for university internationalisation in the government. Japan’s policy on university internationalisation has relied heavily on practical activities (Rivers 2010) but it has lacked an analytical attitude towards future improvement. Japan needs to create a more macro- and synthetic viewpoint on university internationalisation to place it in the world-wide context and to have a more critical eye for identifying its unique characteristics. Experts can help here, too. A cooperative relationship between the government and university members in terms of macro-level research on university internationalisation would be helpful in the future.

Second, national policy should be based on broader perspectives. The government actions for university internationalisation in recent years have been characterised by a strong initiative of the cabinet. Not only the Ministry of Education but also multiple ministries have been involved in making internationalisation policy. The literature reviewed in Chapter Three showed that there was a clear intention of the government that university internationalisation be strongly directed to the nation’s economic revitalisation. However, locating a focus merely on economic rationale will miss the full value of internationalisation, because internationalisation in practice entails educational and academic meanings other than economic meanings. The other important reasons for internationalisation, such as educational, academic and cultural ones, do not interfere with an
economic rationale at the national level and should not be neglected. Discussion with multiple ministries for university internationalisation with wider rationales will bring better results to university improvement in the long term.

Third, national incentives for internationalisation should be framed for universities in wider ways. The government support for university internationalisation has been intensely provided since the 1980s in the form of scholarships for international and domestic students and competitive budgetary projects for individual institutions. However, this study demonstrates that the series of national projects for university internationalisation have not necessarily met the demands from many universities. This is because most of the projects targeted prestige universities and did not consider the differentiation in institutional characteristics of Japanese universities. More variations of purposes, targets and schemes in national projects will motivate a wider range of universities to participate in proactive institutional internationalisation.

Fourth, national policy should also help universities reform their organisational structures. In order for this, national regulations should allow universities to construct more flexible organisational structures which are based on their institutional profiles and internal and external contexts. In particular, this study shows that centralisation and decentralisation were two possible approaches for internationalisation in accordance with individual institutional environments. National policy should not regulate the leadership for institutional internationalisation, however it should facilitate individual universities to think, decide and secure their individual way of leadership on the basis of careful institutional analysis. Reform in national regulation in 2014 for clarifying and relaxing the role of kyōjukai may become a good example of this, allowing universities to become more independent to deal with institutional internationalisation.

Fifth, as with the structural observation, national policy can assist universities to establish healthy cultures for internationalisation. This study argues that cultures for comprehensive internationalisation necessitate the participation of all university staff members, and the conceptual models proposed show that Japanese universities are making their progress towards internationalisation by ‘specialised’ or ‘universal’ patterns of practice. National incentives for allocating more experts to internationalisation would help universities create more robust climates for institutional internationalisation. Further networks of experts in internationalisation would also be an effective way to exchange expertise beyond institutional boundaries. National initiatives to assist universities to establish evaluation systems for internationalisation activities by academic and administrative staff would further strengthen the culture of internationalisation. It is one role for national policy to help create the pre-conditions in which all university staff realise that actions for
internationalisation are truly expected and that applying internationalisation activities to their regular research and teaching efforts will be beneficial in the end.

11.1.2 Senior leaders

Universities in Japan have been stranded in an unsettled situation about leadership of senior leaders for institutional internationalisation. National promotion since the 2000s has urged universities to change their internationalisation approach from decentralised to centralised modes by strengthening the leadership of senior leaders who drive higher institutional performance. Many universities blindly followed this encouragement without considering why a shift to a centralised approach was necessary. However, this study shows that the case universities independently determined their approaches to internationalisation. It appears that increasing numbers of universities in Japan have improved their administrative capacity at the central office by arranging senior leaders with skills in the management of internationalisation. Senior leaders are a strong agent for institutional internationalisation for they can use influence at both planning and implementing stages. Recognising their significant influence on policy and practice, what might they do for further development of university internationalisation?

First, senior leaders should thoroughly consider how to build a durable system of administration of internationalisation which is able to endure changes in central office. As we have seen in the cases of Tsuki and Sora University, most universities in Japan change the central administration offices regularly every four or five years. The short life-time of the central administration office often causes vulnerabilities in internationalisation management because discussion of internationalisation is enclosed within a small circle of senior administrators. A typical scenario is that the executives leave the discussion board completely after the completion of their period of office and new senior administrators arrive with new ideas for internationalisation. The experiences and lessons of the past are not retained or reflected. To avoid such inefficiencies, senior leaders should establish a robust and enduring structure for policy-making by arranging a wider range of planning staff for internationalisation. Discussion with various stakeholders will bring about an effective structure in two ways. First, they would offer objective and innovative ideas for policy. Second, they would be able to maintain continuity in the discussion after the central office is inevitably replaced by a new office.

There are possible groups which should be invited to the discussion of internationalisation policy. These are: experts of internationalisation in their university; university staff from departments; and people from external sectors. As the case of Tsuki University demonstrated, senior leaders should do more to recognise the significance of the expertise of internationalisation experts. They have
practical experience by working daily on campus as well as an academic grounding in the field of university internationalisation. They can provide profitable resources to discussions for their universities, because they cultivate their values, knowledge and experience from their practice. More university staff from departments should also be invited to contribute to policy-making in order to understand the reality of internationalisation at local level. If the central structure does not ‘listen to’ practice at local, policy will not be informed and substantial. The inclusion of reliable people from external educational, research and industrial bodies will also be effective. They can provide the planning discussion with critical data and information from society and markets as well as forthright evaluation based on their own interpretations of internationalisation.

For the second point, senior leaders should create better analyses of institutional profiles. Institutional self-recognition on the basis of reliable data and detailed analysis will be increasingly important for the future of university internationalisation. For this purpose, a capacity for data collection and analysis should be a high priority for senior administrators. ‘IR’, or institutional research, is becoming a buzzword in current university management in Japan and increasing numbers of universities have been introducing an IR office in a significant way. ‘IR’ is institutional research that collects, analyses and manages a broad range of institutional data, such as financial affairs, academic and research, education, institutional facilities, graduates, assessment of current students, trends in prospective students, and so on, to utilise for the university management in education, research, student support and financial management (Yamada 2011). In the activities of IR, many universities include the field of internationalisation as one of the indicators for more effective university management. By introducing internationalisation dimensions in the IR indicators, the central administration office will be able to utilise this effectively in alignment with the main university policy and promote internationalisation.

For the third point, securing effective internal communication is a matter that senior leaders must take into consideration for making institutional internationalisation successful. Senior leaders can tackle this task by conducting structural reforms. The results of this study demonstrate that the relationships between internal organisations are very important for the practice of institutional internationalisation. We have seen three related organisations for management of internationalisation: the central administration office; an international office; and departments. By strategically increasing communication among these, the ties between these organisational units can be strengthened even though they are physically separated in the organisational chart. Senior leaders should intentionally advocate for the significance of cooperation between organisational units for the institutional goals of internationalisation and plan to build sound relationships. Creating a positive relationship with departments is another issue of concern for senior leaders.
Regardless of a centralised or decentralised approach, the central administration should reach out to departments as much as possible. Several measures, such as using an international office for liaising between departments and the central office and arrangement of top administrators in each department, are possible. It is important to note that strategies for linking with departments are used for the purpose of building good internal communication and creating an effective culture of internationalisation and not for forcing departments to follow arbitrary leadership of the central office. How to avoid sectionalism in different local units, and how to build a communicative relationship across a university, must be key questions for senior leaders.

The final point is that more actions from senior leaders are needed to ensure all university staff being involved in institutional internationalisation. It is admittedly difficult to fully infuse institutional policy of internationalisation with staff members right across campus. Many university staff may not understand the institutional policy for internationalisation at all and they do not know how to bridge the gap between their research and teaching practice and the institutional policy. Patient effort is needed by senior leaders to promote institutional policy for internationalisation to all university staff and to make it relevant to their research, teaching and administrative practice. Further, senior leaders should explicitly advocate the benefits of internationalisation for research and the educational activities of individual staff. Many university staff nowadays realise the demands from internal and external societies for internationalisation in their research and teaching activities. However, most of them may not know how it relates to and benefits their practice. The clear setting of guidelines, evaluation and incentives for their activities for internationalisation must be led by institutional leadership. On the other hand, avoiding possible constraints on conducting effective university-wide internationalisation should be one of responsibilities of senior leaders. As we saw in the case of Sora University, practice in departments may interfere with university-wide internationalisation. Senior leaders should make an effort to discover any structural barriers to be removed and to guide all university staff to realise that internationalisation is not an obstacle but a benefit for their practice in research and teaching.

11.1.3 Experts in university internationalisation

This study has reported a wide variety of university staff who were recognised as experts in university internationalisation. Many do not have an established official position as experts in internationalisation. They have different vocational titles in either academic or administrative organisations to conduct internationalisation activities (Table 4.3). While they hold a variety of responsibilities in accordance with their positions, this study has not been sufficient to investigate the full significance of their diverse roles.
For the first point, the roles, responsibilities and possibilities of experts should be clarified. The roles of experts are more than ever before expanding. From beginnings as teaching staff for international students in the field of Japanese language and international education, their roles in teaching and academic student support have widened remarkably, to include advisors for international and domestic students in the international field and researchers on internationalisation of higher education. In addition to these roles, the recent acceleration of university internationalisation demands experts to assume more administrative responsibilities. They are required to become, for example, co-planners of institutional policy and strategies for internationalisation, practitioners of internationalisation policy and strategies, deliverers of internationalisation policy to the local units, coordinators of practice in the local units, and supporters of internationalisation at all places in a university. Institutional analysis of the main roles of experts should be undertaken in light of the institutional missions and goals for internationalisation. Such clarification is important for successful internationalisation, because experts are one of main actors for the practice of internationalisation in most Japanese universities.

For the second point, the management roles of experts would become clearer when a clear institutional approach for internationalisation is fully articulated. This study found that the roles of international offices changed in accordance with institutional approaches for internationalisation. When a university decides to take a centralised approach, an international office should strengthen its tie with the central administration office so that it can be the main mechanism for realising institutional policy for internationalisation. When a university chooses a decentralised approach, the international office should reach out closely to departments and other units in order to align individual international activities to the institutional entire achievements of internationalisation. The conceptual models offered earlier (Figure 5.1) would clarify the responsibilities of an international office and experts for a specific internationalisation approach in their university.

The third point focuses on the importance of internal and external networking. This study demonstrated that actions of experts for networking were an important element for institutional goals of internationalisation, and the extent to which experts communicated with a broad range of stakeholders was critical to the results of the practice of internationalisation. Networking can be considered internally and externally. In terms of internal networking, the actions should be directed to build a supportive organisational climate for inclusive internationalisation. To move the internationalisation initiatives to a ‘universal’ pattern, experts should not enclose themselves within a small circle but should expand to other university staff, from senior staff at the centre to practical staff at local. Internal networking would benefit from an effective organisational relationship among the central administration office, an international office and departments. The present study
revealed that kyōshoku kyōdō was a characteristic concept of the collaboration between academic and administrative staff members in many Japanese universities. Experts’ effort for internal networking across a university, using the kyōshoku kyōdō practice, can contribute to lowering the barrier separating academic and administrative staff which has interfered with effective internationalisation for a long time.

As with internal networking, external links are significant for engaging experts, too. Developing and using external networks are keys for not only exchange with people of similar interests but also developing professional capability as experts. For example, there are international network associations such as NAFSA, EAIE, AIEA, APAIE and a domestic association for experts called JAFSA. Participation in the activities of these groups of experts would uncover possibilities. Not only the practitioners’ groups but also some research associations, such as the Japan Association for International Student Education, are other opportunities to meet external experts. Contributing to academic journals, for example, the Journal of Studies in International Education, is another way of connecting to people of similar interest worldwide for the purpose of better performance in institutional internationalisation.

11.1.4 All university staff members

The last stakeholder for institutional internationalisation is university academic and administrative members in total. Their involvement is quite essential for the ‘universal’ pattern of institutional internationalisation, which is considered as an ideal direction for most Japanese universities. In a real sense, more and more university staff have sensed the increasing demand for university internationalisation from both internal and external environments. Many of them gradually have become more concerned for adopting internationalisation aspects in their practices. How can a university involve them more in institutional internationalisation initiatives and what is expected of

49 These international and domestic associations are proactive actors in different geographical areas in the world but have a common goal of exchanging academic and practical ideas on internationalisation of higher education among researchers, educators and administrators of related fields.

NAFSA, Association of International Educators. The official website: http://www.nafsa.org/
EAIE, European Association for International Education. The official website: http://www.eaie.org/
AIEA, Association of International Education Administrators. The official website: http://www.aieaworld.org/
APAIE, Asia-Pacific Association for International Education. The official website: https://www.apaie.org/about/


50 Japan Association for International Student Education (JAISE), or Ryūgakusei Kyōiku Gakkai, was founded in 1996 to pursue academic research in accepting international students as the primary purpose. The scope of its organisational interest extended later to more comprehensive research in international education and internationalisation of higher education in domestic and international contexts. The official website: http://www.jaise.org/
In terms of academic staff, they are influential in institutional internationalisation in the fields of research and teaching. The commitment of academic staff to institutional internationalisation is a critical point for successful institutional internationalisation, because they are actors of the practical institutional performance for internationalisation (Stohl 2007; Childress 2009; Hudzik 2011). Their activities in research and teaching functions are directly linked to institutional goals for internationalisation. In order to make institutional internationalisation successful, they should be motivated to conduct individual research and teaching activities at an internationally competent level. Thus, it is important for universities to make their research and teaching activities compatible with institutional policy and strategies for internationalisation. Institutional internationalisation is strongly supported by academic staff when their motives for internationalisation activities and institutional rationales for internationalisation are aligned (Friesen 2012). In order to make this occur, an institutional trial should be planned to infuse institutional policy and strategies for internationalisation across all university staff. Academic staff will believe that their activities are respected by their university only when they can relate their personal practice with institutional policy and strategies for internationalisation. Internationalisation as ‘universal’ will be feasible when academic staff do not feel alienated from institution-wide internationalisation but are aligned with the institutional goals of internationalisation.

In terms of administrative staff, institutional efforts should be made to ensure their stronger engagement with internationalisation. Administrative staff are key to making institutional internationalisation practically effective because they are main actors in its management (Brandenburg 2016). Although institutional performance in internationalisation is demonstrated by the research and teaching achievements of academics, a lack of managerial support from administrative staff members will limit success. Human resource development in administrative staff should be strengthened. This challenge may be tougher in the national universities. As we have seen in the cases of Hoshi and Tsuki University, national universities still do not always have effective human resource development practices for administrative staff. Many national universities have adopted a conventional process of appointment and promotion of administrative staff. They appoint regular administrative staff through uniform examination and interviews by which they judge the general abilities and quality of candidates for becoming an ‘administrative generalist’. After appointment, many universities use the conventional promotion system on the basis of seniority of the length of service. The job rotation system requires administrative staff to be transferred to a different office or a different institution every few years, with the intention of fostering generalist university administration. While positive effects of the typical Japanese style of
staff rotation are reported in early studies, the system of appointment and promotion of administrative staff in most national universities is recognised as a hindrance for sufficient human resources for administration of innovative internationalisation. An institutional trial is urgently needed to construct a more flexible system of allocating ‘the right person in the right place’ of internationalisation. While expertise in the academic category has gradually developed to a certain extent in the last three decades through both national and institutional efforts, human resources in the form of administrative staff are still only half way along the road of development. Serious reform is needed in this area.

The other point of concern for success in institutional internationalisation is that academic and administrative staff clearly need a deeply collaborative relationship. A system is needed for sharing the value of internationalisation across all members of university staff for the development of inclusive cultures. A culture of inclusion guarantees the environment in which a broader range of university staff identify their roles and share the value for internationalisation. How can this culture be created?

This study can offer two suggestions. First, the kyōshoku kyōdō concept has the potential for creating a distinctive Japanese model of the management of university internationalisation. As already examined, kyōshoku kyōdō is a unique norm of behaviour that has evolved in the context of university management in some private Japanese universities since the 1960s. The case studies of Niji and Sora showed that in kyōshoku kyōdō practice, both academic and administrative staff in the field of international education realised and developed the value of internationalisation from different perspectives. Hoshi University also utilised the potential of the kyōshoku kyōdō concept and aimed to apply it to their practice of internationalisation. The collaborative relationships

---

51 Horie (2003) discussed that the job rotation system of administrative staff in Japanese universities may have possible effects in two ways. Firstly, it may foster a sense of internationality in every administrative member by letting a broader range of administrative staff members experience the management of internationalisation for a short period. Secondly, the existence of trained administrative staff members with international literacy at different departments and units may encourage all staff to build holistic internationalisation throughout a university. However, it is too optimistic to expect these positive effects without intentional and strategic efforts by individual universities.

52 However, an unresolved problem resides in the academic category that stems from the similar backgrounds of staff in administrative personnel system. Many universities have been struggling with a shortage of teaching staff for international education and other internationalisation projects. They have supplied these teaching staff through short-term contracts. In most cases, these teaching staff are employed within particular international education projects with some restrictions in their job responsibilities, such as limitation of research activities or limited engagement with university management. Many of them are given a supplemental name tokunin (special appointment) and titles such as tokunin junkyōju (specially appointed associate professor) or tokunin kōshi (specially appointed lecturer) to distinguish them from academic staff in the regular personnel track.
between academic and administrative staff which were seen in these case studies can be applied in other universities.

Second, the findings from the case studies demonstrate that internal networking is a simple but important key for sharing the value of internationalisation among staff in different departments and local units. Each case university built formal and informal networks of both academic and administrative staff for the management of educational internationalisation. For the purpose of utilising the power of networking, the central administration in a university should take every opportunity for infusing the value of internationalisation across their campus to create a supportive and facilitative climate and to support networking among practitioners. Although this effort for creating the culture needs time and patience, it is a necessary institutional initiative to achieve effective internationalisation.

11.2 Topics for further studies

It is appropriate to note and clarify the limitations of this study. The study chose four specific cases of Japanese universities and adopted a highly qualitative approach. The cases were selected by two basic conditions: chosen from universities which conducted proactive institutional-level internationalisation as a prerequisite, and screened by two variables of sector types and institutional size. These conditions were carefully discussed by literature review of Japanese university internationalisation in Chapter Four and the research approach was designed by intensive examination of qualitative methodology in Chapter Five. The discussion in Chapter Ten demonstrated the validity of this research strategy as an appropriate lens for tackling the research questions. However, it should be noted at the same time that these research settings naturally inhibit the study from revealing some of the full complexity of the university internationalisation. The lens which this study used, based on four institutions and a structural/cultural guiding framework, merely captures certain aspects of internationalisation at a particular moment in time.

The present study suggests some possibilities for further study of university internationalisation in Japan. There are three topics for future investigation: exploring the possibility of a case of Model 4; strategies for effective internal communication; and the identities of experts in international education and university internationalisation.

- An example of Model 4 was not found in the case studies. Beyond the case universities, is the Model 4 labelled as ‘mainstreaming of educational internationalisation’ existing in Japanese universities? Can we find cases of Model 4 in universities in other countries, other than the University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands which was analysed by de Wit (2015)? What does
a university of the Model 4 kind look like in terms of the internationalisation management? Is the Model 4 an ideal or effective approach for Japanese universities? These are the matters of further investigation.

- One of the findings of this study is the variety of ways for internal communication in the conceptual models of the practice of educational internationalisation in Japanese universities. In the case study universities the three core organisations, namely the central administration office, an international office and departments, adopted different ways of communication. However, in the all universities the efforts for communication between these organisational units were spontaneous responses to immediate needs in the daily practices in the field of internationalisation. How can we intentionally build strategies for the purpose of more effective internal communication among these different organisations? How can we guarantee the communication among them from both structural and cultural dimensions? Are there any factors critical for building internal networks? How can we find people in the different organisational units who can be change agents for more effective communication and eventually the internationalisation of a ‘universal’ pattern?

- Lastly, this study revealed different types of experts for international education and university internationalisation. As showed in Table 4.3, experts have a variety of backgrounds in terms of academic and practical experiences. Their vocational titles, affiliated organisations, responsibilities and job contracts also vary. In a very real sense, there is not a clear definition of experts of international education and university internationalisation. They are embedded in either academic or administrative groups, because Japanese universities do not have a structural system to officially categorise them as ‘experts’ for their expertise in internationalisation. The problem of identity of experts in the field of internationalisation has been argued since the late 1990s in the context of Japanese university management. However, there is no sign yet of proper recognition of experts of internationalisation. Establishment of identities for ‘internationalisation experts’ is one step in the development of holistic institutional internationalisation. What can universities do about this? This will be an important point of investigation for university internationalisation in coming years.

I will come back to these points of investigations many times with intellectual curiosity. I will keep these questions in mind to be solved someday through further research and practice in the field of university internationalisation in Japanese and world-wide contexts.
11.3 The significance of this study for the further development of higher education system in Japan

What is the potential contribution of this study to the further internationalisation in Japanese universities? Given that the current rationale for internationalisation in Japan is university reform, as discussed in Chapter One, how can internationalisation help universities to change for the better? The OECD report in 1971 signalled Japan’s slow response to the pressure for university reform to contribute economical success (OECD 1971, 52-56; 71-73; 81-86). This assessment is still applicable to the present higher education system in Japan nearly 50 years after the report. Despite a series of initiatives for university reform, such as deregulation in the late 1990s and incorporation of national universities in 2004, Japan is still sluggish in its higher education reforms. There is no clear sign of an effective structural reform in Japanese higher education system, which remains hierarchical and inflexible.

A more recent OECD report of tertiary education in Japan in 2009 asserted that there is an aversion for serious system change at both national and institutional levels:

… while the government wishes to introduce increasing dynamism into the sector, it also (especially MEXT) wishes to see dynamism without risk. Moreover, at the institutional level the perception of increased risk - which we found to be widely prevalent in a tough financial and demographic climate - easily produces greater risk aversion, particularly where it is combined with greater operational autonomy. … many [institutions] are adopting a more risk averse, conservative approach, mindful that their high status in Japanese society will (they hope) carry them through. (OECD 2009, 27)

Some national factors influence this conservative approach. Japan is a non-English speaking country with a unique higher education system. Japan has constructed a domestic system of university entrance examination that has been tightly connected to the secondary education system, causing inflexibility in recruiting international students as well as limiting the encouragement for domestic students to study abroad. The relatively closed domestic labour market has protected the higher education system from seriously facing the fierce competition for high quality human resources in the world’s business and industrial context. These national conditions have allowed the country’s higher education system to take an exclusive attitude for a long time. However, globalisation attacks Japan relentlessly to face up to global trends. Globalisation urges the country to take serious actions for university reform with quality improvement, to meet world standards.

The internationalisation of higher education can contribute to an acceleration of university reform. Internationalisation makes universities engage with the wider societies and reflect upon themselves more clearly. However, as this study has shown, effective internationalisation requires careful and strategic management. Although national policy still has a massive influence on institutional
internationalisation, universities should not blindly follow the national initiatives. Individual universities should have their own lenses through which they see the necessity for internationalisation from their own goals. This can be realised by building effective organisational systems that bridge national policy and the institutional realities of internationalisation. An organisational self-learning system is needed here, by which individual universities can identify their present situations and future directions for internationalisation. The present study suggests that universities in Japan should invite a wider range of university people to the discussion and planning of institutional internationalisation. In particular, the findings of the study encourage more collaborative conversations between senior leaders and practitioners. In the study, senior leaders in the case universities were mostly good at grasping the essential features of national policies and could build (and rebuild) better institutional structures to follow the national intention. However, they often failed to become aware of the influence of institutional cultures that might stall or limit the effectiveness of structural reform. This study argues that institutional structures and cultures are equally important dimensions and relate each other for constructing the effective self-learning system. By careful planning, structures can create facilitating cultures and cultures can explore the potential for new structures. Through the process of development of these institutional systems, internationalisation can contribute to university reform that aims for the betterment of higher education overall.
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