

How Internationalization Policy Initiatives Affect Students and Faculty Members in Japanese Higher Education

Haswell, Christopher G.
Faculty of Languages and Cultures, Kyushu University : Professor

<https://doi.org/10.15017/1804174>

出版情報 : 言語文化論究. 38, pp.59-71, 2017-03-03. 九州大学大学院言語文化研究院
バージョン :
権利関係 :

How Internationalization Policy Initiatives Affect Students and Faculty Members in Japanese Higher Education

Christopher G. HASWELL

Abstract:

The international mobility of university students is increasing, and the number of students moving to and from Asia has been growing in line with global policy trends in international education. In addition to encouraging greater international recruitment, policy initiatives to boost the internationalization of Japanese universities are closely linked to the metrics of global university rankings. Aiming to provide an insight into the internationalization process, this paper reports the findings from interviews with faculty members working at an international university in Japan and considers their impressions of how efforts to create an internationalized university environment affect their careers and the academic experience of their students. This investigation concludes that an internationalized student population creates a profoundly different university environment than that found on regular domestic campuses, but that efforts still need to be made to assist all students and faculty members in taking full advantage of their opportunities.

Key Words: internationalized university education; international student mobility; university faculty members

Introduction

As more institutions around the world seek to internationalize, the effect of greater student mobility will mean university faculty members accommodating a different student demographic in their classes than they have experienced in the past. Creating an international university environment is not the aim of all institutions, but it is the goal of a growing number of internationally focused universities. This paper investigates the circumstances at one Japanese university as an example to other universities interested in further internationalizing their student populations, using testimony from faculty members to build a picture of the on-campus environment. Faculty members' impressions of the effects of increasing institutional internationalization are of concern to educators, administrators and policy-makers alike, as the faculty members experience the effects of internationalization efforts on a daily basis.

What Is An International University?

Universities cannot simply be labeled international or non-international; internationalization is a process that has several identifiable stages. To use one example, Foskett (2010) suggested five labels that could be

given to any university: Domestic, Imperialist, Internationally aware, Internationally engaged, and Internationally focused (2010: 45). Even domestic universities, the first level of this scale, can have inbound and outbound international student mobility while focusing primarily on their local context. According to Foskett, only the top three levels of internationally aware, engaged and focused universities undertake changes to their organization to accommodate greater internationalization efforts. Below these levels, the focus of the universities is on the domestic market while accepting international students into their programs.

The population of internationally-mobile tertiary-level students is increasing in size. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) reports that the total population of international students is over four million, double the number in the year 2000 (OECD, 2015), and of these international students, the number coming to Japan is relatively small but significant. According to the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), China is the country with the world's largest number of outbound students, with 712,157 currently outside the country, or 17.4% of the global total, and has 96,409 inbound students in their universities, or 2.5% of the global total. By comparison, Japan has only 32,332 outbound students but more inbound students, currently 150,617 or 4.3% of the worldwide total (UNESCO, 2015). This means that Japan is a popular destination for internationally mobile students. In fact, Asia is considered one of the most active and important areas of international student mobility (Huang, 2006, 2007; Waters & Brooks, 2011).

The number of international students at a university is not a guarantee that there will be an increase in the international outlook of the domestic students. As was reported in Knight (2011) and de Wit (2011), and further investigated by Morita (2012) in a study of Nagoya University in Japan, the "myth ... that more foreign students on campus will produce more internationalized institutional culture and curriculum" (Knight, 2011: 14) is one that continues to this day. However, while it does not guarantee the formation of an international university environment, an increase in the number of international students should offer more opportunities for domestic students to experience communication with students from outside their national borders.

The Top Global University Project (TGU)

Internationalization efforts in Japan are encouraged by the various funding initiatives that have been undertaken over the last few decades. "Global human resources" (Yonezawa, 2014: 37) are in increasing demand throughout Asia as trade associations such as The Association of Southeast Asian Countries (ASEAN) and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) seek closer ties through the use of English as an official language (Kirkpatrick, 2011). In order to be more widely internationally recognized, thereby making institutions more attractive to potential partner institutions, outside investment, and student recruitment, universities around the world have endeavored to climb internationally recognized rankings, with Japan universities being no exception. The most famous rankings are the Times Higher Education (THE) and Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) indices, but there also exists the Shanghai Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU) that is particularly popular in Asia. The number and importance of these rankings agencies reinforce the pressures upon internationally active institutions.

The Japanese Ministry of Education (MEXT) recently instigated a new policy designed to boost

Japanese universities in the international rankings, called the Top Global University Project (TGU) (MEXT, 2014). The TGU was an attempt to connect more directly with the metrics of global university rankings rather than with the narrow criterion of international student recruitment used by the TGU's now defunct predecessor, the Global 30 Project (G30). The new intent is to focus on the metrics of global ranking agencies, specifically on the recognition of international outreach and the use of English on campus. These policy decisions specifically relate to ranking metrics: the new government funding requires the recipients of the highest level of government investment to aim to be in the world's top 100 universities. This is an ambitious target because, at the time of writing, only two Japanese universities are in the top 100 of the Times Higher Education rankings (Times Higher Education, 2016), with five in the top 100 of the Quacquarelli Symonds rankings (Quacquarelli Symonds, 2016).

University Internationalization in Relation to Faculty Members

A focus on international institutional reputation brings about the discussion of how best to achieve an increase in the use of English among students and faculty at a university. To address this concern, MEXT has mandated the hiring of more faculty members from overseas. The TGU project requires the hiring of overseas staff to internationalize the faculty along with the changing of student demographics (Shimomura, 2013) and as such the efforts to internationalize Japanese higher education are relevant to any faculty member from outside the country who may be recruited in the future. With the large majority of universities in Japan being private institutions, their policies can differ greatly, meaning that requests made of faculty in regard of internationalization will be different depending on the location of employment.

Internationalization efforts have reportedly caused problems for both university administrators and faculty. A focus on internationalization by Asian universities was referred to as 'riding the tiger' with regard to the process of internationalization, meaning "hanging on for dear life or jump off and risk being eaten" (Hallinger, 2013: 231) as these institutions attempted to keep up with international trends and therefore, by implication, international competition. The investigation of recent wide scale adoption of English as a language of on-campus communication in Hong Kong (Choi, 2010) and Korea (Cho, 2011, 2012; Piller & Cho, 2013) has highlighted the potential for negative consequences and student and faculty stress connected to such changes. The focus on international rankings is also providing new incentives and pressures on universities, and these "geographies of reputation oscillate around three scales that demonstrate the constitutive power of national histories, growing international networks and new measures of university performance in establishing a scaled imaginary of university reputation" (Collins & Park, 2015: 121). Simply stated, the need for universities to now maintain a close watch on the metrics of international rankings has added a further stage of complexity into their decision-making processes. On an institutional level, changing the university demographic through student recruitment and faculty hiring policy innovations has the potential to disrupt the operation of any university.

The use of international rankings as the metric by which universities judge their faculty members also affects the way that faculty members approach their careers. This is because "rankings generally rely more heavily on measures of research quality than on teaching quality" (Shin, 2011: 7), as teaching quality is considered far more difficult to measure. This focus on research creates a bias in the job market towards those faculty members who undertake research rather than consider their career primarily as a teacher.

Recent research by Yonezawa, Ishida, and Horta (2013) found that Japan was an attractive work environment for foreign faculty due to competitive wages and working environment. However, the job market is unstable, with 84% of foreign faculty reporting having changed jobs during their time in Japan (Horta & Yonezawa, 2013). Such a situation means that university faculty members in Japan, especially foreign faculty members, have to consider new places of employment on a semi-regular basis. When a faculty member's short-term contract expires, they may move to an institution that is further along the scale of internationalization than their previous employer. A focused strategy is required to help faculty members prepare for working in new environments where there are a large number of international students or where an institution is proposing such innovations. For this purpose, the experiences of faculty members currently working in an environment affected by internationalization policy initiatives are instructive and provide a useful impression of the future of tertiary education in Japan.

Study Methodology

The study presented here was aimed at answering the research question: "How does increasing the number of international students at a university affect faculty, domestic students, and international students?" Even where efforts have been made to recruit more students from outside Japan, the vast majority of Japan's universities would be classified on the Foskett scale as domestic or imperialist universities. The research location I chose, hereafter referred to as University A, is not the only highly internationalized university in Japan, as other universities such as Akita International University, International Christian University, and Tokyo International University are other prominent examples of institutions that are internationally focused, taking a large proportion of their student intake from overseas, and offering a dual-language policy with extensive use of EMIs for taught courses. My selected research location is, however, highly unusual in Japan, as University A accepts 45% of its students from outside the country. To put that number into perspective, the national average for Japanese universities is around 3% (Shimomura, 2013). University A is, therefore, an accelerated example of what institutions of higher learning around the world are being required to do by their respective countries' policy makers.

The research data presented here are a combination of an online survey that allowed faculty members from University A to respond with typed comments and testimony from follow-up interviews, covering questions from the original survey related to the internationalization of a university campus and the respondents' roles as a faculty member. In total, thirteen faculty members responded to the initial survey, and from these nine were available for follow-up interviews. The faculty members remain anonymous, but they represented a cross-section of teaching experience at the university and contained both domestic Japanese and international faculty members from five different countries.

A limitation of the study data being presented here is it is exclusively the opinions of faculty members. This research project focused on faculty members as they provided complimentary information to work published investigating students at the same university (Haswell, 2014a, 2014b). This prior research found that the students at the university were aware of the opportunities that were presented to them by their time on an international campus, particularly the opportunities to learn and use English among the international student population. However, this positivity was tempered by the linguistic stress of using English with other Asian users of the language who were not of the expected standard of their

interlocutors. This form of stress was not reported by comparison populations of students studying in less internationalized universities, leading to the conclusion that it was the highly internationalized environment that was causing both domestic and international students particular linguistic problems. The project being reported here was a continuation of this research effort.

Findings

Question: “In your experience, how does the educational environment and campus environment at the university differ, if at all, from other universities in Japan?”

Given the fact that nearly 50% of the students at the research location come from overseas, a point referenced by most of the interview participants, one might assume that this was an obvious question. It was included to provide faculty members in other institutions with first-hand testimony regarding the environment of an internationalized campus.

One faculty member noted the effect of internationalization on the linguistic character of the campus, saying, “there’s such a predominance of English, and there’s a ... bifurcation: there’s the English environment, then there’s the Japanese environment.” Regarding the out-of-class activities on campus, another faculty member brought up the fact that the university is “celebrating a different country each week and Japanese students always seem to take part in the festivals that are mostly international student-driven.” This comment was echoed by another faculty member who said, “[the university] tends to have a more dynamic campus life; there is a lot more going on.” Another faculty member noted, “our students have face-to-face interaction with many international students and faculty members...some of [the students] live together ... they probably understand each other at a deeper level.” These and other comments expressed in the interviews led to the conclusion that the university was unlike anywhere the faculty members had worked before. It appears that an increase in the number of international students can have a profound effect on the campus environment, an outcome not precluded by Knight’s (2011) aforementioned “myth” of internationalization.

In their responses to this question, the faculty members make it clear that the university is, while not unique, a very different environment than that of other Japanese universities, a fact that should affect the decisions that faculty members make in their classrooms. University A is the archetype of what is being envisioned by MEXT and their focus upon internationalization. It is not only increasing the number of international students on the campus but also increasing the opportunities for students to use English both inside and outside the classroom. It is also interesting to hear that attempts are being made to showcase the different countries represented on campus but that the students themselves usually organize these showcase events. Such enthusiasm for the process of on-campus internationalization is encouraging and could be used as an example for other universities to follow when attempting to introduce elements of cultural education into their internationalization efforts.

Question: “What would be your advice to a new student joining your university to help them prepare for life at an international campus?”

This question was asked as a way of elucidating what the faculty members believed was the gap between student expectations and on-campus reality. In response to this question, two faculty members identified

the potential problem of negative opinions that freshman students at the university may have about the students they would be meeting on campus. The statements “be careful of your assumptions and automatic responses” and “I would tell them to try to identify their pre-conceptions, and go out and actively challenge them,” suggested these faculty members had witnessed the existence of such preconceptions. Other faculty members said, “be open ... try to make new friends, join clubs, join a multi-cultural week event” and “reach out, join events, don’t be shy, and seek out opportunities to make foreign connections.” The theme of student pro-activity continued with advice such as “keep working on your communication skills” and the reminder that “this is your opportunity to meet new people and improve your language and intercultural communication skills [so] take advantage of that.” These comments focus on the positive activities that students should do and the fact that the university environment can support students willing to try and take advantage of their opportunities to challenge their pre-conceived judgments regarding their fellow students.

These findings can be viewed in the light of the mission statement of University A, and also the activities of other internationally-oriented institutions. In its mission statement, International Christian University says it believes that its “multi-cultural environment provides students the groundwork for future problems in the world by handling tensions in a group, accommodating other’s needs and adapting common goals.” Akita International University’s statement reads, “In this age of globalization, where multifaceted exchanges are ever increasing across national borders, we need to mutually accept different world views and value systems, work together to solve various issues and have the strength to pioneer new paths to the future.” In addition, Tokyo International University claims, “Our school aims at fostering mentally and physically balanced members of society well equipped with a good public-mindedness and an insightful overview of ethnic, religious, and national boundaries in the world.” Not wishing to identify University A by directly quoting its mission statement (which is available online), I can say that these statements from the three other institutions are very similar to those of University A, and suggest that the self-determined image of an international university is one that aims to change the perspectives of their students by increasing the frequency of international contact on campus. The statements of the faculty members at University A give the impression that while the university follows this mission in its institutional decision-making process, the students themselves must actively pursue these outcomes to benefit from them. This gives support to de Wit’s conclusion that “[w]ithout denying that the combination of local and international students in the lecture room can make a significant contribution to internationalization, simply having international students is not sufficient” (2011: 4), which in practice requires students in internationalized universities to make a change in their on-campus activities.

Question: “In your experience, what do the students gain, if anything, from spending their university life at a university with a large population of international students?”

One faculty member highlighted an important notion in relation to the country where the students were studying, stating “Japan is known as a closed country, not really open to the world, but now it’s getting more internationally open-minded...it will be good for students to interact with other nationalities.” Another faculty member brought up the point that “when they come to [the university], they have frequent chances to interact with international students, especially if they live in the dormitory ... where the rooms are connected with another student.” One faculty member noted, “for the students who are a little bit shier

... they are the ones who really benefit from it because they are almost forced into interacting with non-Japanese people and using English.” The belief that even students who are not the most outgoing have opportunities to encounter positive situations is a very positive sign for the university. Another faculty member said, “it was a great advantage for Japanese students to have diversity in their daily life; it’s really valuable for them to become tolerant of different cultures.” The situation at the university, for students with a positive attitude, is best summed up by this statement: “For those students who are so inclined, there is a lot of opportunity for making connections with people from a vast number of places.”

When asked what they thought their students gained from their time on campus, beyond daily international experiences, a faculty member made the point that “even though it’s not an academic powerhouse, [the university] still has one of the highest job placement rates of any university in Japan because companies know that the students they hire are going to be more open to ideas and more flexible so I think that’s a huge advantage that the [students] have.” This is not only an advantage for the students individually, but, as in the case of the majority of Japanese universities, also for the university as an institution and private business: if companies feel that the graduates from an international university are the human resources that they need, then they will repeatedly return to support the university’s recruitment efforts.

One faculty member gave the information that “not just the students but half of the faculty are from abroad and half are Japanese but more than 80% of the whole university faculty are either foreign or have a degree or teaching experience abroad: the international ratio of the university is really high.” This should be of interest to future employees of international universities, in that they should feel well supported and surrounded by faculty members with similar experiences to their own. Much has been made in recent times of the development of global human resources (as in the earlier quoted work of Yonezawa, 2014), an attempt to produce a new generation of graduates who can operate effectively in an internationalized environment. On-campus internationalization, whereby students receive and make use of the linguistic and cultural resources available to them, could be of great value to a Japanese company that has overseas business, or requires its employees to travel or move abroad. This diversity is also in line with the aforementioned MEXT recommendations for universities to recruit a greater number of academics with international experience into their respective faculties.

The confidence of the previous comments was tempered by the belief expressed by another faculty member that, as a students at a university in Japan, the necessity to speak English was not always readily apparent to some students: “I am not sure to what extent my students actually use English to speak with international students outside of class; I feel like it could be a lot more.” This reinforces the earlier point that an international environment may only truly assist motivated students, and that the effect of the same environment on more insular students might be, in fact, very minor.

Question: “What would be your advice for new faculty members to help them prepare for their job teaching at a university with a large population of international students?”

This question was asked with the intent of finding out the professional developments that the respondents felt had made since joining the university and therefore what they believed could have done better had they known these points from the beginning of their employment term. It was also a follow-up to the earlier question regarding students’ preparation prior to attending the university. The comments given in answer to this question were consistent with the other comments made regarding the on-campus environment

students and faculty members should expect.

One comment from a faculty member outlines an issue that newly-hired faculty members should consider before coming to the university and addresses the preconception that intercultural contact is inevitable between the domestic and international populations on campus: "It is interesting how little interaction can take place between the domestic students and the international students...some students do take advantage of [their opportunities], but there are a large number of Japanese students that just choose to stay with the home crowd and not take advantage of that." This opinion was offered despite the previous comment that students are "forced" to interact with students from other countries by the ethnic make-up of the university. While it may be true that students automatically have more incidences of international contact, it appears possible for students to volitionally minimize the number of interactions. Another faculty member commented, "make sure you mix them ... and not make a Japanese group, a Chinese group or a Korean group." This comment gives the impression that there is not currently adequate collaboration between the ethnicities throughout the university, even within the classrooms of EFL, a point faculty members should be aware of early in order to help them address it.

In relation to the differences between domestic and international students, one faculty member said, "the international students are on scholarships, and highly motivated; they are kind of a dream," meaning that the international students are more open to interaction than the Japanese students. Therefore, the comments "don't forget that there are 50% of students that you don't know ... teach your students how to use those resources" and "use international students and think about them as a resource, a resource that is truly unique to here" suggest that the international students are positive and willing to assist in the process of giving the domestic student population an international experience that they, as international students, have ostensibly been brought to the campus to provide.

Not all comments were as positive as those given above. One faculty member gave the opinion that, "it is better to have English as an international language rather than just a language to communicate with native speakers, but it is very difficult to decide how fluent they should be." This is a problem that may be specifically for universities with a very high proportion of their population who are both international and have a higher proficiency in English than the domestic student population. This is because there would be more examples on campus of localized Asian performance of English than a geographically distant variety such as British or American English. It is something that should be considered when deciding within which market the 'global human resources' the university is producing should be expected to perform.

In their responses to this and other questions, the faculty members repeatedly made mention of two main initiatives that they and the university were undertaking that they would recommend in other international university settings. The first was what they termed "Exchange Classes." A point discussed by De Wit (2011) in his "Nine Misconceptions of International Higher Education" is that schools may feel that there is no particular need to include intercultural understanding and communication in their curriculum; De Wit argues that such a focus is of benefit to the students and the institutions. "Exchange classes" are reportedly organized at University A to bring students from the English-based and Japanese-based courses together for joint language study. The number of classes included in this program did not seem to satisfy any of the faculty members, as all of them said that they would like to see more, with several faculty members commenting that they would like to see them on a weekly basis. Most faculty members voiced the opinion that these classes should be included as part of the curriculum, thereby adding international

communication proficiency as a requirement for students to pass their courses and succeed at the university. There is currently no specific requirement that the students leave the university with a better understanding of other cultures, but, with exchange classes, the Japanese students could maximize their use of the opportunities afforded them in an internationalized university environment.

Another recommended activity was “group projects.” This idea was suggested by two of the respondents in the interviews and again relates to making internationalization of students’ outlook a learning outcome from their time at the university. On-campus or community projects requiring groups of domestic and international students working in English would appear to be another method of improving the relationships between international and domestic students in a supportive, practical manner. These projects could include intercultural festivals, which the university reportedly holds on a regular basis. Although ostensibly organized by international students, the faculty members suggested that these festivals pique the interest of the domestic students. Having students, both international and domestic, take the lead in organizing these events, with space and financial support provided by the university, appears to be an effective opportunity for positive intercultural interaction.

Question: In your experience, what difficulties, if any, do the students at the university have while spending their university life at a university with a large population of international students?

While I had thought that the faculty members would respond to this question with comments concerning the problems of both the international and domestic students, they spoke mainly about the domestic students. The main concern that emerged was the lack of preparation that the faculty members felt the Japanese students who attended the university had for dealing with a highly internationalized campus environment leading to an overall academic disadvantage. The problems that the faculty members raised were those that had the potential to continue throughout the students’ time at the university, and even after graduation.

The largest issue that was raised in response to the question of disadvantages was stated clearly by this response, referring to the domestic students: “The biggest disadvantage is, for some of the kids that come here, they really do miss out on being able to shine ... from the moment that they get to the university, they’re kind of put in the lower tier group because their English isn’t very good ... and I think that kind of affects their confidence and I think it’s a little unfair, actually.” The higher proficiency of the international students, when compared to the domestic students, means that there may be an added sense of resentment. This point was continued by another faculty member, who noted, “[the domestic students’] English skills don’t improve as quickly as the Japanese competencies of the international students, and [the international students’] achievements are often praised.” Referring to praising of international students’ performance in English, another faculty member said, “If the students are getting those kinds of feedback all the time, it’s the students who think they are behind [who suffer]: they lose their self-confidence.” That is to say that relative to Japanese students in other universities, the international students attending this university could be considered more proficient, but even though the Japanese students at University A have adequate proficiency relative to their domestic peers, they are being compared to an even more proficient group of international students on the same campus.

The issue of relative proficiency is not one that can be taken lightly, as the TOEIC, TOEFL, and IELTS scores of the relative populations are likely to be somewhat, if not dramatically, different. Such

disparities clearly play a role in determining the current academic success and future professional opportunities of the university's students. Large disparities are also a potential cause of classroom difficulties. I reported findings in my doctoral thesis of students at University A, both international and domestic, expressing dissatisfaction with the English proficiency of other students at the university, with the criticism aimed only at Asian speakers of English (Haswell, 2014b: 249). Similar findings have been published very recently from an investigation in South Korea, with Choi (2016) reporting the English performance of university faculty relative to the expectations of the international students were often the source of complaints, leading to faculty members being reprimanded for not using English in 100% of their classroom interactions. In these and other universities, potential problems based on English proficiency in all areas of faculty and student interaction should be acknowledged and accounted for in any curriculum or university policy.

The importance of being able to use English, and foreign languages in general, on campus was emphasized by one faculty member, who said, "there's such a language focus that kids who are really good at language, either English or Japanese, have such a huge advantage ... and [the students'] whole university experience is pretty much about how well they can speak a foreign language." On this point, it should be noted that none of the students at the university are language majors, nor do they receive a joint qualification that includes a foreign language. Their actual qualification will not mention their language proficiency, and this study may identify a blind-spot in the actions of the university in not actively recognizing the additional linguistic efforts that are required to be a student who succeeds in a highly internationalized environment. One would expect that such proficiency and experience would be of interest to future employers, who clearly value the additional international experience of the students from this university. However, according to another faculty member, the disadvantages that some Japanese students experience can continue after graduation: "we have international students who can speak Japanese, and who can speak English fluently; they can speak another language, which will make their opportunities for job-hunting improve, and thus limit the chances for Japanese students to get good jobs." Such is the supposed premium on the ability to use English professionally, this faculty member believed that studying with a more proficient group of international students might be a disadvantage for the domestic Japanese students when it came to applying to use these skills in post-graduate employment.

Finally on this topic, there was a suggestion that it was not only the on-campus environment that caused the students to have problems. One faculty member reported, "I know of situations where [living with international students] has lead to misunderstandings, like divvying up labor and hygiene standards that change from different places... I've heard from students that they had some difficult circumstances there." These off-campus and intercultural interaction problems also have the potential to lead to wider difficulties among the student population and should also be carefully monitored.

Discussion

From these reported opinions and experiences, it can be concluded that an international university campus, which in the context of Japan is taken to mean a university with a relatively high number of students from outside Japan in its student body, creates the potential for international interaction. However, the development of an international outlook among the domestic students is not automatic, as the students must still

be pro-active to gain the maximum benefit from their internationalized education environment. The process of internationalization of global tertiary education is set to continue, and institutions around the world can, therefore, learn from the activities of other universities who are part of the same developing paradigm. It is not just the linguistic but also the sociolinguistic element of the university environment that is having an effect on the long-term personal and professional benefits of students with experience at an international university.

A central concern of research into the internationalization of universities in Japan is how, despite the policies produced to incentivize change, institutions are often left to themselves to decide how best to implement them. Huang states that the Japanese method of encouraging transnational higher education is to “introduce a free market approach and to implement deregulation” (Huang, 2007: 425), unlike the “government controlled” approaches of China and South Korea. This free market provides the potential opportunity for greater differences between institutions, further increasing the stress on faculty members and students as they attempt to reconcile their personal image of internationalization with that of their respective institutions.

It is in the area of English language use on campus, a key part of MEXT’s foreign language policies, that the greatest difficulties were highlighted by this study. Issues of linguistic competition within the university and university classes, post-graduation, and even off-campus problems, should be areas that are addressed by universities through policy. The potential and real problems reported by this study are warning signs for other universities wanting to increase their numbers of international students. The concern for the university should always be for the character of the university, which is to say the environment on campus, created by the interactions of the students in attendance. This environment should be the focus for the administration of the institution, even if only for practical, economic reasons. As a private university, which is the case for most Japanese tertiary education institutions, University A should consider the reputation being built by the students currently in its programs, and how this reputation could affect future recruitment.

The concern for the faculty members facing problems related to a mutually foreign language on campus is also significant, but these problems also contain opportunities. For those faculty members for whom English is also a foreign language, they should be concerned with how their performance of the language is being viewed by their students, and perhaps use this as a method of building relationships with their domestic and international students, by demonstrating the professional advantages of being able to proficiently use English. Even for those faculty members who can be considered ‘native’ speakers of the language, they should also work to help their students recognize the local value of experiencing Asian Englishes, varieties that these students are much more likely to come into contact with both on and off campus. All faculty members can also enrich their repertoire of intercultural communication strategies on an internationalized campus. In these ways, the effect of spending time working and studying on a campus with a large number of international students can be viewed as positive and of long-term benefit.

Conclusion

The university at the center of this research is attempting to do what MEXT is encouraging all other universities in Japan to do, and in doing so is following established international trends. What is clear is that

efforts to internationalize do not stop at the recruitment of international students; faculty members and students need to make efforts beyond those of the institution and its administrators. The picture that develops is complex but instructive, not only for Japan but also for Asia and beyond. Once the international and domestic students are present on campus, it is the interlinked responsibility of administrators, faculty members, and students to be aware of, and address, potential concerns. Collaboration between these groups should maximize the opportunities for institutional and personal internationalization. Policies can then be evaluated and improved for the next generation of faculty members and students. A cycle of evaluation and feedback of opinions and experiences is something that could benefit all stakeholders. It appears that the ongoing internationalization of universities can create positive opportunities for all - the question is whether these opportunities can be successfully grasped.

References

- Brooks, R. & Waters, J. (2011). *Student mobilities, migration and the internationalization of higher education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Cho, J. (2011). *Expansion of English-medium lectures in Korea*. Paper presented at Asia TEFL Conference, Seoul, Korea.
- Cho, J. (2012). Campus in English or campus in shock. *English Today*, 28(2), 18–25.
- Choi, P. K. (2010). Weep for Chinese university: a case study of English hegemony and academic capitalism in higher education in Hong Kong. *Journal of Education Policy*, 25(2), 233–252.
- Collins, F. L. & Park, G. (2015). Ranking and the multiplication of reputation: reflections from the frontier of globalizing higher education. *Higher Education*, 1-15.
- De Wit, H. (2011). Internationalization of higher education: nine misconceptions. *International Higher Education*, 64, 6–7.
- Foskett, N. (2010). Global markets, national challenges, local strategies: the challenge of internationalization.” in Maringe, F. & Foskett, N. (Eds), *A Review of Globalization and Internationalization in Higher Education: Theoretical, Strategic and Management Perspectives*, Pp. 35–50, N. Abingdon: Taylor and Francis.
- Hallinger, P. (2014). Riding the tiger of world university rankings in East Asia: where are we heading? *International Journal of Educational Management*, 28(2), 230-245.
- Haswell, C. G. (2014a). Issues relating to the internationalization of Japanese universities, *JALT Conference Proceedings 2013*, 28-37
- Haswell, C. G. (2014b) *Asian Students at an International University in Japan: A Study of Attitudes to the Use and Study of English*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. <http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/7430/> (Accessed 3rd December 2014).
- Horta, H. & Yonezawa, A. (2013). Going places: exploring the impact of intra-sectoral mobility on research productivity and communication behaviors in Japanese academia. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 14(4), 537–547.
- Huang, F. (2007). Internationalization of higher education in the developing and emerging countries: a focus on transnational higher education in Asia. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 421-432

- Huang, F. (2007). Internationalization of curricula in higher education institutions in comparative perspectives: Case studies of China, Japan and The Netherlands. *Higher Education*, 54(4), 521-539.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: a multilingual model*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Knight, J. (2011). Five myths about internationalization. http://www.international.ac.uk/media/1417436/International_Focus_67.pdf (Accessed 21 November 2013).
- Ministry of Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2014). Selection for the FY2014 Top Global University Project. http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/26/09/___icsFiles/afiedfile/2014/10/07/1352218_02.pdf (accessed 4 December 2014).
- Morita, L. (2012). English and intercultural interaction in the internationalisation of a Japanese university. *Korea*, 3(2), 5. <http://immi.se/intercultural/nr30/morita.html> (Accessed 7 January 2015).
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2013). How Is International Student Mobility shaping up? <http://www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond-school/EDIF%202013--N%C2%B014%20%28eng%29-Final.pdf>. (Accessed 12 January 2014)
- Piller, I. & Cho, J. (2013). Neoliberalism as language policy. *Language in Society*, 42, 23-44
- Quacquarelli Symonds. (2014). QS World University Rankings: Indicators. <http://www.iu.qs.com/university-rankings/rankings-indicators>. (Accessed 23rd June 2016)
- Shin, J. C. (2011). The Past, Present and Future of Rankings, in Shin J.C., Toutkoushian R. K. & Teichler, U. (Eds), *University Rankings: Theoretical Basis, Methodology and Impacts on Global Higher Education* (Vol. 3), Pp. 1–16, Berlin: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Shimomura, H. (2013). Making Japanese Higher Education More International. *The Japan Times*, 2 September 2. B1.
- Times Higher Education. (2014). Times Higher Education: Methodology. <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2014-15/world-ranking/methodology> (Accessed 23rd June 2016).
- United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2015). Global flow of tertiary-level students. <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Pages/international-student-flow-viz.aspx> (Accessed 15 September 2015).
- Yonezawa, A., Ishida, K., and Horta, H. (2013). The long-term internationalization of higher education in Japan: a survey of non-Japanese faculty members in Japanese universities. in Mok, K. H. & Yu, K. M (Eds.) *Internationalization of Higher Education in East Asia: Trends of Student Mobility and Impact on Education Governance*, Pp. 179-191. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Yonezawa, A. (2014). Japan's challenge of fostering "global human resources": policy debates and practices. *Japan Labor Review*, 11(2), 37–52.