

How International Are Japanese Universities?

Bernard Susser

Doshisha Women's College

Reference Data:

Susser, B. (2016). How international are Japanese universities? In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Focus on the learner*. Tokyo: JALT.

Today, “Japanese universities painfully face the reality of global higher education” (Ishikawa, 2009). This reality demands that Japanese higher education institutions internationalize and many universities are making efforts to respond. However, there is disagreement over what the internationalization of higher education is and how it can be carried out. The aim of this paper is to examine two aspects of the internationalization of Japanese universities. First, internationalization evaluation instruments developed in Japan are compared with those from other countries. By implication, these instruments define what internationalization means. Second, the curricula of English-medium instruction degree programs from three universities are examined with respect to the extent of their internationalization, focusing on pedagogy and the instructors’ qualifications to teach discipline courses in English. The results are generally positive, suggesting that Japanese universities are internationalizing, but the conclusion suggests possible future problems.

今日、「日本の大学はグローバルな高等教育の現実に痛いほど直面している」(Ishikawa, 2009)。この事実は日本の高等教育機関に「国際化する」ことを求めており、これに対応するために、多くの大学は国際化に力を注いでいる。しかし、高等教育における国際化とは一体何を意味するのか、また、どのように国際化を推進したらよいのか、ということについて一致した考えはない。本研究では、日本の大学における国際化の2つの側面について調査する。はじめに、日本で開発された大学国際化の評価指標を他の国の評価指標と比較する。これは、評価指標によって国際化の意味が規定される、ということを暗に示している。次に、英語で専門分野を教える教師の資格と教授法に焦点を当てながら、3つの大学の学位プログラムにおいて英語を媒介言語として使用するカリキュラムを国際化という観点から検証する。その結果、国際化に対しては概して肯定的であり、日本の大学は国際化しつつあるが、将来問題が生じる可能性もあることが示唆される。

Today, “Japanese universities painfully face the reality of global higher education” (Ishikawa, 2009, p. 165). This reality demands that Japanese higher education institutions internationalize and recently many universities have been making efforts to do so, for example by creating English-medium instruction degree programs (EMIDPs). However, there are serious problems. A review by the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development of Japanese universities found that “most higher education institutions do not have a clear and coherent internationalisation strategy” (Newby, Weko, Breneman, Johanneson, & Maassen, 2009, p. 85). In the present research, I examined the internationalization of Japanese higher education by first comparing the indicators used in Japan to evaluate the degree of internationalization to those used in other countries and then by examining one aspect of internationalization in practice, undergraduate EMIDPs.

Defining and Evaluating the Internationalization of Higher Education

In Japan, there is a lack of agreement on what the internationalization of higher education is and how it can be carried out (Yonezawa, 2010, p. 134). As noted in a Japan Society for the Promotion of Science report on university internationalization (JSPS, 2010), “one can say ‘internationalization’ in a word but its contents are various. Therefore, we believe that it is not appropriate to designate a standardized model of internationalization” (p. 8). This suggests that there is no official definition of higher education internationalization in Japan.

Definitions aside, one way to describe and evaluate the internationalization of an institution of higher education is through the use of an evaluation instrument, great numbers of which have been produced around the world (see, e.g., International Association of Universities, 2015). The major evaluation instruments that have been produced in Japan are listed in Table 1 (texts in Susser, 2015). Comparing these to instruments produced in other countries will indicate the extent to which the Japanese government and universities are aware of what the internationalization of higher education means and requires.

Susser: *How International Are Japanese Universities?*

Table 1. Japanese Instruments for Evaluating the Internationalization of Higher Education

Author	Year	Number of indicators	Source
Ashizawa, S.	2006	49	Ashizawa, 2006b, Table 1 (pp. 1-10 between pp. E-156 and E-157)
Yokota, Ota, Tsuboi, Shiratsuchi, & Kudo	2006	39	http://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/rs/bitstream/10086/15762/19/0410800107.pdf (Ch. 5, pp. 114-115)
JSPS	2010	16	https://www.jsps.go.jp/j-bilat/u-kokusen/program_org/finalreport/3.pdf (p. 20)
NIAD-UE*	2013	10	http://www.niad.ac.jp/english/unive/publications/eng_pbc_itac.pdf (p. 2)

* National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation.

Table 2 shows the top-level categories of indicators in the Ashizawa (2006b) instrument. These can be compared to the topics covered by evaluation instruments produced in other countries. In a recent study, Gao (2015) analyzed many of these instruments and listed their common components (Table 3). A comparison of the items in Table 2 with those in Table 3 shows that the Japanese instrument covers roughly the same topics as those found in instruments produced elsewhere. This is not surprising, considering that most instruments “include essentially the same categories” (Aerden, De Decker, Divis, Frederiks, & de Wit, 2013, p. 60). Further, the Japanese instrument was developed based in part on European and North American evaluation instruments (Ashizawa, 2006a, p. E-1).

Table 2. Top-Level Indicator Categories in the Ashizawa Instrument

Categories
1. Mission, goals, and plans of the university
2. Structures and staff
3. Budgeting and implementation
4. International dimension of research activities

Categories
5. Support system, information provision, and infrastructure (entrance examination, education, housing, multilingual aspects, and the environment)
6. Multifaceted promotion of international affiliation
7. Internationalization of the university curriculum
8. Joint programs with external organizations (academic exchanges, internships, and others)

Table 3. Measureable Components of University Internationalization

Dimension	Components
Governance & organizational support	Human resources Financial support International presence
Students	International students Mobility of students
Faculty	International profile of the faculty International experience of the faculty
Curriculum	Courses with an international component Joint degree programs Students' participation in international studies
Research	Internationally cooperative research programs Internationally focused research centers International researchers Internationally acknowledged research achievements
Engagement	International networks and partnerships International presence of alumni

Note. Modified from Gao, 2015, p. 191.

Susser: *How International Are Japanese Universities?*

However, two issues have been raised in the literature. First, some experts have complained that there is little interest in Japan in curriculum internationalization (e.g., Kudo & Hashimoto, 2011, p. 348). Despite this claim, one section of the instrument is devoted to this topic, covering such items as language education, understanding foreign cultures, courses taught in languages other than Japanese, courses with an international perspective, and curricula based on international standards (Ashizawa, 2006b, pp. 8-9). This seems to match the definition of an internationalized curriculum, which is “a curriculum with an international orientation in content, aimed at preparing students for performing (professional [sic]/socially) in an international and multicultural context, and designed for domestic students and/or foreign students” (Green & Olsen, 2003, p. 59).

The second issue concerns values and principles. Many authorities (e.g., Clifford, 2013) have claimed that internationalization of higher education requires embracing certain values and principles such as academic freedom, socially responsible practices, and research ethics (International Association of Universities, 2012, p. 4), and even understanding “the nonuniversality of culture, religion, and values” (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2006, p. 87). It is true that there is little mention of values and principles in any of the Japanese evaluation instruments, but as Table 3 shows, these do not appear specifically in most other instruments from around the world either. In fact, the Japanese government has been promoting education for sustainable development (ESD) at all educational levels for many years. Values related to ESD include respect for democracy, human dignity, and the diversity of beliefs in society (Kitamura & Hoshii, 2014, p. 209). These are similar to the values and principles cited in the Western literature.

In short, the Japanese evaluation instruments in general are comparable to those produced in Europe and North America. However, this is not to say that evaluation instruments are ideal descriptors or measures of the internationalization of higher education. In fact, they are problematic in several respects. First, “there is no consensus on the components that should be included in the measuring of internationalization” (Gao, 2015, p. 187). Some contain relatively few indicators, but others list hundreds (see, e.g., Beerkens et al., 2010). Second, their focus is on institutional strategies rather than educational programs (Aerden et al., 2013, p. 60). Third, they tend to measure quantitative rather than qualitative elements (Hudzik & Stohl, 2009). This goes against the trend of emphasizing quality rather than quantity in higher education internationalization (Beerkens et al., 2010, p. 12). A final problem is the data used for evaluation: “Valid or reliable data for measuring outcomes is often not available, or interpreting their meaning gives rise to methodological problems” (Hudzik & Stohl, 2009, p. 14). These problems suggest that we should exercise caution when using evaluation instruments for measuring the internationalization of higher education.

Besides evaluation instruments, other documents shed light on how the Japanese government and universities see the internationalization of higher education. For example, the application form for the Top Global University Project of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT, 2014; translation in Susser, 2015) shows what aspects of internationalization are considered to be important by the government. In addition to standard internationalization categories, it includes items such as the percentage of female faculty members and the grade point average system. This suggests that for MEXT the issues of internationalization and university reform in general are closely related (Ishikawa, 2011, p. 195). This is similar to the European situation, where internationalization “is a lever for forcing change in higher education pedagogy” (Dearden, 2014, p. 24). Another list of topics for internationalization was developed for MEXT’s Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities; the nine items cover many of the key issues with emphasis on “university governance and management over international activities in education and research” (Ota, 2014, p. 231). The topics covered by these two instruments are similar to the topics included in evaluation instruments produced in other parts of the world.

Investigating the Reality of Japanese Higher Education Internationalization

The above survey demonstrates that the Japanese government and universities are well aware of the meaning of and requirements for the internationalization of higher education, demonstrating in that sense a high degree of internationalization that meets global standards. Of course, knowing what needs to be done is not the same as doing it. As Tsuruta (2013) pointed out with respect to the internationalization of higher education in Japan, “There is a significant gap between the rhetoric and reality” (p. 141). In part this is a result of faculty resistance to change in general and adoption of English-medium instruction in particular, which is often cited as an impediment to internationalization (e.g., Aspinall, 2013, pp. 164-166). Another explanation is the argument that “the discourse on educational reform has been largely dominated by a belief in the need to strengthen Japanese identity and love of country” (Kariya & Rappleye, 2010, p. 45). This point has been made often with respect to the internationalization of higher education in Japan; Bradford (2015, pp. 63-66) covered the issue and literature nicely. A final explanation for this gap is bureaucratic inertia. In his study of the careers office at one of Japan’s few genuinely international universities, an institution where the rhetoric of internationalization is very strong, Breaden (2013) showed that “any new challenges raised by *kokusaika* [internationalization] will be ignored if they cannot be absorbed into the existing framework” (p. 122).

Susser: How International Are Japanese Universities?

The following study investigated this reported gap between rhetoric and reality by examining one aspect of higher education internationalization, EMIDPs, to see to what extent internationalization has been accomplished. EMIDPs, also called English-taught programs, are defined as “HE [higher education] programs which use English exclusively as the language of instruction in countries where English is not the usual language of instruction in HE” (Bradford, 2015, p. 38). Establishment of such programs has been an important aspect of the internationalization of higher education in Japan, both for attracting students from other countries and for improving the English ability and international outlook of Japanese students. These programs offer majors in typical academic disciplines and are not focused on English language study itself. In fact, the students from other countries often include native speakers of English who take the same subject-matter classes as other students.

The focus in this paper is on two important aspects of these programs: instructors’ qualifications and teaching methods. First, there is a reported tendency to staff EMIDPs in some cases with EFL or other instructors who are competent to teach in English despite not being specialists in the disciplines of the department (Bradford, 2015, p. 152; lyobe & Brown, 2011, p. 183; see also Carty & Susser, 2015). Such a practice would have an adverse effect on the reputation of the programs, as faculty expertise is an important factor in the assessment of educational quality and is of importance to prospective students. Second, the EMI literature suggests that teaching classes made up of students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds requires active student participation instead of lectures (e.g., Leask & Wallace, 2011, p. 31). Further, it is a truism that on the whole Japanese university faculty do not have a teaching-oriented culture (Yamada, 2014, p. 167). The non-Japanese students interviewed by Lassegard (2006) complained about their Japanese professors’ “lack of teaching skills” (p. 130; see also Bradford, 2015, pp. 218, 224).

To investigate these two issues, I selected three EMIDP departments at three different universities as a pilot study. All three universities were large, with many faculties (divisions) and departments, and were located in metropolitan areas. The criteria for selecting the departments to be studied were as follows:

1. There was a specific statement that students can obtain sufficient credits for graduation by taking only courses offered in English.
2. The program must have completed at least one cycle and produced at least one cohort of graduates as of March 31, 2015.
3. The program was undergraduate leading to a bachelor’s degree or its equivalent.

4. The program did not focus on: (a) Japan; (b) English/American/etc. language, literature, or culture; or (c) STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics). STEM programs were excluded because I do not have sufficient expertise to evaluate instructors’ qualifications in these fields.

“A” is a social science department in a national university in the Kanto area. “B” is a department focused on international relations in a private university in the Kansai area. “C” is a cultural studies department in a private university in the Kanto area. All three programs enrolled students of many different nationalities, including Japanese. My experience has shown that nationality in the legal sense is not a good indicator of the English language ability or cultural background of students in such programs. Many have lived in more than one country, have gone to international schools, or are the children of international marriages.

Table 4 shows the results of the investigation based on the information available on the universities’ Internet sites, which provided curricula, syllabi, and some information about the instructors’ education and research activities. Further information about instructors’ background and research was found by using Google Scholar, CiNii (Scholarly and Academic Information Navigator), and similar databases. Item one is the number of courses that were examined. These were in principle 2nd- or 3rd-year content courses in the department major; language and other skills courses, seminars, internships, and so on were excluded. The syllabus or the instructor’s name was not available for some courses so they are not included. Item two shows the number of instructors checked. Some instructors taught more than one course counted in item one and information on some instructors was not available or was incomplete. Item three shows the percentage of courses that emphasized active student participation through discussion, presentations, and so on. A course was counted here if the syllabus and grading emphasized discussion or presentations even if the course was labeled in the syllabus as a “lecture.”

Susser: *How International Are Japanese Universities?*

Table 4. Results of Analysis of English-Medium Instruction Degree Programs

Criteria	Department		
	A	B	C
1. Number of courses checked	49	38	37
2. Number of instructors checked	30	23	27
3. % of courses emphasizing active student participation	8%	45%	68%
4. % of instructors who are full-time (including contract)	80%	78%	59%
5. % of instructors with degrees from anglophone institutions	60%	61%	63%
6. % of instructors who have published in English	83%	87%	70%
7. % of courses taught by discipline specialists	96%	92%	92%

Items 4 and 5 were included to estimate both the instructor's ability to teach in English and his or her qualifications to teach the given course. Of course, neither a degree from an anglophone university nor publications in English guarantee that the individual's English is at a sufficiently high level to teach in English, but they provide some indication of that construct. Additionally, publication in English suggests that the author is familiar with the English-language literature in the field, which is an important requirement for teaching content courses in English. Item 7 shows the results of comparing the content of the course syllabus with the instructor's graduate degrees and publications to determine whether or not the instructor was qualified to teach that course.

As the table shows, there was considerable variation among the three departments in the percentage of courses emphasizing active student participation (item 3), indicating that lecture-style classes are still common. More encouragingly, the results for item 7 show that overwhelmingly courses were taught by discipline specialists. There were very few cases in which the instructor clearly had no training or research experience in the subject of the course. However, this study suffered from several limitations:

1. As a pilot study, only three EMIDPs were covered.
2. I often had to draw conclusions from limited or indirect data.
3. There was no second reader to confirm my judgments.

This investigation revealed that there are many academics in various disciplines available in Japan to teach in EMIDPs, including Japanese and non-Japanese, and native

and nonnative English speakers. In addition to the many Japanese who have studied at anglophone universities, quite a few scholars from European and Asian countries who are comfortable teaching and publishing in English are working in Japan. Whether this number is large enough to staff the many new EMIDPs now opening is still an open question.

Conclusion

The above has shown that within the limitations of this study Japanese universities are internationalizing to a considerable degree. The instruments developed and used in Japan to evaluate the degree of higher education internationalization compare favorably to those used in other countries, and the EMIDPs studied are being taught by qualified discipline specialists. However, concerning the future, there are two problems. First, as more EMIDPs are established, how will they be staffed? The three schools studied here were all large, metropolitan universities able to draw on English-speaking discipline specialists from other departments or other universities in the area, or experts from think tanks, NGOs, and so on. However, this will not be possible for schools that are smaller, located outside large metropolitan areas, or both. Will these schools be forced to make use of EFL teachers for their content courses as the sources cited above suggest? Second, how well will the nonnative English-speaking discipline specialists actually be able to teach in English? Studies in non-English-speaking countries have shown that instructors in EMI programs are often concerned about their ability to teach in English (literature surveyed in Bradford, 2015, pp. 81-83). Further, as mentioned above, teaching in EMI programs requires not only language ability but also learner-centered pedagogies. In the end, if Japanese universities are not able to staff their EMIDPs with faculty who are both discipline specialists and able to teach in English, the quality of the education they will be able to offer may suffer, disappointing and disadvantaging all students.

Acknowledgment

The author is very grateful to the anonymous reviewers for providing valuable comments and suggestions.

Bio Data

Bernard Susser is a professor emeritus of Doshisha Women's College and has published research on second language writing instruction, CALL, content-based language instruction, and English-medium instruction. <bernsusser@gmail.com>

References

- Aerden, A., De Decker, F., Divis, J., Frederiks, M. & de Wit, H. (2013). Assessing the internationalisation of degree programmes: Experiences from a Dutch-Flemish pilot certifying internationalisation. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 43(1), 56-78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2013.746562>
- Ashizawa, S. (2006a). Significance and objectives of the study to develop evaluation criteria to assess the internationalization of universities. In N. Furushiro (Ed.), *Developing evaluation criteria to assess the internationalization of universities* (pp. E1-E6). Osaka, Japan: Osaka University.
- Ashizawa, S. (2006b). The process of developing evaluation indicators. In N. Furushiro (Ed.), *Developing evaluation criteria to assess the internationalization of universities* (pp. E137-E156). Osaka, Japan: Osaka University.
- Aspinall, R. W. (2013). *International education policy in Japan in an age of globalization and risk*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Global Oriental.
- Beerkens, E., Brandenburg, U., Evers, N., van Gaalen, A., Leichsenring, H., & Zimmermann, V. (2010). *Indicator projects on internationalization—Approaches, methods and findings. A report in the context of the European project “Indicators for Mapping & Profiling Internationalisation” (IMPI)*. Gütersloh, Germany: CHE Consult. Retrieved from <http://www.impi-project.eu/pdf/full_indicator_projects_on_internationalisation-IMPI%20100511.pdf>
- Bradford, A. (2015). *Internationalization policy at the genba: Exploring the implementation of social science English-taught undergraduate degree programs in three Japanese universities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <<http://pqdtopen.proquest.com/doc/1668131342.html?FMT=AI>>
- Breaden, J. (2013). *The organisational dynamics of university reform in Japan: International inside out*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Carty, P. & Susser, B. (2015). Global education and classroom teaching: From CBI to EMI. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *JALT2014 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 1-8). Tokyo: JALT.
- Clifford, V. (2013). *The elusive concept of internationalisation of the curriculum*. Retrieved from <<http://www.brookes.ac.uk/services/cc/definitions.html>>
- Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a medium of instruction—A growing global phenomenon*. London, UK: British Council. Retrieved from <https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/e484_emi_-_cover_option_3_final_web.pdf>
- Gao, Y. (2015). Toward a set of internationally applicable indicators for measuring university internationalization performance. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 19(2), 182-200. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1028315314559030>
- Green, M. F., & Olsen, C. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Hudzik, J. K., & Stohl, M. (2009). Modelling assessment of the outcomes and impacts of internationalisation. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Measuring success in the internationalisation of higher education* (EAIE Occasional Paper 22) (pp. 9-21). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: European Association for International Education.
- International Association of Universities. (2012). *Affirming academic values in internationalization of higher education: A call for action*. Paris, France: UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://www.iau-aiu.net/sites/all/files/Affirming_Academic_Values_in_Internationalization_of_Higher_Education.pdf>
- International Association of Universities. (2015). *Indicators and assessment*. Retrieved from <<http://www.iau-aiu.net/content/indicators-and-assessment>>
- Ishikawa, M. (2009). University rankings, global models, and emerging hegemony: Critical analysis from Japan. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(2), 159-173. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1028315308330853>
- Ishikawa, M. (2011). Redefining internationalization in higher education: *Global 30* and the making of global universities in Japan. In D. B. Willis & J. Rappleye (Eds.), *Reimagining Japanese education: Borders, transfers, circulations, and the comparative* (pp. 193-223). Oxford, UK: Symposium Books.
- Iyobe, B., & Brown, H. (2011). The positioning of bilingual education initiatives of Japanese universities: The global context and local possibilities. *Journal of International Studies and Regional Development*, 2, 177-192.
- JSPS. (2010). *Guroubaru shakai ni okeru daigaku no kokusai tenkai ni suite—Nihon no daigaku no kokuzaika o suishinsuru tame no teigen* [University internationalization within global society: A proposal for promoting the internationalization of Japanese universities]. Tokyo: Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. <Retrieved from https://www.jsps.go.jp/j-bilat/u-kokusen/program_org/finalreport.html>
- Kariya, T., & Rappleye, J. (2010). The twisted, unintended impacts of globalization on Japanese education. *Research in the Sociology of Education*, 17, 17-63.
- Kitamura, Y., & Hoshii, N. (2014). Education for sustainable development at universities in Japan. In A. Yonezawa, Y. Kitamura, A. Meerman, & K. Kuroda (Eds.), *Emerging international dimensions in East Asian higher education* (pp. 207-225). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Kudo, K. & Hashimoto, H. (2011). Internationalization of Japanese universities: Current status and future directions. In S. Marginson, S. Kaur, & E. Sawir (Eds.), *Higher education in the Asia-Pacific: Strategic responses to globalization* (pp. 343-359). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Lassegard, J. P. (2006). International student quality and Japanese higher education reform. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(2), 119-140. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1028315305283878>
- Leask, B., & Wallace, J. (2011). *Good practice report: Learning and teaching across cultures*. Strawberry Hills, NSW: Australian Learning & Teaching Council. Retrieved from <http://www.olt.gov.au/system/files/resources/GPR_Learning_and_Teaching_Across_Cultures_Leask_2011.pdf>

Susser: *How International Are Japanese Universities?*

- MEXT. (2014). *Heisei 26 nendo suupaa guroubaru daigaku nado jigyou "suupaa guroubaru daigaku sousei shien" kousou chousho* [FY2014 Top Global University Project: "Support for the creation of top global universities" plan form]. Retrieved from <https://www.jsps.go.jp/j-sgu/data/download/08_sgu_kinyuu.pdf>
- Newby, H., Weko, T., Breneman, D., Johanneson, T., & Maassen, P. (2009). *OECD reviews of tertiary education: Japan*. Paris, France: OECD.
- NIAD-UE (National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation). (2013). *Institutional thematic assessment: Internationalization of higher education*. Retrieved from <http://www.niad.ac.jp/english/unive/publications/eng_pbc_itac.pdf>
- Olson, C. L., Green, M. F., & Hill, B. A. (2006). *A handbook for advancing comprehensive internationalization: What institutions can do and what students should learn*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Ota, H. (2014). Japanese universities' strategic approach to internationalization: Accomplishments and challenges. In A. Yonezawa, Y. Kitamura, A. Meerman, & K. Kuroda (Eds.), *Emerging international dimensions in East Asian higher education* (pp. 227-252). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Susser, B. (2015, November). *How "international" have Japanese universities become? Testing the internationalization of Japanese higher education* [handout]. Paper presented at JALT2015, Shizuoka, Japan. Retrieved from: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284498446_How_International_Have_Japanese_Universities_Become_Testing_the_Internationalization_of_Japanese_Higher_Education>
- Tsuruta, Y. (2013). The knowledge society and the internationalization of Japanese higher education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 33, 140-155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2013.780674>
- Yamada, R. (2014). A comparative study of Japanese and US first-year seminars. In R. Yamada (Ed.), *Measuring quality of undergraduate education in Japan: Comparative perspective in a knowledge based society* (pp. 153-168). Singapore: Springer.
- Yokota, M., Ota, H., Tsuboi, T., Shiratsuchi, S., & Kudo, K. (2006). *Kiro ni tatsu Nihon no daigaku: Zenkoku yonensei daigaku no kokusaika to ryuugaku kouryuu ni kansuru chousa houkoku* [Japanese universities at a crossroad: Report of a survey of four-year universities throughout Japan concerning internationalization and international exchange]. Tokyo: Hitotsubashi University. Retrieved from: <<http://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/rs/handle/10086/15762>>
- Yonezawa, A. (2010). Much ado about ranking: Why can't Japanese universities internationalize? *Japan Forum*, 22(1-2), 121-137. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09555803.2010.488948>