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Abstract

In light of the three policy and environmental factors: (1) shifting from quantitative to qualitative goals in the international student policy in 2003, (2) the corporatization of national universities in 2004, and (3) a deteriorating national demographic climate, the primary purpose of this study is to examine international student enrollment management differences between two types of Japanese national universities: more selective and less selective institutions. Specifically, this study examines the international student recruitment policies of national universities, such as their primary/prioritized host programs, target international student applicant pools, and required language proficiency standards. Data was first collected through quantitative methods in the form of a mailed survey questionnaire and later complemented by interviews for qualitative data collection.

Results indicated that, first, in general, more selective national universities had larger numbers and higher proportions of international students than those of less selective national universities in their student populations. A university’s selectivity type significantly influenced international student populations and a university’s selectivity index was found to be a strong predictor of international student proportions overall. Second, the lower selectivity index a national university had, the more it placed importance on admitting international students to meet their authorized enrollment quotas. Third, regarding specific measures to recruit more international students, a higher percentage of more selective national universities than less selective national universities had English-based academic programs and international alumni association chapters. Fourth, with regard to language proficiency requirements, a significantly higher percentage of more selective national universities than less selective national universities required a TOEFL score for international applicants. Fifth, a significantly higher percentage of
less selective national universities than more selective national universities had an academic program(s) not requiring English proficiency for their international admissions. Regarding international student recruitment, both more selective national universities and less selective national universities prioritized their graduate programs over undergraduate programs, but their approaches, motivations, and reasons for doing so were different. On one hand, more selective national universities, particularly in their advanced graduate programs, tended to take a proactive and positive approach for recruiting international students in order to both reinforce their institution’s international dimensions and their institution’s prestige of research and education. On the other hand, less selective national universities, especially with regards to their unstable graduate programs, tended to have passive, ad hoc approaches for recruiting such students in order to solve their immediate and pressing enrollment problems.

By and large, while the increased autonomy of national universities has generally benefited a national university’s administrative authority, in particular the self-financing accounts and internal budget allocations of more selective national universities, such is not necessarily the case for their international education programs, especially within less selective national universities.

Finally, considering the newly formulated 300,000 International Student Plan, this study specifically recommends strategic reforms and innovative measures for both the Japanese government and Japanese universities in order to increase the number of incoming international students in Japan.
Chapter I

Introduction

Context of the Problem

Various studies show clear growth in transnational education as a part of a broader process of the internationalization of tertiary education. Student mobility represents the bulk of transnational education and is growing steadily around the world. According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (hereafter called “OECD”) statistics, over three-quarters of all international students (studying outside their home countries) are concentrated in the following six host countries: the United States (22% of all enrollments in 2004), the United Kingdom (12%), Germany (10%), France (9%), Australia (6%), and Japan (5%). Although development assistance, mutual understanding, and international cooperation in teaching and research rank high on many countries’ internationalization agendas, economic and revenue-generation rationales have become much more important recently in terms of their international student policies. However, skilled migration rationales and capacity building rationales can be weightier factors, depending on both a particular country’s demographic situation and thus its supply/demand ratios within the country’s system of higher education.

Since the 1980’s, internationalization has been one of the most crucial issues in Japanese higher education. In the beginning of the 1980’s, Japan recognized that the country’s economic achievement implied expectations for, and would therefore depend on, both greater financial and intellectual contributions to the international community. In trying to meet these expectations, the

---

1 OECD defines, “Students are classified as international students if they left their country of origin and moved to another country for the purpose of study.” [OECD, Education at a Glance 2007 (Paris: OECD, 2007), 314.]
2 OECD, Education at a Glance 2007, 304.
government, in accordance with Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone’s proposal, set a target in 1983 to increase the number of international students\(^3\) enrolled in Japanese universities and colleges to 100,000 by the beginning of the 21\(^{st}\) century (hereafter called “the 100,000 International Student Plan” or “the Nakasone Plan”). This quantitative goal was finally achieved in 2003 although it was rather belated. Following this achievement, in 2003 the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (hereafter called “MEXT”) released a policy paper: “Development of New Policies for International Student Exchanges: Aiming for the Expansion of Student Exchanges and its Quality Improvement,” setting forth the government’s initiative for the post-100,000 International Student Plan. This policy paper set up a new strategy to augment the previous 100,000 international student goal with an additional 30,000 students by 2008. Also, the policy paper emphasized that each university, based on its own mission and strategy, should advance proactive, international student exchanges, focusing on the qualitative improvement of admission systems and support programs for already-enrolled and future international students.

In 2004 all national universities in Japan were corporatized as a part of Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi’ reform agenda of state-owned businesses. This corporatization removed national universities from the national government organizational framework and was meant to mainly: (1) expand the independence and autonomy of each national university, (2) realize agile, strategic, and responsible management through private-sector approach, including the development of performance-based evaluation and accountability efforts, and (3) create a new

---

\(^3\) In Japan, an international student means a student from a foreign country who is receiving an education from any university, graduate school, junior college, college of technology, special training college, or taking university preparatory courses and who resides in the country with “college student” visa status as defined in the Immigration Control and Refugee Recognition Act. [Student Services Division, Higher Education Bureau, *Outline of the Student Exchange System in Japan 2007* (Tokyo: Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, 2007), 7.]
management system centered on the university president and featuring the participation of external experts. Under this major reform, national universities are expected to take advantage of this corporatization benefit as much as possible. In accordance with national university corporatization, the MEXT’s funding/budgeting system for national universities was also changed. The MEXT handed the internal budget allocation of the government’s national university operation subsidy over to the newly established management body of each institution. In other words, according to a national university’s mid-term (six-year-cycle) goals and plans as assessed by the National University Corporation Evaluation Committee, the MEXT now provides a lump sum budget to each national university. At the same time, however, since 2004 the government subsidy for the operational costs of each national university has been decreasing by one percent every year. Concurrently, the MEXT has been introducing new, and various competitive funding programs for education, research and administrative reform, including those for international education.

Therefore, the current catchword of the MEXT for the development of higher education reform is “To be distinctive universities in a competitive environment.”

Apart from attempting to raise the academic level of Japanese universities, that aforementioned “competitive environment” also refers to the pronounced demographic decline of 18-year-olds throughout the country. It is furthermore estimated that the total admission quotas of universities and junior colleges will reach 100 percent in the year 2008. It means, in theory, that all

---

5 It is an independent committee but the members of the committee are appointed by the MEXT.
6 The government subsidy for national universities became similar to the block grant in the U.S.
7 These new funding programs for international education are, for instance, Advanced Student Exchange Pilot Project, Strategic International Cooperation with Universities Abroad, and Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarter in Universities.
applicants could be admitted to at least one university or college. Moreover, from 2008 onwards, the population of high school graduates will seemingly continue to fall below the total university admission quotas. Less selective universities, especially private institutions in provincial areas, have already been experiencing trouble filling their classrooms and/or attracting qualified students. Some of these institutions are desperately recruiting international students, especially Chinese, through study abroad or recruiting agents. Under these demographically competitive circumstances, some forward-looking national universities, for instance, Hiroshima University, Tohoku University, and University of Tokyo, have both taken the initiative in articulating missions and strategies for international student enrollment management and started to embark on aggressive international recruitment activities. The declining number of young people in Japan, coupled with the above-mentioned national university managerial, structural, and policy reforms, raises the question as to just how different new Japanese national universities, according to their own agendas, will respond to government initiatives aimed at both increasing and managing international student enrollment at their respective institutions.

As both the Japanese government and society struggle to respond to demographic issues: decreasing numbers of high school students, the resultant labor shortage and immigration problems, increasing the numbers of international students can also be seen as a potential hedge against those issues. The government’s nascent reform policies for national university corporatization and international student recruitment, however, are not well-coordinated between the government and higher education institutions at present, and national universities, as

---

9 There were 756 universities in 2007 in Japan. Because of the relaxation of the MEXT’s chartering criteria in 1991, the number of universities, especially private universities, increased by 233 (44.6%) in a decade and a half, from 523 institutions in 1992, including institutions that were upgraded from junior colleges (two-year programs) to universities (four-year programs) in spite of the continual decrease of high school graduates.

10 90% of the students were Chinese when Hagi International University (private), Yamaguchi went bankrupt in 2005.
independent entities, must find new and creative funding inroads. In order to both engage in income-generating activities and adopt cost recovery-based tuition plans for international students, a budgetary countermeasure currently under consideration by these newly-corporatized institutions—that now face continuous budget cutbacks and governance reform—could be a possible shift from the old aid-approach model, once heavily relied upon for Japan’s “international cooperation” projects, to the trade-and-business model. Thus, national universities’ missions and strategies for recruiting international students, which in turn are related to both the financial capability and newly-given autonomy of these corporatized institutions, will be defined, in the context of this study, as institutional responses to the implementation and coordination of the government’s international student policies that often overlap, and are involved with, other inter-ministry issues.11

**Purpose of Study/Statement of the Problem**

In light of the three major policy and environmental factors: (1) shifting from quantitative to qualitative goals in the international student policy in 2003, (2) the corporatization of national universities in 2004, and (3) a deteriorating national demographic climate, the primary purpose of this study is to examine international student enrollment management differences between two

---

11 In Japan, international student policy is made by the MEXT, but it is also concerned with the Ministry of Justice (Immigration Bureau), Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, and Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry regarding their relevant issues.
types of Japanese national universities: more selective and less selective institutions. More specifically, this study examines the international student recruitment policies of national universities, such as their primary (prioritized) host programs (undergraduate or graduate programs), target prospective international student pools (inside or outside Japan), and required language proficiency standards. Also, this study examines gaps and conflicts between the government’s stated international student policies and actual practices of international student recruitment in national universities. Additionally, for the purpose of comparative analysis, when appropriate, this study includes international student recruitment policies of sampled private universities as counterparts to the above-mentioned, two types of national universities.

**Research Hypotheses**

The research hypotheses of this study are as follows:

1. More selective national universities would seek international students mainly for their graduate programs (including those programs that are entirely conducted in English) and would most probably downplay the importance of tuition/cost recovery, whereas less selective national universities would generally recruit international students for their undergraduate programs.

---

12 For the purpose of this study, these two types of universities are defined and sampled as follows: (1) More selective national universities: 20 universities were selected by the Selectivity Ranking Chart of National Universities, which is compiled by the Yoyogi Seminar on the basis of the results of the National Center Test for University Admissions, in descending order of the selectivity index. 16 out of the 20 universities are historically known as prestigious universities consisting of three types of institutions such as former imperial universities, former state-run universities (originally established by non-education ministries, for example, the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce, before World War II), and universities of foreign studies; (2) Less selective national universities: 20 universities were selected from the same ranking chart in ascending order of the selectivity index. All 20 universities are located in provincial areas and mainly established after World War II. Yoyogi Seminar is one of the major preparatory schools for universities’ entrance examinations and the above ranking chart can be found at http://www.yozemi.ac.jp/rank/gakubu/index.html. In addition, in order to further validate the selection of these two groups of national universities, a supplemental maker for “more selective” and “less selective” was determined by how many of the MEXT’s recent nine competitive funding programs, which are related to international education and to internationally collaborative research, were obtained by these national universities. As a result, from 2002 to 2005, it was revealed that the group of 20 more selective universities obtained 312 grants (15.6 grants per school) in total, whereas the group of 20 less selective universities received 42 grants (2.1 grants per school).
and unstable graduate programs because of low domestic enrollment. Additionally, less
selective national universities would emphasize both tuition/cost recovery and the
sustainability of their academic programs.

2. More selective national universities would recruit highly qualified students from the
international student market outside Japan, whereas less selective national universities would
recruit primarily from the international student market within Japan.13

3. More selective national universities would prioritize applicants’ academic abilities over
Japanese language proficiency as admission criteria, however, less selective national
universities would prioritize Japanese language proficiency over the academic ability as
admission criteria for international applicants.

Assuming the gap between more selective national universities and less selective national
universities would widen in terms of resource acquisition, which include increasingly competitive
funds, competent personnel, and the capacity of education, research, and management under the
MEXT’s higher education reform agenda, the objectives and behavior of international student
recruitment will change accordingly consonant with the abovementioned hypotheses.

**Rationales of Hypotheses**

With respect to the first hypothesis, more selective universities would be expected to recruit
international students in order to reinforce the international dimension of their research and
education as well as to acquire potential, highly-motivated human resources who can play a vital
role in their advanced scientific research programs. In fact, University of Tokyo states

---

13 This refers to international students who are already enrolled in either Japanese language schools or undergraduate
programs of Japanese universities and are eligible to be international student applicants for, and further studies at
Japanese higher education institutions.
“International students account for approximately 7.5 percent of the total number of students. When it comes to graduate schools, international students account for as high as 14.4 percent of all the postgraduate students. This number will only increase, as we remain in the era of globalization.”¹⁴ Due to their deeper pool of academically-able applicants and great domestic demand (claiming the “high-ground” in administrating rigorous and nationally-standardized examinations for national university admission), highly selective universities neither worry about attracting high-caliber domestic students, especially for their undergraduate programs, nor are they concerned much about tuition revenue. Moreover, they are more likely to acquire various kinds of grants¹⁵ than less selective universities based on their prestige¹⁶ and competitive edge of education and research. Also, since highly selective universities maintain both a high number of internationally-trained faculty and a large capacity for research, it is not difficult for highly selective universities to establish English-based graduate programs¹⁷ for international students who do not have a strong command of Japanese. Thus, more selective universities primarily seek qualified students for their advanced/graduate programs and dismiss the significance of tuition/cost recovery.

In contrast, less selective national universities are likely to admit international students to supplement their domestic enrollment although they do not mention it explicitly. In provincial

---


¹⁵ For example, in the academic year of 2004/05, 14 out the 20 more selective universities received at least one of the three major MEXT’s grants to promote international education and internationally collaborative research, i.e. Strategic Fund for Establishing the International Headquarters of Universities, Support Program for Strategic International Cooperation with Universities Abroad, and Assistance Program for Application of Overseas Advanced Education and Research. However, only two out of the 20 less selective national universities obtained these MEXT’s grants.

¹⁶ “Selectivity” and “prestige” of universities can be used interchangeably in the Japanese context. It is because the selectivity is the most determinable factor of university’s prestige.

¹⁷ In 2006, there were 99 graduate programs (degree-granting programs) that were conducted in English in national universities. 45 out of the 99 programs belonged to the abovementioned more selective national universities, while 20 programs were provided by the less selective national universities. [Information Center for International Education, JASSO, University Degree Courses Offered in English (Tokyo: Japan Student Services Organization, 2006), 1-10.]
areas, however, national universities’ graduate programs face enrollment problems. These institutions, despite little local demand, have established and/or expanded their graduate programs in order to be recognized as prestigious research-oriented universities and to differentiate themselves from private universities, which are more teaching oriented. However, in reality, these national university graduate programs face difficulties in recruiting enough students to meet their enrollment quotas authorized by the MEXT.\footnote{The Evaluation Committee for Corporatized National Universities in MEXT reported that 14 national universities had several kinds of management problems including a shortage of matriculated students in their graduate programs. [Seishi Chiyozaki, “Several National Universities are Behind the Schedule: Management Reform.” \textit{Mainichi Interactive}, September 16, 2005, <http://www.mainichi-msn.co.jp/shakai/edu/news/20050917k0000m040154000c.html> (September 17, 2005).]} Undergraduate programs of less selective universities too, when considering Japan’s demographic problem, may encounter the same enrollment dilemma soon. And these less selective universities cannot afford to establish new English-based graduate programs due to their lack of financial and human resources. Therefore, less selective national universities in provincial areas can be expected to mainly recruit international students in order to maintain their existing programs (fill classrooms and laboratories) while both enhancing the tuition revenue and attempting to sustain their allocation of government subsidies.

As for the second and third hypotheses, more selective national universities will tend to focus on the international student market outside Japan in order to recruit highly qualified students for their cutting-edge disciplines by utilizing their cross-border networks, for instance, by utilizing their alumni associations’ chapters, overseas branch offices, and partner universities abroad. Furthermore, with their large financial capacity, more selective universities can offer their own scholarships and other assistance services to high-quality, potential international students. Their market would not be confined only to foreigners who have a high command of Japanese, but more
selective institutions with graduate-level, English-based academic programs, also would not even have to require foreign applicants to acquire an academic-level proficiency in Japanese so long as their academic abilities benefit related disciplines within the university. Thus, as admission criteria, more selective national universities could be expected to prioritize applicants’ academic ability over their Japanese proficiency.

On the other hand, due not only to financial constraints but also to the lack of resources and expertise to deal with the international student market outside Japan, less selective national universities could be expected to be heavily dependent upon a pool of prospective international students currently studying at Japanese language schools,\(^\text{19}\) colleges (undergraduate programs), and/or vocational schools located in Japan. Facing contracting government subsidies, less selective universities are more severely affected than more selective universities and may have to cut their Japanese language programs and assistance services for the special needs of international students. In this sense, these universities would like to accept international students that have already lived in Japan, adapted themselves to its culture and system, and acquired enough Japanese proficiency to be ready to take regular academic programs conducted in Japanese. These international students might not be highly talented in an academic sense since they are recruited from a smaller international student market existing inside Japan compared with a larger student market outside the country. However, they would not need much support from institutions and universities that could treat them in a similar manner along with their domestic students. In short, less selective

\(^{19}\) In 2006, there were 30,607 Japanese language school students in Japan. 52.5% of these language school students were Chinese. [Student Services Division, Higher Education Bureau, Outline of the Student Exchange System in Japan 2007, 7.] 72% of the language school students proceeded to universities and colleges upon completion of the language programs in 2004. [Central Council for Education, “Survey on Japanese Language Schools.” Support for Japanese Language Schools and Pre-College Students, June 4, 2004, <http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo4/gijiroku/007/03061101/002.htm> (September 17, 2006).]
national universities would approach the international student market within Japan by prioritizing Japanese language acquisition over academic ability.

**Variables**

In order to compare orientations and behavior of international student recruitment between more selective national universities and less selective national universities, the following variables are used in this study. The independent variables are: (1) selectivity type (more selective universities and less selective universities) and (2) selectivity indicator. The dependent variables are: (1) ratios of international students (the ratio of international students to the total student population, the ratio of international undergraduate students to the total undergraduate student population, the ratio of international graduate students to the total graduate student population, the ratio of international undergraduate students to the total international student population, and the ratio of international graduate students to the total international student population), (2) numbers of international students (the total number of international students, the number of international undergraduate students, and the number of international graduate students), (3) implementation rates of university’s vision and plans for the recruitment of international students (mission statement, numerical target, and academic programs planned to increase international students), (4) degree of importance regarding international students’ contribution to the student intake, (5) implementation rates of measures for recruiting international students (approaching prospective international students who reside outside Japan), and (6) implementation rates of requirement of language proficiency test (EJU and TOEFL) and academic programs not requiring language proficiency (Japanese and English). The control variables are overall student populations (the total...
number of entire students, the total number of undergraduate students, and the total number of graduate students).

**Significance of the Study**

There are very few studies that can be found in the literature which focus on the international student enrollment management of national universities in Japan. Findings from this study will provide a supplemental assessment of actual, institutional-level, international student policy and practice as it functions (or dysfunctions) within the newly-reformed relationship between national university corporations and the Japanese government. It is hoped that if this study’s hypotheses are verified, the divergence of international student recruitment practices between the two types of national universities, which used to be owned and managed by the MEXT on a theoretically equal basis, will also be revealed. Thus, it is also hoped that the results of this study will benefit stakeholders in international education: higher education institutions, the Japanese government (the MEXT and other ministries relevant to international students), Japanese language schools, and associations and organizations involved with international education such as Japan Network for International Education and Japan Student Services Organization. Specifically, it is hoped that the MEXT would utilize these research findings for future policymaking, implementation, and coordination of international student policy in the Japanese higher education system. Finally, the findings of this study, in terms of the immigration and demographical issues addressed within, could offer some suggestions to social researchers and other social organizations in coping with future labor shortages and the projected shortfall of highly-trained human resources in Japan.
Limitations of the Study

In the course of conducting this study, the following limitations were encountered. First, this study primarily focused on national universities in the context of both the corporatization of these national institutions and their evolving international student enrollment policies. Accordingly, all the national universities were surveyed. However, in case of private universities, 40 selected institutions were surveyed as counterparts to the two groups—more selective and less selective—of national universities. Considering the large number of private universities (580) in the Japanese higher education system, the 40 surveyed private universities constitute a rather small sample. Therefore, although findings from this study can be generalized to the situation of the international student enrollment management in national universities, they cannot be generalized to the private universities’ situations when comparing with national universities as a reference.

Second, it was difficult to elicit the candid views of representative officials and their staff in charge of international student enrollment management at national universities. Generally speaking, representatives of Japanese universities, as they are Japanese whose highest priority is to nurture social harmony, tend to respond to survey questions according to their notions of socially desirable answers.

Third, and finally, the response rates of some survey questions were low although the overall response rate of the survey questionnaire was high (75.4%). Thus, follow-up interviews

20 In Japan, there were 580 private universities and they accounted for 76.6% of the total universities in 2007. [MEXT, Japan’s Education at a Glance 2007 (Tokyo: MEXT, 2008), 2.]
21 In this context, it should be remembered, as opposed to the strident offerings of one’s individual, straightforward opinion in nations courting individual rights over the rights of the collective, that Japanese, on the whole, identify first with the collective they are a part of (in this case their employers), reserving their own individual opinions for only the most intimate of their relationships.
with some vice presidents (or senior chief directors) in charge of international education/exchange of the two researched groups were helpful in both supplementing the data collected by the survey and corroborating evidence from it.
Chapter II

Conceptual/Theoretical Framework

This chapter discusses theoretical frameworks that provide the conceptual foundation for the issues of this study as follows: (1) international student mobility in its forms of transnational education, (2) flows, factors, motivations, and rationales of international student mobility, (3) corporatization of public universities, (4) background and rationales of corporatization of national universities in Japan, and (5) diversification and differentiation of new national universities through corporatization.

International Student Mobility

As globalization evolves, both a rising demand for higher education and an expanded global higher education market have been created. The largest and most intensely competitive segment of the global higher education market among the three basic forms of transnational higher education (i.e. movement of individuals, such as students and faculty, movement of programs, and movement of institutions and providers) has been international student mobility.\textsuperscript{22}International student mobility is defined as “any form of international mobility which takes place within a student’s program of study in higher education.”\textsuperscript{23} In other words, “International student mobility (movement of people) involves students or trainees who go abroad to study in an institution. Examples include full study abroad toward a degree, part of an academic partnership for a home degree (study abroad) or a joint degree, and students in exchange programs.”\textsuperscript{24} The UK Higher

\textsuperscript{22} Jane Knight, “GATS, Trade and Higher Education. Perspective 2003 - Where are we?” The Observatory, May 2003, 3.
\textsuperscript{23} Sussex Centre for Migration Research, University of Sussex and Centre for Applied Population Research, University of Dundee, International student mobility (Bristol: The Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2004), 11.
Education Statistics Agency uses a threefold typology for its definition of international student mobility: (1) for an entire program of study (diploma mobility), (2) for part of a program (credit mobility), and (3) other voluntary moves undertaken for a range of personal reasons. Accordingly, the length of study can range from a short trip to the full duration of an academic program.

**Flows, Factors, Motivations, and Rationales of International Student Mobility**

The major pattern of international student flow resembles an almost unilinear movement from largely developing countries (peripheries) to industrialized countries (centers). In host countries, international student inflows are affected by policy changes, political and economic factors, and demographic changes. For sending countries, student outflows are also influenced by policy changes, political and economic factors, and educational changes. Moreover, political factors directly affect not only student outflows from a country but also directions of the flows. For instance, Iran was, in the past, the world’s largest “exporter” of students, yet after the Iranian revolution in 1979, the numbers of Iranian students studying abroad declined, and many of those still abroad became refugees. “Push factors” in sending countries and “pull factors” in host countries are both involved in the broad picture of international student flows. In terms of private and public aspects, individual students and their families have their own interests and concerns, and governments both in

---

25 Sussex Centre for Migration Research, University of Sussex and Centre for Applied Population Research, University of Dundee, 11.
28 Because of the petroleum industry, Iran experienced rapid growth in per capita income during the 1970’s and also greatly expanded financial aid for study abroad as a result of increased government income. The country was engaged in ambitious development programs requiring sophisticated labor skills. Consequently, in the U.S., Iranian share of international students increased to 15.2% in the academic year of 1979-80. However, the Iranian revolution drastically changed the diplomatic relationship between Iran and the U.S. Since then, Iranian enrollment steadily declined.
industrialized (host) and in developing (sending) countries have their own distinctive priorities and interests. Therefore, in many instances, there is usually more than one motivational factor involved in choosing to study abroad and in the selection of the host country, and these motivations and factors are becoming more diversified and intertwined.  

In general, students’ motivation for pursuing their education in foreign countries is based on the universal validity of knowledge, science, and technology. They presume knowledge, science, and technology obtained in other (industrialized) countries will be useful and convertible in their home (developing) countries under the circumstances that scientific and technological progress varies in each region of the world. Furthermore a great number of individuals who have completed secondary education cannot enter domestic universities in some (developing) countries since domestic higher education systems are very small and highly selective (excessive demand over supply). Hence, these students often choose to go abroad (to industrialized countries) either for their post-secondary or for post-graduate education depending on the accessibility and development of higher education programs in their home countries. In other words, aspiring students move to (industrialized) countries where they can study innovative science and technology, e.g. nuclear physics, computer science, and biotechnology that are not available or accessible in their home (developing) countries. This is the major factor for international student mobility during the age of institutionalized knowledge.

---


31 In the 1970’s and 1980’s, a majority of international students from South Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong pursued their bachelor degrees outside of their countries. However, nowadays more students from these countries directly apply for graduate programs as undergraduate programs have rapidly expanded in their home countries.


International student mobility involves not only academic benefits but also socio-economic advantages. The largest number of international students hope to improve their professional opportunities and job qualifications through study abroad in order to obtain higher salaries and better prospects for promotions at home.\(^{34}\) In many cases, they obtain higher degrees, training, and knowledge in business, technology, or natural science fields,\(^ {35}\) which are often not available at institutions or accessible in their home countries. Additionally, the prestige value of a degree obtained in an industrialized country is a major motivation. Moreover, skills, expertise, and knowledge obtained abroad, coupled with the intercultural and second language-learning benefits of having studied abroad, are also highly valued and useful credentials in job markets in most developing countries.\(^ {36}\) Nevertheless, there are some international students who perceive their study abroad experience as a prelude to emigration, and statistics on the “brain drain” from countries such as Taiwan, China, and African countries support this phenomenon.\(^ {37}\)

Neave describes the motivation of host countries to be one of an “official nature” or a “degree of control,” a factor which influences international student mobility. In other words, host country authorities exercise control over the movement of individuals and require that they move within a particular formal framework, scheme or program, and diplomatic (foreign policy) and economic considerations that justify such intervention.\(^ {38}\) For instance, Western governments wish


\(^{35}\) The most popular fields of study for international students in the U.S. are business and management (17.8%), engineering (15.3%), and physical and life sciences (8.9%) in 2006/07. [Institute of International Education, “Fields of Study, International Students,” *Open Doors* 2007, n.d., <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=113124> (December 15, 2007)].


to maintain their influence overseas and regard the promotion of study abroad opportunities with scholarships as means of exerting this strategy.\textsuperscript{39} This is a traditional approach originating initially from the relationship that existed between suzerain nations and their colonized countries. Recently, the U.S. government’s Fulbright program has promoted a new “International Linkages” component which attempts to foster the U.S.’s diplomatic relations with partner countries, especially Third World nations. Scholarships provided by host countries have been used to recruit students of high potential from developing countries and given them educational opportunities at prestigious universities.\textsuperscript{40} As a result, ties between the host (developed) countries and sending (developing) counties have been strengthened through the creation of international networks of political and business elites educated in host countries.\textsuperscript{41} These policy measures are generally supported by academic partnership programs and development assistance projects founded on the basis of international cooperation.\textsuperscript{42} Hence, these traditional motivations of host countries are known as “the foreign-aid approach.”\textsuperscript{43} However, in the 1980’s, this approach came under criticism by policy makers in many host countries. They argued that large numbers of international students were costly and these students added a new and sometimes difficult element to the educational equation.\textsuperscript{44} Furthermore, economic downturns in host countries supported this argument. As a result, grant and scholarship programs have not been able to keep pace with the increasing demands of studying abroad particularly in the developing world. In Australia, New


\textsuperscript{40} OECD, \textit{Internationalisation and Trade in Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges} (Paris: OECD, 2004), 221.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{44} Basically, the cost of research and education for international students is subsidized by general tax revenues, since in almost all the countries higher education is subsidized by the state or in some cases provided virtually without cost to individual.
Zealand, and Canada, education and human resource development projects, in collaboration with their universities, were encouraged to be part of their governments’ development assistance policies until the late 1980’s. However, the absolute number of these university-based development projects decreased steadily from 1990 to 1999 due to significant budget cuts of their governments.\footnote{OECD, \textit{Internationalisation and Trade in Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenge}, 222.}

Demographic changes often have stimulated international recruitment activities of universities in host countries. In the 1980’s, the decline in the college-age population in the U.S., for example, reduced domestic enrollments at lower-tier universities and colleges (excessive supply over demand) and these institutions started recruiting international students and competing for numbers of international students in order to fill their classrooms. For example, about 40 U.S. higher education institutions established branch campuses in Japan during the 1980’s in order to recruit more Japanese students.\footnote{Only two out of some 40, once-established branch campuses of U.S. universities and colleges still remain in Japan.} These institutions’ branch campuses provided the first two years of undergraduate education so that those students who completed the branch campus programs could then be transferred to their home campuses in the U.S. for the last two years of undergraduate education. Moreover, U.S. research universities confronted (and are still confronting) the problem of recruiting enough qualified students into science and engineering graduate programs in the 1980’s. To maintain these programs and to continue their extensive research endeavors, departments increasingly looked to the international student market in order to make up for the shortfall. International students have come to dominate many graduate programs.\footnote{During the 1980’s international students earned 50% of all Ph.D.s in engineering and mathematics, more than 40% in computer science, and more than 30% in physical sciences. [Alice Chandler, “Obligation or Opportunity: Foreign Student Policy in Six Major Receiving Countries,” \textit{Institute for International Education Report}, no. 18, (1989): 9.]}
in the hard science fields.\textsuperscript{48} In the context of an aging and low-birthrate society, international students, especially in fields like science and technology, are expected to contribute to the knowledge-based economy of the host country.\textsuperscript{49} Some European countries, such as the Netherlands, have developed a combination of not only agencies that market the higher education sector abroad but also an immigration policy that makes it easier for international students to stay after the completion of their studies.\textsuperscript{50} This type of pull factor is called as “the skilled migration approach.” In this approach, international students are viewed as a means of supporting economic growth and competitiveness in the knowledge-based economy and are expected to become skilled immigrants in the host country.\textsuperscript{51}

In some sending (developing) countries, instead of building the capacity of their own higher education systems, governments provide financial assistance for study abroad to meet the rapidly-growing domestic demands of tertiary education. Moreover, these governments often cannot afford to establish research-oriented and highly specialized programs of natural sciences and engineering within their universities. Thus, these governments have granted scholarships to qualified students for their study of those disciplines in industrialized countries.\textsuperscript{52} This kind of policy is known as “the capacity building approach” and has been carried out by many Asian countries since increasing numbers of middle-class parents and their children demanded access to higher education during cycles/periods of the rapid economic growth in their respective countries.

Industrialized countries have typically emphasized the value of having international students

\textsuperscript{49} OECD, \textit{Internationalisation and Trade in Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges} (Paris: OECD, 2004), 223.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{52} Altbach. \textit{Higher Education in the Third World}, 169-170.
on campus in the context of “internationalizing” their higher education systems. From a cultural and academic viewpoint, international student mobility not only brings intellectual and cultural enrichment to a country’s academic community but also stimulates their education and research activities. Better understanding of cross-cultural issues and personal networks between the future political and economic elite of host and sending countries, gained through international student mobility, can reinforce political and economic ties as well as enhance mutual understanding and social cohesion in increasingly multicultural societies.\(^{53}\) Many industrialized countries finance international student exchanges through scholarship schemes, bilateral or multilateral agreements among institutions, and regional policies to promote cross-national student mobility. The European SOCRATES-ERASMUS\(^{54}\) and other related programs on mobility as well as the NORDPLUS exchange program among Scandinavian countries, are just two examples of very successful multilateral and reciprocal approaches. These programs have made it easier and less costly for mobile students to study in their member states and in turn have fostered a strong sense of a regional community in their respective areas.

Due to the rapid globalization and resultant interdependency of the world’s economies, the accelerated internationalization of higher education itself has exponentially grown and expanded the international student market and therefore influenced the enrollment management strategies of the world’s universities. In host countries (industrialized countries which in large part have spearheaded “globalization”), both governments and institutions have attempted to maximize their


\(^{54}\) ERASMUS, “European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students,” is the European Commission's educational program for higher education students, teachers, and institutions. It was first introduced in 1987 with the aim of increasing student mobility within the European Community, subsequently spread to the European Economic Area countries, and has now also been established in the Associated Countries of Central and Eastern Europe, Cyprus and Malta. In 1995 ERASMUS became incorporated into the new SOCRATES program which covers education from secondary school to university and to life-long learning. In 2006, over 150,000 students (almost 1% of the European student population) participated in the ERASMUS program.
higher education’s marketability beyond national boundaries so that these countries’ universities can attract even more (fee-paying or privately-financed) international students coming from developing countries.\(^5^5\) Those industrialized countries then, in turn, further involve developing countries in the globalized and knowledge-based economy through their international students who are educated at host countries’ universities. Concurrently, countries hosting a large number of international students have been part of an international phenomenon in whereby higher education has become less a part of social policies (public goods) and more a subset of a country’s economic policies (private goods). Higher education systems in industrialized countries generally operate within a tight budgetary climate\(^5^6\) in which regulatory mechanisms and performance indicators are the accepted standard. Ironically, approximately two decades of higher education under-funding in host (industrialized) countries has led to the incredible growth in transnational higher education as a means of both diversifying and generating institutional revenues. International education has shifted from a once marginal activity to a contemporary core set of administration and operational procedures within many universities in North America, Europe, Asia, and Australia. International education now provides more than 10 percent of the average revenues of Australian institutions.\(^5^7\) It is the fifth largest services export in the U.S. and the third largest in Australia. Both the Australian and U.S. governments are calling for further liberalization of trade in transnational education in World Trade Organization (hereafter called “WTO”) negotiations on the General Agreement on Trade in Services (hereafter called “GATS”). These recent orientations of host

---


\(^5^6\) In 2004, the public expenditure on higher education institutions as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP) was 0.8% in the U.K., 1.2% in France, 1.0% in Germany, and 1.0% in the U.S., and 0.5% in Japan (the lowest percentage in OECD countries). Its mean of OECD countries was 1.0%. [OECD, *Education at a Glance 2007*, 208.]

countries to absorb students from abroad are called “the trade and revenue-generating approach,” and coupled with globalization, they have provided the impetus for the unprecedented growth in international student mobility.

In order to summarize the rationales stimulating international student mobility, it is noteworthy to refer to the OECD analysis of cross-border, post-secondary education. It demonstrates four different, but not mutually exclusive, approaches to international student mobility and their policy instruments are developed as follows:

1. “Aid and mutual understanding approach” encompasses political, cultural, academic, and international development goals.
   - Student mobility (academic exchange) programs
   - Development assistance
   - Scholarships for students and financial assistance for institutions
   - Scholastic network and institutional consortium (academic partnership between institutions)

2. “Capacity building approach” encourages the use of foreign post-secondary education, however delivered, as a quick way to build an emerging country’s capacity.
   - Providing outbound international students with scholarships and some measures to encourage expatriates to return home
   - The consolidation and relaxation of the legal system that encourage foreign educational providers and scholars to come to a country, e.g. twinning arrangements and partnerships with local institutions.

3. “Skilled migration approach” gives stronger emphasis to the recruitment of selected international students, e.g. graduate students in computer science, and tries to attract talented students to work in the host country’s knowledge economy, or render its higher education and research sectors more competitive.
   - Marketing campaign (active promotion) of country’s higher education to the world
   - Special programs for international students including scholarships and academic programs conducted in English in non-English speaking countries
   - Special treatment for those international students who received a degree in a hosting country regarding immigration laws to make it easy for them to migrate permanently or simply relaxation of immigration laws

4. “Trade and revenue-generating approach” offers higher education services on a full-fee basis, without public subsides (developing higher education as an export industry).
   - Full cost recovery tuition system
   - Marketing campaign (active promotion) of country’s higher education to the world
   - Granting autonomy of public institutions to have them engaged in for-profit operation abroad
• Seeking to secure the reputation of the higher education sector and protect international students, e.g. through quality assurance arrangements.\textsuperscript{58}

The higher education system in industrialized nations (major host countries of international students), which is considered in many ways to be the most market-oriented and competitive in the international student market, has been inhibited by an incentive structure bogged down by intervening levels of state policies, finance and budgetary issues, and campus central administration.\textsuperscript{59}

**Corporatization of Public Universities**

Many countries have initiated broad and important public-sector reforms, often implementing corporatization or incorporation as a policy measure for said reforms, and the public sector of higher education is no exception. Sozzani maintains that corporatization can be defined as the transformation of a government-owned enterprise (hereafter called “GOE”) into a public corporation.\textsuperscript{60} In other words, the primary goal of corporatizing a GOE is to provide it with a business structure and endow it with a new legal being/person in the form of a corporation.\textsuperscript{61} Also, corporatization can be seen as a precursor to privatization since the process of corporatization includes a great deal of economic, structural, and operational reform which takes services out of the direct control of the government and gives them to a new legal entity in the form of a corporation.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{58} OECD. *Internationalisation and Trade in Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges*. 232.


\textsuperscript{61} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid.
Jeon mentions “corporatization,” as a term in higher education, generally describes a part of privatization, which is more commonly used in recent studies on higher education. As Johnstone maintains, privatization refers to “a process or tendency of colleges and universities, both public and private, taking on characteristics of, or operational norms associated with, private enterprises.” Privatization of universities implies a set of changes that include one or more of the following: (1) the transfer of ownership of public institutions, (2) shifting sectoral balance without redesigning existing institutions, (3) increased government funding and support for private institutions, or (4) increased private financing and/or control of public institutions. Several theories discuss specific features of corporatization and draw attention to a series of changes in the higher education sector such as: (1) adoption of entrepreneurial norms in universities (e.g., emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness of performance, better use of limited budgets, and commercial use of education), (2) expansion of private resources to finance universities (relief of a heavy financial burden on government), and (3) engagement of profit-making practice in universities (e.g., entering into business ventures, raising endowments, setting up companies, and acquiring and holding investment shares). Furthermore, Johnstone writes in “Privatization in and of Higher Education” that “privatization connotes a greater orientation to the student as a consumer, including the concept of the college education as a "product"; attention to image,

---

67 Jeon, 27.
competitor institutions, and "market niches"; pricing and the enhancement of net earned revenue; and aggressive marketing.  

Privatization also suggests the following characteristics: (1) the adoption of some revenue-enhancing management practices associated with private business, such as contracting out, or "outsourcing"; (2) aggressive labor relations and minimization of payroll expenditures; (3) decisive decision-making and "top down" management; and (4) widespread use of audits and accountability measures.  

Johnstone further argues, “Privatization suggests movement along a dimension (or along several dimensions) rather than an absolute quality or precisely measurable distinction.” Hence, according to Johnstone, the movement in the direction of greater privatization may mean any or all of the following:

- Seeking greater autonomy from government, as in getting relief from state budget "line" or "billet" controls and moving toward "lump-sum" budgeting.
- Relying more on revenue from tuition fees (including in the public sector).
- Putting considerable resources and managerial attention to marketing.
- Embracing the concept of "enrollment management," which limits financial assistance, or institutional "price discounts," to those students whom the institution most wants and who also require the least discounts to matriculate.
- Adopting a culture of service to the student as a client.
- Fund raising (to lower dependence on state taxpayers).
- Contracting out auxiliary enterprises (e.g. bookstore and food services) as well as certain administrative functions such as printing and maintenance—or at least putting such services "on their own fiscal bottoms" and making them compete with private providers.
- Trimming departments and other units that seem not to be attracting students or research dollars, or otherwise requiring a justification for them being "carried" by the units that do.

In the U.S., various circumstances, including a prolonged economic downturn decreased public and private financial support for higher education and forced universities and colleges to look for other sources for funding, and have led universities to move forward to a corporate-type

---

69 Johnstone, “Privatization in and of Higher Education.”
70 Ibid.
71 Ibid.
72 Ibid.
practice over the past decades.\textsuperscript{73} James maintains that in the U.S., one of the contributors to university corporatization is the domination of institutional governing boards by successful business leaders who support the application of free-market business practices to public universities and similar-minded presidents and high-ranking officials.\textsuperscript{74} This type of business-oriented leadership, in the eyes of the public, deems that university research is both a potential source of institutional revenue and that university faculty members should compete for external research grants and funds. Moreover, it is encouraged to eliminate academic programs with low enrollments and downsize faculties to focus on developing potentially popular and profitable programs.\textsuperscript{75}

In a number of countries, governments no longer have ownership of public universities nor operate them directly as corporatization has prevailed under this new public management-reform wave. But the form or nature of the corporatization of public universities in some countries like Japan and China is not necessarily identical to that of many other countries due to differences in academic traditions, higher education systems, and socioeconomic backgrounds.\textsuperscript{76} Compared with corporatization in other Western countries, the governments of China and Japan still retain much greater authority over their university corporations. For example, these governments still hold strong leadership or exercise powerful control over individual corporations with regard to approving or terminating a corporate entity.\textsuperscript{77} “Moreover, the current amount of funding allocated

\textsuperscript{75} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid.
by government still constitutes a major part of the total revenue of individual corporations.”

Considering the above situation, corporatization has taken place as part of national political or of administrative reforms which have influenced the practice of governance of public universities in two aspects, i.e. the changing role of government from direct control to supervision at a macro-level and the commission of more autonomous powers to individual institutions. In addition, the governing body (the executive board of institutional leaders such as a president and vice-president) has been greatly reinforced at the institutional level, with a corresponding reduction in the autonomous rights and decision-making powers residing in faculty meetings.

**Background and Rationales: Corporatization of National Universities in Japan**

In Europe and North America, public universities generally have corporate status. In the U.K., the major reforms of the higher education sector took place in the 1980’s under the initiative of Margaret Thatcher, and the new corporations are now called “Independent Administrative Institutions (IAIs).” However, the national universities in Japan were stipulated as being part of the government’s overall organization and did not possess independent corporate status until March, 2004. In order for national universities to respond properly to both accelerated globalization and intellectualization—as well as to the high expectations society has within the competitive environment of higher education in the world today—and the Japanese government granted corporate status to the national universities in 2004 (this corporatization being also a part of many public sector reforms). Hence, these structural reforms, one of which granted national universities a new corporate status, originated both from a need to ease what was perceived to be

---

78 Ibid.
79 Ibid.
severe financial burdens on the government and stemmed from a need to enhance the effectiveness, efficiency, transparency, and accountability of public sector institutions in response to both public demand and pressures from the political arena.

The government first announced its intention to incorporate national universities in 1999, and a special committee within the MEXT, envisioning a future course for national universities, submitted its final report in 2002. The laws for national university corporations were enacted by the Japanese Diet in 2003, and in the same year, each national university was required to submit its mid-term goals and plans\(^8\) to the MEXT, wherein each university outlined its next six years’ activities. The mid-term goals and plans were assessed by the National University Corporation Evaluation Committee and formally approved by the MEXT, and these institutions were then realized as “national university corporations” in April, 2004. Each national university established its independent and autonomous administration at that time. Accordingly, each national university president became the chief executive and wields the strongest powers within each “national university corporation.”

This “corporatization” was expected to mark both the beginning of national university reform and the downsizing of the Japanese government organizational structure as a whole. In order to create a competitive system of higher education, endeavoring for excellence in recreating Japan’s leading universities as world class universities, corporatization was also expected to introduce private sector management practices, one of the three components of the Toyama

---

\(^8\) The mid-term goals and plans of national universities are evaluated and renewed on a six-year cycle under the MEXT’s supervision. It is planned that the National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE) will implement the initial ex-post-facto assessment process in 2009 regarding national universities’ education and research activities for the past six years. The assessment results are expected to alter the current, incrementally based financial allocation mechanism. [Yonezawa, “Japanese Flagship Universities at a Crossroads,” \textit{Higher Education}, 4-5.]
Plan’s Structural Reform Policies for Universities announced in 2002. The other two components of the Toyama Plan were: (1) to reduce the number of national universities through mergers, and (2) to introduce greater competition within the higher education sector through both mandatory third-party evaluation and increasing competitive (performance-based) funds.

Currently, government funding is appropriated to each national university corporation in the form of block grants without earmarks, and therefore internal budgeting for the university corporation is more flexible at the institutional level. However, the government’s operational grants for these university corporations have been reduced by one percent every year from the time of the law’s enactment. Despite severe budget constraints, each corporatized national university is expected to acquire and maintain its own distinctive characteristics of education and research.

According to the outline of the National University Corporation Law, the system of newly corporatized national universities is characterized by the following major components:

- Individual corporate responsibility—a break away from support of the national universities in the style of an “armed convoy”.
- Deregulation of budget and personnel affairs leading to a competitive environment by ensuring university autonomy.
- Production of attractive education and research by the national universities.
- Introduction of management techniques based on private-sector concepts—top down management by a board of directors centered on the president.
- External participation in management of universities—participation of people from outside the university as executives and to approve management plans.

---

83 The reform plan was named after Atsuko Toyama, who was the Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology at the time.
84 The number of national universities decreased from 100 in 2003 to 87 in 2007. Several other merger plans are under negotiation.
85 In 2004, the mandatory third-party evaluation of universities was launched. Now each university must be evaluated by a third-party evaluation agency accredited by the MEXT every seven years. This measure is designed to assure the quality of universities’ teaching and research by the ex-post-facto assessment.
• Improved process for selecting the president—establishment of a Presidential Selection Committee in which external non-university experts participate to identify well-qualified candidates for president from both inside or outside the university.
• Selection of a non civil servant type as the status of personnel—introduction of a diverse and flexible personnel system on the basis of capability and performance.
• Evaluation and disclosure of information—allocation of resources based results of third-party evaluation.\(^{87}\)

From the government’s perspective on the public sector reform, financial savings and autonomous fiscal responsibility are the highly expected benefits of corporatization. Although, national universities account for only 21% of the total students in Japanese universities and colleges, they receive as much as 80% of the overall national budget for higher education.\(^{88}\)

National universities currently have about twice as many faculty and administrative members per student as private universities, and their tuition fees often are about two thirds of the amount private universities charge matriculated students. Atoda estimates that the amount of the savings yielded by corporatization’s national university reforms would be approximately one trillion yen\(^{89}\) a year if both national universities were brought into line with private institution’s staffing level and tuition fees\(^{90}\) were raised to bring them also in line with those of private universities.\(^{91}\) In fact, the corporatization in 2004, by changing the status of the 125,000 civil servants in national universities to public corporation employees, assisted the government in its goal to decrease the number of government employees by about 25% throughout the decade beginning from the mid-

\(^{89}\) 1 trillion yen is about 8.5 billion US dollars (exchange rate: 1 US dollar is 117 yen).
\(^{90}\) The average tuition of humanities and social sciences programs of private universities is as much as 1.5 times as high as national university’ tuition. And the engineering and natural sciences of private ones are as much as 1.7 times as expensive as national institutions.
90’s onward. However, it is still the case that, in general, career-track administrative staff are recruited and assigned to national university corporations by The Japan Association of National Universities (hereafter called “JANU”), being periodically transferred to different national universities just as before. In essence, at the time of the corporatization, responsibilities for the basic personnel management of national universities’ career-track staff were merely transferred to the JANU from the MEXT.

Furthermore, the university reforms based on the Toyama Plan are ideologically colored. According to Royama, market mechanisms and forces are expected to determine the future of both individual institutions and the public sector as a whole. In this sense, the changing demography is accelerating the use of market forces in Japanese higher education, as the general public believes that universities have not been serving either national or individual needs in a broad sense as they should. Moreover, as Hatakenaka points out, “it was only when the economic situation of the nation as a whole had deteriorated sufficiently that the call by politicians to incorporate the national universities became legitimated.” In other words, the market sensitivity of all universities, but in particular national universities, has been inadequate under both the once favorable demographic climate for universities (seller’s market) and the corresponding low expectation of companies towards universities to improve the intellectual ability of their future employees. Thus, both the recent demographic challenge and the longest post-war economic
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93 This organization was established in 1950 that is made up of all the national university presidents.
95 This has been the widespread perception of Japanese universities for a long time both inside and outside the country.
96 Hatakenaka, “The Incorporation of National Universities,” 70.
97 Historically, companies have not been eager for greater vocational preparation in universities and have preferred generalist to specialist knowledge in their graduate recruits, and positive character traits rather than achievements. Those companies rely on their own in-house/on-the-job training programs to develop their human resources.
recession have driven the implementation of current higher education reforms in Japan. Under the Koizumi Cabinet (now continued under the Fukuda Cabinet), the structural reform and privatization agenda for the public sector is expected to significantly decrease bureaucratic red tape, introduce entrepreneurial management, and help ameliorate the dysfunction in the Japanese higher education system.

In line with marketization, corporatization brings a greater emphasis on transparency and accountability to national universities. They are now required not only to submit financial statements, an activities report, and other statistical data to the MEXT, but also to make this information public, so that individual consumers (students, parents, and research and business partners) can make more informed choices about which institutions to enter or work with. Corporatization is intended to transition national universities from their current unhealthy situation—where universities are ranked almost solely on the basis of the difficulty/selectivity of their entrance examinations—to being judged on a wider range of criteria, including employment rates, performance of education and research, as well as the quality of student services. The corporatization of national universities in Japan is a contract-based model and a fundamental change that reformed the whole basis of national university operation and management. Huang argues, “Incorporation in Japan proceeded as a means of avoiding privatization and as an outcome of negotiation between various political elements. The control or supervision of each corporation by government still remains strong, but basically government regulates or influences the operation of each corporation through funding based on evaluation.”

---

99 Huang, “Incorporation and University Governance: A Comparative Perspective from China and Japan,” 14.
100 Ibid.
according to medium-term goals and plans submitted by each national university and approved by the MEXT. At the institutional level, efforts have been made to strengthen the executive power of institutional leadership, to adopt functional top-management based on private sector models, and to place more emphasis on participation by experts and professionals from outside the university corporation.\textsuperscript{101} With great anticipation, the corporatization of national universities will have a powerful impact on other continuing reforms. Although the policy framework of competitive environment and quality and management evaluation have been reasonably established, both corporatization (governance and structural reform) and the overall effectiveness of such reform projects remains to be seen and will clearly depend on the universities’ capacity to plan and practice.\textsuperscript{102}

Lastly, in reference to privatization, the general transition of Japanese national universities before and after the corporatization of 2004 is shown in Table 1, with private universities’ corresponding shifts as a reference. This table was originally created by Johnstone for the purpose of illustrating that privatization can be viewed as a direction along the continuum of several related yet distinct dimensions.\textsuperscript{103}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid.
\item Hatakenaka, “The Incorporation of National Universities,” 55.
\item Johnstone, “Privatization in and of Higher Education.”
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Table 1 Privatization in Higher Education as Direction or Tendency on Multiple Dimensions with Transitions of Japanese Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mission or Purpose</td>
<td>Serves a clear &quot;public&quot; mission as determined by the faculty or the state</td>
<td>Mission is avowedly both public and private, but as defined by faculty</td>
<td>Mission is mainly to respond to student’s private interests, mainly vocational</td>
<td>Mission serves private interests of students, clients, and owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ownership</td>
<td>Publicly owned: can be altered or even closed by state like any other state entity or agency</td>
<td>Public corporation: public with private characteristics or constitutional entity</td>
<td>Private non-profit: clearly private but with public accountability</td>
<td>Private for-profit: owned by individual proprietor, partners, or stockholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Source of Revenue</td>
<td>Dependent on public, or tax, revenue</td>
<td>Mainly public, but some tuition, or &quot;cost sharing&quot;</td>
<td>Dependent on tuition &amp; donations: some public aid: e.g. needy students</td>
<td>Tuition-dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Control by Government</td>
<td>High state control, as in agency or ministry</td>
<td>Subject to controls, but less than other state agencies</td>
<td>High degree of autonomy; control limited to oversight</td>
<td>Controls limited to those over any other businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Norms of Management</td>
<td>Academic norms; shared governance, antiauthoritarianism</td>
<td>Academic norms, but acceptance of need for effective management</td>
<td>Limited homage to academic norms; high management control</td>
<td>Operated like a business; norms from management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions of Japanese Universities</td>
<td>Old national universities (before corporatization)</td>
<td>Newly corporatized national universities</td>
<td>Current private universities</td>
<td>Establishments of private universities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The transitions of Japanese Universities are added by the author.

In the above table, in Japan, national universities have moved from A to B since their corporatization in 2004, and private universities have gradually shifted from D to C along with their historical development. Thus, the differences between Japanese national and private universities have been reduced in this sense. Johnstone mentions, “The only nearly unambiguous distinction between a public and a private (non-profit) college or university lies in the criteria of ownership.”\(^{104}\) The legal concept of a public corporation, which is a newly corporatized national university in the case of Japan, introduces shades of gray.\(^{105}\)

\(^{104}\) Ibid.
\(^{105}\) Ibid.
Diversification and Differentiation of New National Universities through Corporatization

Before corporatization, the Japanese government used to treat national universities equally (at least officially), while implicitly striving to protect top research institutions—including seven former imperial universities—against the massification of higher education. Yonezawa maintains that in postwar years, formal classification and differentiation of national universities had been somewhat of a taboo until almost the end of the 20th century.\textsuperscript{106} A fundamental area of concern involved the budgeting patterns within the national university system, based on incrementalism without necessary assessment of university performance. The Japanese government had, and still has at a certain level, a tendency to allocate budgets in accordance with the hierarchal order based on the conventional reputation and prestige of national universities.\textsuperscript{107}

However, both intensifying competition among leading research-oriented universities in the world and increasing pressure to meet the needs of the knowledge-based global economy have compelled Japanese higher education policies and measures to become more strategic.\textsuperscript{108} At the same time, flagship university policies in East Asian countries, especially China\textsuperscript{109} and South Korea,\textsuperscript{110} are now having a significant impact on Japanese higher education policies.\textsuperscript{111} The Japanese government is now taking a definite role in promoting a limited number of world-class universities by concentrating financial allocations (increasing application-based competitive funding programs\textsuperscript{112}) so that they are in line with the national universities’ corporatization efforts.

\textsuperscript{106} Yonezawa, “Japanese Flagship Universities at a Crossroads,” 8
\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., 5.
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid., 8.
\textsuperscript{109} It is referred to a series of major policies such as the Education Act of 1995, Higher Education Act of 1998, 211 Project in 1994, and 985 Project in 1998.
\textsuperscript{110} Brain Korea 21 in 1999 and Study Korea Project in 2004 are referred to South Korea’s flagship university policy.
\textsuperscript{111} Ki-Seok Kim and Sunghee Nam, “The Making of a World-Class University at the Periphery,” 122.
\textsuperscript{112} The ratio of competitive funds increased to 38.3% in 2007 from 24.8% in 2001 regarding the government financial support for higher education. [MEXT, Japan’s Education at a Glance 2006 (Tokyo: MEXT, 2007), 84.]
This type of fiscal control of the higher education system is gaining increasing acceptance, and a small number of leading national universities are now taking the lion’s share of public resources, while it is inevitably weakening the management base of small and medium-sized national universities in the provinces.\footnote{Yonezawa, “Japanese Flagship Universities at a Crossroads,” 8.} Individual institutions are also attempting to strengthen their own management abilities, establish their own university foundations, raise external funds, and formulate strategies for transnational competition among world-class research universities.\footnote{Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, “New Program to Support University Internationalization,” \textit{JSPS Quarterly} 13 (2005): 3-4.} Top private universities, such as Waseda University and Keio University, are also developing their visions, goals, and strategies from an international perspective.\footnote{Yonezawa, “Japanese Flagship Universities at a Crossroads,” 8.} Considering the country’s low birthrate, the market involved with the enrollment of high-caliber students, especially international students, has priority and serves to maintain a competitive environment among the top national and private research-oriented universities.\footnote{Ibid., 5.} Therefore, “the changing global and regional higher education market is now having a significant influence on the international strategies of Japanese flagship universities” as Yonezawa mentions.\footnote{Ibid., 10.}

With regards to institutional management and administration, corporatization has increased the autonomy of Japanese national universities and has led to the diversification and differentiation of the universities under the pressure of global competition as well as changes in the government’s financial support of the universities. Although the government policy is to officially support high-performing universities regardless of whether they are public or private, in reality, public funding for prestigious national institutions far exceeds the funding for private
universities and provincial national universities. And while these funding incongruencies are addressed with the corporatization of national universities, it can be said that “global competition is placing the top private universities under greater pressure than their rivals in the national sector.” Overall, the creation of these newly corporatized, Japanese flagship universities, which mainly consist of leading research-oriented national universities, has made significant progress as part of higher education reform. Furthermore, these emerging flagship universities are engaging the international market of higher education with their newly developed international strategies and with affluent resources.

118 Ibid.
119 Ibid., 15.
Chapter III

Japanese Higher Education System and its Pursued Internationalization

This chapter provides the reviews of the Japanese higher education system and its pursued internationalization in the following sections: (1) a brief description of the Japanese higher education system, (2) the historical development of international student policy in Japan, (3) basic facts about international students in Japan, (4) Japan’s approach and rationales for admitting international students, and (5) the marketability and competitiveness of Japanese universities during the age of globalization.

Brief Description of Japanese Higher Education System

The Japanese higher education system is characterized by its dual structure that includes a limited public sector controlled by national and local governments and a very large market-driven private sector. In 2007, there were 756 universities in total including the three types of university-level institutions: 87 national universities (11.5%), 89 municipal public universities (11.8%) run by local or regional governments, and 580 private universities (76.7%).\textsuperscript{120} In addition, there were 434 junior colleges (of which most were private) and 64 technical colleges (of which most were national).\textsuperscript{121} According to the MEXT statistics, in 2007 Japan’s higher education system had an enrollment of over 3 million students including 2.8 million students in universities, 186,664 in junior colleges, and 57,985 students in technical colleges.\textsuperscript{122} It means that 49.4 % of the newly graduated high school cohort entered the above universities or colleges in 2006. And this figure

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., 4.
rises to over 70% when including vocational programs (non-university post-secondary education).\textsuperscript{123}

According to a survey by the OECD, Japan’s public and private funding of higher education institutions accounted for 1.3% of its GDP, compared with 2.9% in the U.S., 1.3% in France, and 1.1% in both Germany and the U.K. in 2004.\textsuperscript{124} At the higher education level, “a below-average increase in spending per student in Japan (25%) can possibly be explained by an even lower increase in student enrollment (24%), such that spending per student increased by 1% only between 1995 and 2003. This result is below the 9% increase of spending per student on average among OECD countries over the same period.”\textsuperscript{125}

In the Japanese higher education system, national universities not only have played a central role toward advancing the standards of academic research in training graduate students but also have contributed to the manpower supply on the nationwide scale by their geographical allocation.\textsuperscript{126} National universities have undergone a dramatic change since they were granted independent corporation status in 2004. While they are still part of the public sector, they are to be independently managed by their non-civil servant staff. These national universities are also able to set their own tuition fee levels, but may not exceed 110 percent of the standard tuition fee set by the MEXT and the Ministry of Finance. The standard tuition fee is currently 535,800 yen (US$4,059 using the 2007 PPP\textsuperscript{127} conversion), and almost all the corporatized national universities raised their tuition fees to the above standard in 2005.

\textsuperscript{123} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{126} Each prefecture has at least one national university and this system was developed under the recommendation of the U.S. occupational government for the educational reform, “equality of opportunity,” in the post-war years.
\textsuperscript{127} PPP means purchasing power parity.
Private institutions are, in principle, self-financed by tuition fees, application (entrance-exam) and admission fees, and donations and income from auxiliary services. However, subsidies are granted by the national government through the Promotion and Mutual Aid Corporation for Private Schools of Japan with respect to current expenditure. These subsidies are mainly to maintain and improve educational and research conditions of private universities and ease the financial burden of their students. The Corporation also provides long-term low interest loans for funds necessary to improve the facilities and equipment in private higher education institutions.

**Development of International Student Policy in Japan**

Since the first two international students from Korea came to Tokyo in 1881, Japan has played an important role in the intellectual trade throughout Asia. In 1906, Japan already had more than 10,000 international students from its neighboring countries. Japan has been Asia’s prime location of import for Western knowledge, science, and technology; modifying Western knowledge for Asian use, and then exporting its expertise to other Asian countries through international students who have studied in Japan. Because of Japan’s geographically proximity to mainland Asia, its linguistically similar culture, and its highly industrialized society, many East Asian students have recently selected Japan as both their study abroad destination and their steppingstone towards the attainment of Western knowledge as efficiently and culturally modified to structure, scale, and use by the Japanese. Furthermore, due to both Japan’s former colonization of the East Asian region, its advanced science and technology, and its economic

---

129 Ibid.  
130 Ibid.
success, Japanese academic prestige and granted degrees are generally higher\textsuperscript{131} than their Asian counterparts.\textsuperscript{132}

**Figure 1 Number of International Students in Japan**

![Graph showing the number of international students in Japan from 1984 to 2007.](image)

**Table 2 Number of International Students in Japan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>10,428</td>
<td>12,410</td>
<td>15,009</td>
<td>18,631</td>
<td>22,154</td>
<td>25,643</td>
<td>31,251</td>
<td>41,347</td>
<td>45,066</td>
<td>48,561</td>
<td>52,405</td>
<td>53,787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53,847</td>
<td>52,921</td>
<td>51,047</td>
<td>51,298</td>
<td>55,755</td>
<td>64,011</td>
<td>78,812</td>
<td>95,550</td>
<td>109,508</td>
<td>117,302</td>
<td>121,812</td>
<td>117,927</td>
<td>118,498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the early 1980’s, although Japan had already became one of the world’s leading economic nations, the number of international students in Japan, as a percentage of its total enrollment, was low compared with other industrialized countries, especially the U.S., France,

\textsuperscript{131} According to the World University Rankings 2007 compiled by The Times Higher Education Supplement, 11 Japanese universities ranked in the top 200, compared to the ranked numbers of six Chinese universities, two South Korean universities, and two Singaporean universities \cite{oro}. \textsuperscript{132} Hiroshi Ota, "The International Student 100,000 Plan (Policy Studies)," *Center for Student Exchange Journal* 6 (2003): 32.
Germany, and the U.K.\textsuperscript{133} In economic terms, Japan was recognized as superior and admired by developing countries as the only highly industrialized country that was not in the West, but Japanese universities were still not as highly regarded as other industrialized countries’ universities. Despite Japan’s economic success and geographical proximity to other Asian nations, Japanese leaders thought that this relatively lower-prestige value of Japanese higher education was the major reason why Japan was not one of the most preferable destinations for prospective international students in developing nations. Subsequently, the initiative of then Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone, as well as the existing inferiority complex among Japanese political and business leaders towards the West, became supports for the development of the 100,000 International Student Plan.

The Council for Foreign Student Policy, which was established by Prime Minister Nakasone, wrote up the “Recommendations for Foreign Student Policy for the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century” (hereafter called “the Recommendations”) in August 1983. The Recommendations state the fundamental importance of Japan enhancing its mutual understanding with other countries through international exchange as well as the promotion of activities and friendly relations built upon mutual trust with other countries.\textsuperscript{134} On the basis of this statement, the Recommendations describe the purpose of international educational exchange as having incoming international students attain a better understanding and a wider range of knowledge about Japanese society and culture.\textsuperscript{135} In other words, educating international students in Japanese institutions primarily benefits the national interest, and from the purview of the country’s development model known as “catch-up with the

\textsuperscript{133} In 1983, the numbers of international students were approximately 310,000 in the U.S., 120,000 in France, 60,000 in Germany, 50,000 in the U.K., and 10,000 in Japan [Council for Foreign Student Policy, \textit{Recommendations for Foreign Student Policy for the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century} (Tokyo: Ministry of Education, 1983), 5.]

\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., 2.

\textsuperscript{135} Ibid.
West,” this was the turning point for both Japan’s diplomatic and international education policies shifting to “play a leading role in Asia.” The government realized that a great number of young Japanese people had studied in Europe or the U.S., and that Western knowledge, science, and technology were being imported through those students. In general, these Japanese returnees were favorably disposed towards the countries that had hosted them, while on the other hand, Japan itself had not endeavored to promote other countries’ understanding of its own country by increasing the number of incoming international students within its system of higher education. Thus, having a small number of international students was further recognized as being disadvantageous to Japan’s national security. Conclusively, the Recommendations proposed that 100,000 international students should be studying at Japanese higher education institutions by the beginning of the 21st century. In short, the objectives of the Nakasone Plan were to increase Japan’s influence and status in the international community, make an international contribution and cooperative effort to fulfill a role befitting Japan’s position within the international community, and aim at being not only a leading economic nation but also a cultured/intellectual nation. In 1984, the MEXT released the “Development of Foreign Student Policy for the 21st Century” (hereafter called “the Development”) that aimed at putting the aforementioned Recommendations into action. The Development emphasizes international students’ contributions to the improvement of Japanese higher education, whereby increasing numbers of incoming international students is expected to both enhance internationalization of higher education and uphold the academic prestige of Japanese universities and intelligentsia. In accordance with the

136 Ibid.
137 Ota, "The International Student 100,000 Plan (Policy Studies)," 34.
Development, the following measures were carried out to deal with mainly the language and financial difficulties of international students studying in Japan:

- Expanding the Japanese Government Scholarship
- Providing yen loans to other Asian countries so that their governments can increase the number of their government scholarships to study in Japan
- Assisting in building university residences for foreign students
- Reinforcing Japanese language courses for foreign students and the system of Japanese language teachers’ training
- Initiating several financial assistance programs for privately financed foreign students, for instance, the Tuition Reduction and Exemption Program for Privately Financed Foreign Students
- Establishing foreign student centers, which includes the function of teaching Japanese language to foreign students at national universities
- Permitting a foreign student with a “college student visa” to work off-campus for up to four hours a day at a maximum of 28 hours a week\(^{139}\)

Since the 100,000 International Student Plan was implemented in 1983, the number of international students in Japan had increased steadily until the middle of the 1990’s, and the rate of increase was considerably higher than the government’s expectation. In the first decade of the Nakasone Plan, the “push factor” for students from rapidly industrializing Southeast and East Asian countries was the expectation that human resource demands would be partially made up by students returning from Japan. The “pull factors” for students were both Japan’s booming economy and the government’s initiatives and measures as initiated by the Nakasone Plan.\(^{140}\)

These strong economic push and pull factors explain the rapid increase of international students during the first decade of the Nakasone Plan. Shibazaki accounts for this rapid growth of international students by suggesting that the more a country’s economic power grows, the more transmitted information and knowledge from that country attracts aspiring people from outside.\(^{141}\)

\(^{139}\) Ibid., 20.
\(^{140}\) Seo K. S., *International Education in Japanese Elementary and Middle School in Japan—Based on My Own Experience with Japanese Students* (Tsukuba: Tsukuba University, 1997), 10.
However, arguably, the academic “pull factors”, such as the attractiveness of Japanese universities and their educational and research programs, did not directly lead to the raise in the number of international students.\textsuperscript{142} Additionally, the enormous imbalance between Asian countries and other nations in terms of the distribution of international students’ countries of origin\textsuperscript{143} raised both diplomatic and budgetary problems in view of the fair distribution of the Japan Official Development Assistance.\textsuperscript{144}

Along with the collapsing of Japan’s “bubble economy” in the early 1990’s, the nation’s subsequent economic stagnation, and the Asian financial crisis beginning in 1997, the growth rate of international students declined proportionally in Japan from 1994 to 1998 (absolute decreases in both 1996 and 1997). In order to cope with this stagnation of the international student influx to Japan, the MEXT established the Advisory Committee on Promotion of Short-Term\textsuperscript{145} Student Exchange Programs in 1995. Subsequently, the Committee submitted the proposal for “Promotion of Short-Term Student Exchanges” (hereafter called “the Promotion”) to the Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. The summary of the Promotion’s recommendations is as follows:

- Accepting not only degree-seeking students but also non-degree and short-term (from one semester to one academic year) students through student exchange programs or junior year-abroad programs
- Developing financial assistance for incoming as well as outgoing international students to promote student exchange programs with partner universities abroad
- Diversifying international students’ countries of origin
- Developing academic programs and courses taught in English (lowering the requirement of Japanese language proficiency or not requiring Japanese language proficiency towards non-degree and short-term international students)

\textsuperscript{142} Ota, "The International Student 100,000 Plan (Policy Studies)," 38.
\textsuperscript{143} In 1991, 92 percent of international students were from Asian countries.
\textsuperscript{144} The MEXT’s budget concerned with incoming international students heavily relied on the funds come from the Japan Official Development Assistance at that time.
\textsuperscript{145} The short-term means a period of from one semester to one academic year.
• Expanding the concept of hosting international students (“Studying in Japan” means not only the opportunity of “studying Japanese studies in Japan” but also of “studying specialized disciplines/areas (major academic fields) in Japan”)

The MEXT’s initiative of promoting short-term exchange programs in the mid-1990’s was an attempt to lead Japanese universities to catch up with bilateral or multilateral student exchange/mobility programs widely practiced in North America and Europe. Ninomiya writes, “Japanese institutions of higher education have traditionally hosted students from developing countries as a part of overseas assistance program. But the focus must change to student exchange programs.” Industrialized countries have long realized that students need to go abroad and learn different cultures and languages in order to live in the global age, and in this sense, short-term study abroad programs are effective and meaningful schemes in order to encourage students to study abroad and acquire cross-cultural competency. Thus, it was time for Japanese universities to develop short-term exchange programs to attract prospective international students wishing to study in Japan for a period of one semester or one academic year, and these Japanese universities were in turn expected to both increase their numbers of international students and diversify these students’ countries of origin. The Promotion was aimed especially at national and local municipal universities, where short-term student exchange and junior year-abroad programs were traditionally not as common as compared with leading private universities. These private universities had already developed such programs and diversified/internationalized student bodies, especially with students from Western countries. This in turn, attracted more domestic students

146 Advisory Committee on Promotion of Short-Term Student Exchange Programs, Promotion of Short-Term Student Exchanges (Tokyo: Ministry of Education, 1995), 25.
147 The expansion of study abroad programs (semester abroad and summer abroad) in the U.S. and the success of the ERASMUS Plan (the mobility of university students in EU) in Europe can be given as examples.
149 Ibid.
(increasing the domestic marketability). Consequently, among major national universities, establishing courses and programs taught in English were on the rise to meet the demand of international students especially from Western countries through the MEXT’s short-term student exchange promotion programs. This movement led national universities to recruit international students, in academic fields other than Japanese studies, who might not possess enough Japanese language proficiency so as to study their academic fields in Japanese.

In spite of the MEXT’s promotion of short-term exchange programs, the international student inflow to Japan did not quickly rebound. To the contrary, for the first time since the MEXT officially began compiling annual statistical data for such students in 1978, the country encountered absolute decreases in the number of international students in 1996 and 1997. Subsequently, as a countermeasure, the MEXT started to examine the recruiting activities and admission procedures of Japanese universities for prospective international students. The Investigative Research Committee on International Student Issues was formed within the MEXT and released “Measures to Improve Admission Procedure for Prospective International Students” in 1997. This report recommends the following directives:

- To recruit not only international students currently studying at domestic Japanese language schools but also prospective students living in their home countries (direct recruitment and pre-arrival admission)
- To establish a new Japanese language proficiency test tailored to prospective international students of Japanese universities (Japanese language version of TOEFL)
- To promote actively “study in Japan” and Japanese higher education to the world
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150 Ota, "The International Student 100,000 Plan (Policy Studies)," 41.
151 NUPACE (Nagoya University Program for Academic Exchange), ISEP-TUFS (International Student Exchange Program at Tokyo University of Foreign Studies), and JTW-KU (Japan in Today’s World at Kyushu University) are typical examples of those English based short-term programs at national universities. In 2007, 30 national universities (36.1%) had these kinds of programs.
152 Ninomiya, “Japan’s Goal for Foreign Students and the New Short-Term Students’ Exchange Program,” 31.
In terms of degree-seeking international students, Japanese universities have traditionally recruited prospective students who are currently studying at domestic Japanese language schools due to a lack of Japanese language preparatory programs within these universities. The vast majority of Japanese language schools are private, proprietary, and for-profit corporations. Unlike private universities, these language schools are not eligible for receiving financial assistance from the government, and their educational environments are generally not so favorable. Nonetheless, in fact, these schools have often filled the needs of newly-arrived international students wishing to proceed to degree-granting programs at Japanese higher education institutions by providing Japanese language training and study skills. Because of private language schools’ high tuition and lack of support for their students, including financial aid, most language school students (prospective international students of universities) are in an unstable financial situation and unsure whether or not they will be able to continue their study at the university level.

The development of a Japanese language proficiency test, tailored to both prospective international students and host institutions, had been one of the longer-term issues in international education in Japan until the Examination for Japanese University Admission for International Students (hereafter called “EJU”) was introduced in 2002. Before the EJU, almost all the universities had had no alternative but to use a government-sponsored test called the Japanese Language Proficiency Test (hereafter called “JLPT”) as an application requirement for prospective international students. However, the JLPT is not a test targeted specifically at academic Japanese
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154 In 2007, only 70 out of 756 Japanese universities had affiliated Japanese language institutes for international students who do not possess sufficient proficiency in Japanese but wish to be accepted by degree granting programs.
155 EJU is a testing program used to evaluate whether international student applicants who wish to study at universities or other kinds of higher educational institutions in Japan possess the Japanese language skills and the basic academic abilities needed to study at those institutions. The EJU test is held at 16 cities in 13 countries outside Japan, as well as at 20 test centers in 15 cities inside Japan. It is administered by JASSO.
language learners wishing to study at universities; rather it assesses the proficiency of general Japanese language learners. Since the EJU’s introduction, it has become a required, standardized test for prospective international students who wish to apply for admission to most Japanese universities.

The lack of information concerning Japanese higher education and “study in Japan” for prospective international students residing abroad has been an age-old problem. Except for a few innovative private universities, Japanese universities in general, especially national universities, do not actively promote themselves to the world. Also, the Japanese government lags behind other major host countries in the promotion and marketing of higher education abroad and advising prospective international students in their home countries. For instance, Japan has only four overseas advising and information centers that promote its higher education, whereas the U.K. has 229 branches of the British Council, France has 80 offices of the Campus France, and the U.S. has a network of nearly 500 centers of the Education USA program around the world.156 Thus, unlike their U.S., U.K., and Australian counterparts, Japanese higher education neither provides a worldwide public relations network nor a user-friendly roadmap for aspiring young people which comfortably guides them towards “study in Japan” from abroad.

In 1999, the Commission on Foreign Student Policy released a report entitled “Aiming at Development of Intellectual Contribution to International Community and Progress of New International Student Policy” (hereafter called “the Aiming”). The Aiming stressed that the MEXT should maintain the 100,000 International Student Plan, especially its numerical target, despite a

prevailing pessimistic view due to only 55,000 international students studying in Japan in 1999.\textsuperscript{157}

Also, the Aiming argued that the MEXT and Japanese universities should continue to strive to achieve the Nakasone Plan for Japan’s new paradigm of international education for the 21st century, coined “International Intellectual Contribution.”\textsuperscript{158} Considering the context of advancing globalization, this idealized concept was developed from the country’s original rationale of mutual understanding and aid-approach for increasing international students at the beginning of the Nakasone plan.\textsuperscript{159} This conceptual development reflected the Japanese government’s view of the global society at that time. The Aiming states:

> We live in the global community that has complicated relationships of interdependence among countries. Our stability and prosperity is not ensured unless a peaceful, stable, and prosperous international community is realized. It is because Japan heavily depends on both overseas markets and foreign sources.\textsuperscript{160}

Promoting the increase of international students has been largely advocated as Japan’s “International Intellectual Contribution” since the Aiming was published, and this contribution is expected to enhance not only Japan’s national interests but also its mutually beneficial relationships with other countries. Moreover, the Aiming emphasizes the importance of improving university education in the context of “International Intellectual Contribution.” The key issues in the Aiming are:

- Security and peace: Further development of mutual understanding and friendly relations between Japan and foreign countries
- International intellectual influence: Securing the initiative of forming global standards and intellectual networks and leading Japanese higher education to “Centers of Learning”

\textsuperscript{158} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{159} Ota, "The International Student 100,000 Plan (Policy Studies)," 44.
\textsuperscript{160} Commission on International Student Policy, 2.
• Globalization: Reforming social and economic structure and improving and enriching higher education on an open-door basis\textsuperscript{161}

Additionally, considering the hosting of international students as an opportunity to uplift the quality of Japanese universities, the following recommendations are presented in the Aiming:

• Reforming higher education’s structure in order to improve the quality of education and research conducted in universities through the hosting of international students
• Developing educational programs that are more open to the world in order to attract prospective international students
• Assisting the life of international students with various schemes sponsored by the collaboration between the government and private sector\textsuperscript{162}

In the Aiming, the rationales, concepts, and prospects of hosting international students were described more comprehensively and elaborately than ever before, yet, almost all the Aiming’s detailed recommendations were rehashed from previous reports. Although the problems involved in hosting international students were clear, they had not been actively resolved. The Nakasone Plan turned out to be one of the most important and challenging national policies within the scope of higher education. Accordingly, the MEXT’s budget for incoming international students rose nearly seven times\textsuperscript{163} in the years from 1983 to 1997, coupled with an increase of Japan Official Development Assistance. Hence, absolute decreases in the number of international students in 1996 and 1997 affected Japan’s academic prestige and national pride.

After the stagnation of student inflow from outside Japan during the mid-1990’s, the number of international students suddenly doubled in the following five years from 1999 to 2004. The numerical goal of the Nakasone Plan was finally achieved in 2003, and the number of international students in Japan reached nearly 110,000. The key “push factor” during this period of increased

\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., 3.  
\textsuperscript{162} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{163} The budget was about 8 billion yen in 1983 and increased to 55.6 billion yen in 1997 [Manabu Horie, “The impact of the 100,000 International Student Plan,” Join 31 (1999): 17.].
international student enrollment was China’s excessive demand-over-supply in higher education, a corollary to both the country’s significant economic growth and open-door policy. The major “pull factors” were not only Japan’s excessive supply-over-demand in higher education due to the increased number of universities\(^\text{164}\) (despite a drastic decline in the college-age population in the country) but also the Immigration Bureau’s simplification of visa processing and regulation in 2000 partly based on neighboring countries’ requests.\(^\text{165}\) Before this change, the Immigration Bureau screened student-visa applicants’ financial capabilities and academic backgrounds. However, under the new, simplified regulations, universities, not the Immigration Bureau, became responsible for checking the financial capabilities and academic backgrounds of students as a part of their admissions procedures. In other words, the Immigration Bureau both simultaneously entrusted and transferred some of its duties to higher education institutions through a streamlining of the visa process. Keeping in mind both the aforementioned drastic decline of the college-aged population and the augmented number of universities in Japan during this period, “pull factors” in Japan increased demonstrably as lower-tier, private institutions of higher education sought greater tuition revenues through increased international enrollment. Needing only a letter of admission from a university, most of which simply assumed an international student’s sound financial capability and qualifying academic ability to be in order according to already relaxed institutional admission standards, the Bureau started issuing certificates of eligibility to visa applicants. In reality, those private schools that desperately needed international students to maintain their student intake quotas purposely relaxed admission standards, especially concerning financial

\(^{164}\) The number of universities, especially private ones, increased by 233 (44.6\%) from 523 in 1992 to 756 in 2007 including institutions that were upgraded from junior colleges (two-year programs) to universities (four-year programs) because the MEXT relaxed university chartering criteria in 1991.

ability, and issued as many admission letters as they could to international students, including to applicants who were neither financially nor academically qualified to be admitted. These universities, which often collaborate with study abroad/recruiting agents in China for their recruitment activities and goals, have heavily relied on the tuition fees paid by privately-financed international (Chinese) students. Additionally, they have counted on government subsidies for private institutions concerning the acceptance of international students.\footnote{Private institutions receive government subsidies through The Promotion and Mutual Aid Corporation for Private Schools of Japan in accordance with its criteria, for instance, the number of international students and assistance programs for international students.} At the same time, quite a few graduate schools, especially those in the humanities and social sciences of national universities in provincial areas, also have had difficulties in recruiting enough Japanese students and have therefore accepted a large number of international students in order to maintain their academic programs.

Under these circumstances, the country-wise distribution of international students became heavily concentrated on neighboring Asian countries, making up around 92.4% of the total.\footnote{Bureau of Policy and External Relations, Japan Student Services Organization, \textit{Summary Report of Accepting International Students 2007} (Tokyo: MEXT, 2007), 3.} In 2007, three major sending countries, China (60.2%), Korea (14.6%), and Taiwan (4.0%), comprised 78.8% of the international students in Japan.\footnote{Ibid., 4.} As a result, a typical international student in Japan can be described as a privately-financed Chinese student who enrolls in an undergraduate program, majors in the humanities/social sciences, and engages in off-campus part-time employment\footnote{This kind of typical international student is often called as \textit{Chu-Bun-Gaku-Shi}, an abbreviation for the words of “Chinese,” “humanities/social sciences,” “undergraduate,” and “privately-financed.”} to supplement his/her means to pay tuition and living expenses.\footnote{Toyosaka Morizumi, \textit{Basic Direction for New International Student Policy Considering its Related Issues}, (paper presented at the Symposium on Strategies for International Student Exchange in the 21st Century, Tokyo, December 6, 2003). 1.}
International students who dropped out of school and became undocumented immigrants increased as the number of international students doubled in the five years from 1999 to 2004. These overstaying foreigners turned out to be a serious object of public concern\(^{171}\) when the culprits of some shocking murders and robberies were found to be dismissed international students from China in 2003. Shortly after the target of the 100,000 International Student Plan was met, in the beginning of 2004, the Immigration Bureau considerably tightened its visa requirements for international students in light of the rise in crimes allegedly committed by international students and former international students who overstay their visas.\(^{172}\)

In December 2003, the Foreign Student Section of the Central Council for Education released a policy paper “Development of New Policies for International Student Exchanges” in response to both a growing concern over the decreasing quality of international students and universities’ inappropriate support responses to students’ needs in the wake of this rapid growth in the overall number of international students attending Japanese universities. This policy paper presents the MEXT’s initiative for hosting international students in the era of the post 100,000 International Student Plan. It calls for: (1) an improvement in the international student support system both at the institutional level and the government level, including the establishment of the Japan Student Services Organization (an incorporated governmental agency); (2) efforts to recruit

---

\(^{171}\) In 2003, 28% of the foreign suspects of penal code violations were pre-college student visa holders (students studying at Japanese language schools) or college student visa holders. The crime rate for pre-college visa holders was 2.6% of 47,198 and the same rate of the college visa holders was 1.1% of 110,415. These rates were considerably higher than other visa holders.

\(^{172}\) In January 2004, the Immigration Bureau granted 10,657 certificates of eligibility for pre-college or student visa applicants who hoped to study at language schools or universities starting in April of that year. That was 46% down from the 19,777 certificates granted in the same month of the previous year. Among those visa applicants in January 2004, 16,188 were Chinese accounting for about 70% of the total. Only 4,302 of them were successful in their application—less than one-third of 13,964 Chinese who obtained the certificates a year ago (The percentage of Chinese who successfully received the certificates dropped to 27% from 74% in January 2003). [“Student Visas Drop by 50%,” The Daily Yomiuri, February 3 (2004), 3.]
international students of high potential; (3) a reinforcement of information and consultation services for the promotion of “study in Japan” in foreign countries; (4) advancement of proactive international student exchange at each institution based on its own mission and strategy; and (5) an appropriate management strategy for international student enrollment. In addition, the policy paper mentions a new quantitative goal of adding 30,000 international students by 2008 while qualitative objectives are mainly concerned (shifting to “quality” from “quantity”).

From a global perspective, although the overall number of international students has risen in Japan over the years concurrent with globalization and its attendant development of technology, Japan’s status as the intellectual trading center in Asia has gradually fallen, with the gap between international academic standards and Japanese academic standards growing larger. In terms of engagement in scientific research and technological development, it seems that Japanese academics do not feel fully confident despite their country’s important economic role in the world. In an increasingly global context, higher education is expected to play an international role more than ever. Additionally, in many countries—especially in China, Korea, and Taiwan—the domestic opportunities for higher education have been rapidly improving and expanding, especially at the undergraduate level. Japanese universities can no longer expect a huge increase of both highly qualified and bachelor-degree-seeking international students from those countries. Also, English speaking countries in Asia and the Pacific, e.g. Australia, New Zealand, and Singapore, have become more active players in the international student market with the powerful

174 Ibid., 1-2.
support of their respective governments.

It would seem that universities’ intentions and behaviors of hosting international students have been diverging in two directions in Japan. On one hand, prestigious universities recruit international students in order to internationalize their research and education and strengthen the international dimension and competitiveness of their institutions. These universities attempt to recruit highly qualified international students through their networks, for instance, their alumni associations’ chapters, branch offices, and partner universities abroad. Their financial capacity allows them to establish advanced programs entirely conducted in English and offer their own scholarships and other assistance services to attract bright and talented students. On the other hand, less prestigious universities, often less notably concerned about the quality of international students, regard international students more as a means to supplement demographically-threatened enrollment quotas, maintain their programs, and ultimately secure revenues through larger tuition payments while recovering cost expenditures.

**Basic Facts of International Students in Japan (as of 2007)**

- The total number of international students enrolled in Japanese higher education institutions was 118,498 (not including 30,607 international students enrolled in Japanese language schools [see below]). This international student population increased by only 0.5% (+571) compared to the previous year, when it had experienced the first absolute decrease (-3,885) since 1997.

- International students comprised 3.2% of Japan’s total tertiary student population, increasing by a mere 0.2% compared to 2003 (3.0%).

- The percentage of Japanese government scholarship grantees was 8.4%. This percentage decreased from its peak (16.2%) in 1998.

- Leading countries of origin and their percentages were China (60.2%), South Korea (14.6%), and Taiwan (4.0%). Each of these top three countries’ international student shares in Japan had been almost the same from 2003 (China, 61.3%; South Korea, 16.6%; Taiwan, 4.5%) to 2007.
Popular fields of study and their percentages were as follows: social sciences, 40.2%; humanities, 23.4%; engineering, 15.2%. These percentages had not been changed much, save some increase in the popularity of social sciences, from 2003 (social sciences, 33.1%; humanities, 24.6%; engineering, 13.2%) to 2007.

Graduate students accounted for 26.7% and undergraduate level students were 73.3% of the total international students in Japan. Compared to 1999 statistics (graduate students, 39.9%; undergraduate students, 60.1%), the ratio of graduate students decreased by 13.2%.

25.1% of international students were enrolled in national universities; 72.7% were enrolled in private universities, and 2.2% were enrolled in local municipal universities respectively. Compared to international student enrollment in 2000 (national universities, 37.3%; private universities, 59.4%), national universities’ share of international students decreased by 12.2%, but private universities’ share of international students increased by 13.3%.

61.8% of international graduate students were enrolled in national universities, whereas 88.2% of international undergraduate students were enrolled in private universities. The national universities’ share of international graduate students decreased by 10.3%, however the private universities’ share of international undergraduate students increased by 8.1%, compared to 2000 statistics (national universities’ percentage of international graduate students, 72.1%; private universities’ percentage of international undergraduate students, 80.1%)

Half (50.7%) of the international students were concentrated in the Kanto region (Tokyo and its adjacent areas), unchanged since 1999.

50.9% of international students were male and 49.1% were female. The percentage of female students showed a little increase compared to 2000 (45.7%).

Leading host institutions were Waseda University, private (2,435); and Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University, private (2,352); University of Tokyo, national (2,297);. Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University was established in 2000 and has been actively recruiting international students since then.

77.1% of international students maintained residences in private apartments and 22.9% in dormitories provided either by universities or by public sector/non-profit organizations.\(^{176}\) The percentage of private apartments increased by 9.3% compared to 2000 (67.8%).

---

\(^{176}\) Bureau of Policy and External Relations, Japan Student Services Organization, 1-11.
34.8% of international students who completed undergraduate programs, 33.4% of master’s program graduates, and 31.6% of doctoral program graduates found employment in Japan. 31.0% of those students who completed undergraduate programs continued onto master’s programs in the country, and 28.7% of those students who completed master’s programs went on to doctoral programs at Japanese universities respectively.

The number of international students enrolled in Japanese language schools was 30,607 (not included in the above total number of international students enrolled in tertiary education institutions). 67.1% of the Japanese language school graduates continued onto Japanese institutions of higher education.

Japan’s Approach and Rationales for Admitting International Students

In general, most universities are no longer places to teach and do research in a methodical manner while contemplating the universe. “It [Higher education] is a big, complex, demanding, competitive business requiring large scale ongoing investment.” As a crucial part of their revenue-generating activities, universities of English speaking countries (i.e. U.K., U.S., Canada, and Australia) have become much more business-oriented through the promotion of their international education programs to the world (exporting education). And higher education is even now included as part of the WTO agenda. Yet in spite of their corporatization in April 2004, however, Japanese national universities, at least, have not viewed education in business and income-generating terms. On the other hand, because of a sharp decline in the college-age population, Japanese private universities that are facing financial and enrollment difficulties tend

---

177 These two ratios (31.0% and 28.7%) were much higher than Japanese students who went on to master’s programs (12.0%) and doctoral programs (11.4%) after graduation [MEXT, “Higher Education,” Summary of Basic School Statistics 2007, n.d, <http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/toukei/001/07073002/004/002.pdf> (September 11, 2007)].
to become business-oriented and recruit international students aggressively for income-generating purposes. But it seems that the behavior of prestigious private universities, which still can rely on an applicant pool of high-quality, domestic students due to their high selectivity, is generally similar to national universities and has not yet adopted a business model for recruiting international students.

To date, higher education within Japan has largely exemplified a typical aid and mutual understanding approach model and, as a host country of international students, has developed a primarily non-commercial and policy-driven approach with the government’s robust support of international educational. The country’s international student policy is designed to synchronize foreign aid and international relations objectives mostly within the Asia Pacific region while simultaneously promoting the internationalization of Japanese higher education. However, regarding foreign aid, Yamamoto argues that within Japan there was recognition that the country had reached a crossroads as it attempted to establish a system of foreign study that would meet its development goals as the motive of the 100,000 International Student Plan. Concerning international relations, Lim mentions that Japan basically hopes to cultivate pro-Japan individuals (what the government calls international students “ambassadors of the future”) in the international students studying at the countries’ universities. In terms of internationalization of universities, Kida suggests that opening up Japanese universities to international influences is the way to bring about change across a spectrum of issues, especially education at the universities. Along the lines of policies for the internationalization of universities, the MEXT hoped to achieve two

---

objectives with the 100,000 International Student Plan. One was that the growing numbers of international students would yield a catalyst to university reform. The other was to restore Japan’s weakened academic reputation in the international intellectual community. The country has recently been criticized “as a beneficiary, rather than a benefactor, of the great intellectual currents of the world.”

There seems to be neither a clear motivation to embrace the trade and revenue-generating approach nor a long-term plan to attract highly skilled immigrants in Japan. As the growth in the number of four-year universities has outpaced even the decrease in the 18-year-old population since 1992, lower-tier universities in provincial areas have become increasingly involved in revenue-generating approaches to recruit international students as a means of easing their financial situation. Nowadays, as many as 40% of all universities have enrollment problems with some of their faculties and departments, and many of these universities (especially private universities where tuition fees account for over 80% of their total income) are confronting the possibility of financial collapse. In addition, many national universities (particularly provincial national universities, which have expanded their graduate schools and have much larger capacity than graduate programs of private universities) have made attempts to increase their intake of graduate students, so that their graduate programs can meet their authorized enrollment quotas.

---


187 The number of 18-year-olds peaked at 2,050,000 in 1992 and declined to 1,300,000 in 2007 while the number of four-year universities increased to 756 in 2007 from 523 in 1992. The demographic decrease of 36.6% was lower than the universities’ increase of 44.6%.

188 In 2007, the ratio of four-year universities that were unable to fill their authorized enrollment quotas was about 40%.


But some national universities still do not have sufficient numbers for their particular graduate programs or departments. And in order to deal with this deficiency, less popular graduate schools have begun to admit a large number of international students, especially those who are enrolled in Japanese private university undergraduate programs and wish to continue their further study. In 2007, international students accounted for 12.1% of the total students at the graduate level, whereas at the undergraduate level, the ratio of the international students was only 2.4%. And at the graduate level, international students are more concentrated in national universities than in private universities (61.8% of international graduate students were enrolled in national universities in 2007).

The “skilled migration approach” is recently emerging under the initiative of the government in order to deal with both the country’s dwindling young population and corresponding aging population, as well as to develop human resources to cope with the knowledge-based economy. The Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (hereafter called “METI”) and the MEXT jointly launched a new scholarship program in 2007 for Asian students in collaboration with business enterprises. This program is designed to include internships and job placement assistance for international students to encourage them to work in Japan after graduation.

---

191 These two figures are calculated by the two data (ibid and Bureau of Policy and External Relations, Japan Student Services Organization, Summary Report of Accepting International Students 2007, 6).
194 In 2005, about 33,000 international students graduated from Japanese universities and colleges, but merely 7,900 graduates found employment in Japan. [Japan Student Services Organization, Career and Academic Path of International Students after Graduation 2005, 2.]
Marketability and Competitiveness of Japanese Universities during the Age of Globalization

In the Middle Ages, universities taught in Latin in the West and admitted students from the world. Knowledge and technology were thought to have neither geographical nor cultural boundaries. Now, in a borderless world, the general trend towards freely circulating capital, goods, and services, coupled with changes in the openness of labor markets and the transfer to a knowledge-based society, have increased the demand for international education. The dominance of English as the language of science, business, and information technology greatly affects international student mobility. Language of instruction is a critical factor in a mobile student’s choice of a study abroad destination and reflects the dominance of English-speaking countries such as Australia, the U.K. Canada, and the U.S. in the international student market. Given this trend, “an increasing number of institutions in non-English-speaking countries now offer courses in English to overcome their linguistic disadvantage in attracting foreign students.”195

By contrast, Walker argues “the Japanese university is, and has always been, for the Japanese.”196 In terms of competing in the rising international student market, Japan is not a real competitor. Despite being ranked sixth in the world regarding the number of international students, Japan’s market share is still insignificant compared to the top hosting countries.197 Because of language barriers, Japanese universities are facing difficulties in recruiting high-caliber international students. The Japanese language largely dominates both daily academic and social life, and while publishing in English is rapidly becoming a standard in Japanese engineering and the hard sciences, journal articles in the social sciences continue to be largely published in

---

197 Ibid., 173
Japanese. A vast majority of international students in Japan are from Chinese-speaking countries and South Korea, partly because of their advantage in comprehending and learning Japanese.\footnote{Akiyoshi Yonezawa, “Japanese Flagship Universities at a Crossroads,” Higher Education, online publication, August (2006): 5-6, via Springer Link, <http://www.springerlink.com/content/k375220328623l22/> (September 14, 2006).} However, even for Chinese and Korean students, it is apparent that Japan is less appealing than English-speaking countries as a study abroad destination considering the dominance of English in both the academic and business worlds.\footnote{Many Japanese prestigious universities now offer degree-granting or/and non degree-granting programs that are conducted in English. In 2006, 54 universities had degree-granting programs entirely conducted in English and, at the graduate level, there were 127 English-based and degree-granting programs in total. But these English-based programs are still not any major portion of those institutions’ course offerings or programs. [Information Center for International Education, JASSO, University Degree Courses Offered in English (Tokyo: Japan Student Services Organization, 2006), 1-10.]} Additionally, Japanese universities are facing increasing competition from the rapid academic improvement of top universities in China, South Korea, and elsewhere in Asia. As a result, these other Asian universities, once primarily “sending institutions,” have now transformed themselves into attractive “hosting institutions.”\footnote{Ki-Seok Kim and Sunghee Nam, “The Making of a World-Class University at the Periphery,” in World Class Worldwide: Transforming Research Universities in Asia and Latin America, ed. Philip G. Altbach and Jorge Balán (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), 122.}

Sato demonstrates the strengths and weakness of study in Japan in comparison with study in the U.S. from her survey research of Indonesian and Thai students who studied in these two countries. The strengths of study in Japan are: (1) better establishment and maintenance of good relations with Japanese, (2) increasing opportunities of employment and business promoted by close economic ties with Japan, (3) increasing interests in Japanese culture and language, (4) less expensive tuition and fees and more opportunities of scholarships, and (5) well-maintained public safety in Japan. On the other hand, the weaknesses are: (1) a less pervasive use of the Japanese language compared to English, (2) meager research and educational environment and facilities
such as libraries and laboratories, (3) weaker social influence and network of alumni due to the smaller number of students who have studied in Japan, and (4) higher living costs.\textsuperscript{201}

Tuition fees and living expenses are equally important factors for prospective international students when deciding in which country they would like to study. As Japan is well-known for its high cost of living compared with other countries, the MEXT has worked to improve its financial assistance programs for international students, using such financial instruments as the Japanese Government Scholarship, Honors Scholarship, Tuition Exemption and Reduction Program (mainly for privately-financed students), Short-Term Student Exchange Promotion Plan (for exchange and short-term students), and Medical Expense Reimbursement Program.\textsuperscript{202} As a result, in 2006, 18.0\% of all international students were granted government scholarships, i.e. the Japanese Government Scholarship (8.4\%) or Honors Scholarship (9.6\%) and 28.3\% of international students were recipients of the Tuition Exemption and Reduction Program respectively. The ratio of international students who receive government financial assistance in Japan is substantially higher than other host countries, e.g. 0.4\% in the U.S., 1.7\% in the U.K., 4.5\% in France, and 2.6\% in Germany.\textsuperscript{203} Moreover, 210 Japanese universities (28\% of the total number of universities in Japan) and 51 local governments have scholarship programs for international students.\textsuperscript{204} However, Australia and the U.K. have initiated strategies to attract international students on a revenue-generating basis and have successfully adopted a full-cost policy for their international students.

Thus, “tuition costs do not necessarily discourage prospective international students as long as the

\textsuperscript{201} Yuriko Sato, “The Effect of the “Plan to Accept 100,000 Foreign Students” and the Future of Japan’s Foreign Student Policy: From Its Impact Evaluation Towards Indonesia and Thailand and Comparison with that of the U.S.A,” \textit{Journal of International Students’ Education} 10 (2005): 73.


\textsuperscript{203} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{204} Ibid.
quality of education provided and its likely returns for individuals make the investment worthwhile.”\textsuperscript{205} Nevertheless, when choosing between similar educational opportunities and circumstances, cost considerations may be a decisive factor, especially for students originating from developing countries.\textsuperscript{206}

Moreover, in recent years, several host countries have relaxed their immigration policies to promote the temporary or permanent immigration of their international students after graduation. As a result, a better chance of immigrating to a host country may also guide the directions of international students’ destination choices, when compared with alternative educational opportunities abroad.\textsuperscript{207} On this point, Japan is at a disadvantage due to its lack of an explicit immigration program for international students.

Another important factor guiding the destinations of international students relates to the academic reputation of countries and institutions. The international reputation of Japanese higher education has been called in question. Yonezawa argues, “to be a flagship university\textsuperscript{208} in Japan means only that the institution is one of the most prestigious within Japanese society. This label does not necessarily indicate that the competencies of the university’s graduates or even staff are internationally viable, especially in the English-speaking world.”\textsuperscript{209} The strong orientation of Japanese faculty members toward their research activities, especially at the leading research

\textsuperscript{205} OECD, \textit{Education at a Glance 2006}, 291
\textsuperscript{206} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{207} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{208} Yonezawa defines “flagship universities” in Japan as selective, leading, and research-oriented institutions—namely, the seven former imperial universities (The University of Tokyo, Kyoto University, Hokkaido University, Tohoku University, Nagoya University, Osaka University, and Kyushu University), Tokyo Institute of Technology (the top national university in engineering), and three prestigious private universities (Keio University, Waseda University, and Ritsumeikan University). [Yonezawa, “Japanese Flagship Universities at a Crossroads,” \textit{Higher Education}, 4-5.]
\textsuperscript{209} Ibid., 7
universities, has long hampered the improvement of teaching and learning. In a sense, at the undergraduate level, seminar-style classes, laboratory work, and the writing of graduation theses and/or research projects have been able to provide personal and holistic learning environments at most of the leading Japanese universities. However, the overall learning outcome, such as graduation standards and evaluation criteria including grading, has not been rigorously controlled in bachelor’s and master’s degree programs. And efforts to foster a student-centered approach toward curriculum (curriculum development) and faculty development have been generally unsuccessful although there have been some improvements lately. The problem in the social sciences and humanities has been worsened by the fact that graduate schools of Japanese universities are reluctant to confer doctorates to candidates (given that many Japanese social science and humanities faculty members do not themselves possess doctorates). In 2005, as compared with 60.4% and 60.9% of students who went on to complete their doctorates on the natural sciences and engineering respectively, only 21.6% and 21.4% of humanities and social

---

210 Japanese faculty, as for the ratio of interest in research and education, interest in research was overwhelmingly high with 72 to 28 whereas the ratio of European and North American faculty was 56 to 44 according the Carnegie Foundation Survey conducted in 1992. [Akira Arimoto, “Academic Profession in Japan,” in The International Academic Profession: Portraits of Fourteen Countries, ed. P. G. Altbach (Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1996), 188.]

211 Rather, the in-school period of university has been described as a kind of moratorium between secondary education and the real world.


213 For example, in 2004, 40.0% of the universities carried out course evaluation by students. Especially, that ratio of national universities was 60.0%. And 75.0% of the universities had faculty development programs (national universities’ ratio was 98%). By the early 90’s, these efforts were hardly ever conducted. [Higher Education Bureau, MEXT, Education Reforms of Japanese Universities (Tokyo: MEXT, 2006), 12.] 62.5% of the universities had internship programs for their students in 2005. [Higher Education Bureau, MEXT, Survey on Internship Programs at Higher Education Institutions 2005 (Tokyo: MEXT, 2006), 1.]


215 The ratio of professors with doctoral degrees is still low even at leading national universities, especially in the fields of the humanities and social sciences. For instance, in 2007, the percentage of faculty members with Ph.D.s was 22.6% at the Faculty of Law at The University of Tokyo, 48.5% at the Faculty of Economics at Hitotsubashi University, and 44.6% at the Faculty of Letters at Kobe University. [University Rankings 2007 (Tokyo: Asahi Shimbun, 2007), 193-195.]
sciences doctoral students completed their course of studies.\textsuperscript{216} Thus, Kinmoth mentions that international students who are serious about their studies do not always find the standards of instruction or the accomplishments of their efforts sufficient to justify the high cost of study in Japan.\textsuperscript{217}

Nevertheless, at the same time, Eades argues, “If we look at the international league tables of universities, Japanese universities do not seem to perform all that badly”\textsuperscript{218} in comparison with other non-Anglophone countries based on research output. According to the Academic Ranking of World Universities 2007 compiled by Shanghai Jiao Tong University, The University of Tokyo was ranked 20, the highest of any university outside the U.S. and U.K. There were six Japanese universities\textsuperscript{219} in the top 100, compared to the ranked numbers of Germany (6) and France (4).\textsuperscript{220} Newsweek’s The Top 100 Global Universities shows similar results, with five Japanese universities ranked: The University of Tokyo ranked 16,\textsuperscript{221} again the highest of any university outside the U.S. and U.K. But only two French universities and three German universities made it onto the same list. Therefore, it can be said that Japanese leading universities appear to be relatively successful in terms of research performance. These world university rankings, including the World University Rankings published by Times Higher Education Supplement, are

\textsuperscript{216} Japan Student Services Organization, \textit{Career and Academic Path of International Students after Graduation 2005}, 3.


\textsuperscript{219} Besides The University of Tokyo, Kyoto University ranked 22nd, Osaka University 67th, Tohoku University 76th, Nagoya University 94th, and Tokyo Institute of Technology 99th. [Institute of Higher Education, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, “Top 500 World Universities (1-100),” \textit{Academic Ranking of World Universities 2007}, August 15, 2007, <http://ed.sjtu.edu.cn/rank/2007/ARWU2007_Top100.htm> (September 16, 2007).]

\textsuperscript{220} Ibid.

increasingly referred to by prospective international students when they chose a study-abroad university. As one of the largest higher education systems in the world, Japan has two coexisting academic cultures/facets. Eades explains:

One which is capable of being internationally recognized, mainly in the natural sciences and technology, and one which produces work which has little impact or recognition outside Japan, mainly in the humanities. The social sciences straddle the gap, with the more quantitative and/or experimental disciplines such as economics or psychology behaving more like the natural sciences, while the more qualitative social sciences tend to behave more like the humanities.\textsuperscript{222}

As far as research publications are concerned, Japan’s leading research universities have maintained prevailing positions in Asia. However, the recent rapid development of the scientific research capacities throughout East Asia has served to undermine the once strong position of many Japanese research universities. Japanese most prestigious institutions are now in close competition with their East Asian counterparts, for example, Seoul National University, the University of Hong Kong, and Tsing Hua University,\textsuperscript{223} meaning in turn that Japanese universities are also facing more difficulties than before in order to attract highly potential students within the region.

\textsuperscript{222} Eades, “The Japanese 21st Center of Excellence Program,” 299.
\textsuperscript{223} Yonezawa, “Japanese Flagship Universities at a Crossroads,” 7. Also, refer to SCI (Science Citation Index) scores in the aforementioned Shanghai Jiao Tong University’s ranking.
Chapter IV

Research Methodology

The primary goal of this study is to examine international student enrollment management differences between two groups of Japanese national universities—specifically, more selective and less selective universities—in light of the three major policy and environmental factors: (1) shifting from quantitative to qualitative goals in the international student policy in 2003, (2) the corporatization of national universities in 2004, and (3) a deteriorating national demographic climate.

Particularly, this study examines the international student recruitment policies of national universities such as primary (prioritized) host programs (undergraduate or graduate), target international applicant pools (inside or outside Japan), and required language proficiency standards. Also, this study examines gaps and conflicts between the government’s stated international student policies and actual practices of international student recruitment in national universities. Additionally, this study includes international student recruitment policies of sampled private universities as counterparts to the above-mentioned two groups of national universities for the purpose of comparative analysis when appropriate.

The data was gathered through document analyses, a survey completed by officials of both national universities and sampled private universities responsible for international education/exchange, and semi-structured interviews of vice presidents (or senior chief directors) in charge of international education/exchange of national universities. In short, data was first collected through quantitative methods in the form of a mailed survey questionnaire and later complemented by interviews for qualitative data collection. In addition to these two collection
channels, data and information about international recruitment and enrollment management issues were obtained from a review of available documents, websites, databases of universities, government, and relevant associations and agents of higher education and international education.

Participants

University Survey

This study surveyed all (78) national universities that have both undergraduate and graduate programs (except medical colleges\textsuperscript{224}), as well as a partial sample of private universities (40 out of 560 institutions) as counterparts to both 20 more selective and 20 less selective national universities in Japan. However, for the purpose of testing this study’s hypotheses, these 20 more selective national universities and 20 less selective national universities were chosen from all the national universities. The two types of universities were defined as follows:

1. More selective national universities: 20 universities were selected by the Selectivity Ranking Chart of National Universities, which is compiled by the Yoyogi Seminar\textsuperscript{225} on the basis of the results of the National Center Test for University Admissions (hereafter called “Center Test”),\textsuperscript{226} in descending order of the selectivity index.

\textsuperscript{224}Medical colleges are excluded since they usually do not accept international students.

\textsuperscript{225}Yoyogi Seminar is one of the major preparatory schools for universities’ entrance examinations and the above ranking chart can be found at http://www.yozemi.ac.jp/rank/gakubu/index.html. In Japan, major preparatory schools have the most extensive and reliable data regarding the university selectivity. It is because the selectivity (difficulty of passing entrance examinations of universities) is rated based on the results of both mock entrance examinations conducted on a nation-wide basis by these large preparatory schools and the National Center Test for University Admissions reported by numbers of examinees. This rating is widely accepted in Japanese society and the most influential determinate factor of university prestige in Japan.

\textsuperscript{226}This is a national exam conducted by the National Center of University Entrance Examinations. It is commonly called the “Center Test.” In order to enter a national university, a graduate of a Japanese high school (applicant) has to take two different kinds of exams. One is this nation-wide test and the other is an entrance examination provided by an individual university. The total score of the two exams will determine whether an applicant can be admitted or not. The Center Test is administered once a year in the middle of January and all applicants to national universities have to take the same exam on the same day. After taking the test, each examinee estimates his or her total score on the basis of all the correct answers published by newspapers in collaboration with major preparatory schools on the following day. Major preparatory schools like Yoyogi Seminar collect the results (total scores) of the Center Test from numbers of examinees. Then those preparatory schools will give examinees some guidance about what score (a minimum
2. Less selective national universities: 20 universities were selected from the same ranking chart in ascending order of the selectivity index.

3. Other national universities: Following the selection of ‘more selective universities’ and ‘less selective national universities,’ the remaining 38 universities were categorized as “other national universities.”

In the ranking chart of the selectivity index, each national university’s selectivity is indicated by a percentage figure ranging from 54 (the least selective) to 94 (the most selective). The figure indicates the desirable correct answer percentage (earned score) of the Center Test to be accepted by a national university based on the Yoyogi Seminar’s follow-up research of examinees. Each requisite score percentage means that 60% of applicants who had a relevant score percentage were accepted by a university in April, 2005. For example, “A University’s selectivity score (percentage) is 75” means that 60% of the applicants, whose correct answer percentage (earned score) was 75% of the full points of the Center Test, were accepted by that university. The figures considered both the point allocation between the Center Test (first exam) and individual universities’ subsequent exams (second exams).

1. The selectivity indicators of 20 more selective universities\(^ {227} \) ranged from 80 to 94. 16 out of the 20 institutions were established as universities under the pre-war higher education system required score) of the Center Test is supposedly needed to pass a subsequent entrance examination administered by each university, essentially predicting a total score of the two exams based on prep schools’ accumulated data compiled from the results of both the Center Test and many mock tests. The preparatory schools also publicly release the national universities’ selectivity ranking chart, including the above minimum required scores of the Center Test. It is generally believed that the more difficult it is to enter a university, the better academic qualities that university has.\(^ \text{227} \) The 20 more selective national universities are as follows: (1) The University of Tokyo; (2) Kyoto University; (3) Osaka University; (4) Nagoya University; (5) Tohoku University; (6) Hokkaido University; (7) Kyushu University; (8) Tokyo Institute of Technology; (9) Hiroshima University; (10) Kobe University; (11) Hitotsubashi University; (12) University of Tsukuba; (13) Kanazawa University; (14) Chiba University; (15) Osaka University of Foreign Studies; (16) Tokyo University of Foreign Studies; (17) Ochanomizu University; (18) Kyoto Institute of Technology; (19) Yokohama National University; (20) Kagoshima University
and are historically known as prestigious universities consisting of those types of institutions such as former imperial universities, former state-run universities (originally established by non-education ministries, for example, the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce, before World War II), and universities of foreign studies. Also, 15 are comprehensive universities and 16 are located in metropolitan areas.

2. The selectivity indicators of the 20 less selective universities\(^2\) ranged from 54 to 64. 17 out of the 20 universities are comprehensive institutions. All 20 universities are located in provincial areas and 16 were reorganized/integrated into four-year universities from non-university post-secondary institutions under the initiative of the U.S. occupational government after World War II.\(^3\)

3. The other 38 national universities’ selectivity indicators ranged from 65 to 79. 16 out of the 38 universities were comprehensive institutions and 9 were teachers colleges. 26 universities are located in provincial areas.

In addition, in order to further validate the selection of these two groups of national universities, a supplemental marker for “more selective” and “less selective” was determined by how many of the MEXT's recent nine competitive funding programs, which are related to

---

\(^2\) The 20 less selective universities are as follows: (1) Wakayama University; (2) Hirosaki University; (3) The University of the Ryukyus; (4) Oita University; (5) Kochi University; (6) Kitami Institute of Technology; (7) Kagawa University; (8) Akita University; (9) Ehime University; (10) Tottori University; (11) Miyazaki University; (12) Shimane University; (13) Fukushima University; (14) Muroran Institute of Technology; (15) Saga University; (16) Yamagata University; (17) The University of Tokushima; (18) Fukui University; (19) Iwate University; (20) Hokkaido University of Education

\(^3\) In 1946, in response to the recommendations of the United States Education Mission (USEM) to Japan, Japanese education system was reorganized from the British-based system to the American-based system. As a result of this reorganization, many non-university post-secondary institutions were upgraded/integrated into four-year universities. In the beginning of the 1950s, 201 new universities and 149 junior colleges existed in place of the pre-war 49 universities and other 391 various post-secondary institutions [Akito Okada, “A History of the Japanese University,” in The ‘Big Bang’ in Japanese Higher Education, ed. J.S. Eades, Roger Goodman, and Yumiko Hada (Melbourne: Trans National Press, 2005), 38].
international education and to internationally collaborative research\textsuperscript{230} were obtained by these national universities. As a result, from 2002 to 2005, it was revealed that the group of 20 more selective universities obtained 312 grants (15.6 grants per school) in total, whereas the group of 20 less selective universities received 42 grants (2.1 grants per school). It can be said that these two groups represent not only selectivity distribution but also the distribution of their international dimension of education and research relevant to government grants.

Besides these two subsets, and in order to be surveyed as counterparts to the two groups of national universities, 20 more selective and 20 less selective private comprehensive\textsuperscript{231} universities were selected respectively. These two types of private universities were determined by the Selectivity Ranking Chart of Private Universities, which is also compiled by the Yoyogi Seminar on the basis of the results of private universities’ entrance examinations\textsuperscript{232} reported by numbers of examinees as well as the results database of mock entrance examinations conducted on a nationwide basis by the Seminar.

1. All the 20 more selective private universities are located in metropolitan areas and 15 are located in Tokyo. 11 out of the 20 institutions were established as universities under the pre-war higher education system and are historically known as prestigious universities.

\textsuperscript{230} These nine funding programs are as follows: (1) Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities (2005); (2) Strategic International Cooperation with Universities Abroad (2005); (3) Assistance Program for Application of Overseas Advanced Education and Research (2005); (4) Universities’ Long-term Study Abroad Programs (2005); (5) Support for Advanced Student Exchange Pilot Project Support Program (2003); (6) Initiatives for Attractive Education in Graduate Schools (2005); (7) Support Program for Contemporary Education Needs (2004); (8) Support Program for Distinctive University Education (2003); (9) The 21st Century COE Program (2002). The commencement year of each funding program is shown in parenthesis.

\textsuperscript{231} For the sake of the counterparts to the two national university groups, small size private universities, which are typically described as single-faculty college (in the humanities or social sciences) with a few thousand students, were omitted for the selection considering Japan’s large private higher education sector and its characteristics.

\textsuperscript{232} Private universities screen applicants by their own entrance examinations.
2. 8 out of the 20 less selective private universities are located in metropolitan areas and 18 were established after World War II (8 institutions were established in the 1970’s or later).

Interview with Vice Presidents

Vice presidents (or senior chief directors) in charge of international education/exchange of national universities were interviewed to supplement the data collected by the survey and corroborate evidence from it. Four vice presidents of national universities, which responded to the survey, were selected. Two vice presidents from the group of more selective national universities and other two from the group of less selective ones were selected and interviewed respectively. Characteristic of, and distinctive approaches to, international student enrollment management were also considered for the selection of the four vice presidents to be interviewed based on the results of the mailed survey.

Instruments

The study included a mailed survey to 78 national universities, 40 private universities and individual interviews with four vice presidents (or senior chief directors) of national universities in charge of international education/exchange. Data was first collected through quantitative methods in the form of a mailed survey questionnaire and later complemented with the use of individual interviews.

Questions of University Survey

The Survey Questionnaire (see Appendix D) was developed by the author to obtain data regarding the demography of already-enrolled and applying international students, language requirements for international applicants, and the institution’s approach to the international student market. It was also designed to elicit universities’ international student enrollment management-
related responses and perceptions on the relative importance of variables such as objectives and intentions for admitting international students, recruiting strategies and measures, and the difficulties in promoting acceptance of international students.

The primary variables of these questions selected for the purpose of this study included: (1) the numbers of (international) students and applicants, (2) objectives and plans of admitting international students, (3) strategies and measures for recruiting international students, (4) language requirements and test scores, (5) approach to the international student market outside Japan, and (6) difficulties in promoting acceptance of international students. First, the survey questionnaire collected various kinds of demographic data of already-enrolled and applying international students. Second, it drew upon institutional perceptions about how the estimated importance of each variable, making use of the five point Likert-scale: 1 = Not at all important, 2 = Slightly important, 3 = Moderately important, 4 = Very important, and 5 = Extremely important, with respect to objectives and plans of admitting international students as well as strategies and measures for recruiting international students (the latter one includes dichotomous questions for the implementation of the strategies and measures). Moreover, the questionnaire employed dichotomous, multiple-choice, and categorical questions in order to gather data regarding language (Japanese and English) requirements for international applicants, screening methods of international applicants residing abroad if an institution approached the student market outside the country and, if not, reasons why they did not recruit prospective students residing abroad, and institutional difficulties for the promotion of admitting international students. Additionally, the questionnaire used some open-ended questions to collect data about the institutional advantages
and benefits of recruiting prospective students residing abroad (see Appendix D for exact questions).

Interview Questions to Vice Presidents

Vice presidents were asked individually about their perceptions, views, and insights towards international student enrollment management. The interviews were semi-structured and guided by responses to the mailed survey in order to supplement the data collected by the survey and corroborate evidence from it. An institution’s characteristic and distinctive approach to the international student market was also discussed with vice presidents in reference to the MEXT’s international student policy.

Typical interview questions were: (1) In what faculty or department would your university like to increase the number of international students the most and why? (2) How does your institution approach the international student market, especially outside Japan, and what is your institution’s strategy on this matter? (3) How do you analyze the costs and benefits of accepting international students, and what is your analysis of the matter? (4) How does the corporatization of national universities affect international student enrollment management and behaviors at your institution? (5) What do you think of the MEXT’s current international student policy and initiatives? (6) How do you perceive the recent trend of the medium of instruction shifting from Japanese to English in reference to the acceptance of international students?, and (7) What kinds of measures are needed for the better coordination among stakeholders in order to recruit highly-qualified international students?
Procedures

University Survey

The Survey Questionnaire (see Appendix D) regarding the international student enrollment management and a cover letter along with a pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope (for returning the completed survey questionnaire) were mailed to the aforementioned national and private universities’ representative offices responsible for international education/exchange in early October 2006. The cover letter explained the study and requested the completion of the survey questionnaire. It also stated that participation was entirely voluntary, and that the university could choose not to participate or could withdraw at any time. The survey also asked the respondent to provide the institution’s name only and did not asked universities’ representative offices responsible for international education/exchange to provide their names or any other identifying information. Participants were informed both that the individual institutions’ names were to be guaranteed anonymity, and that a final report summarizing the results of the study would be available to each university which completed the survey questionnaire on a priority basis.

The time frame for the distribution and collection of the surveys was approximately three weeks. A second mailing was sent out three weeks after the first mailing, this time only to institutions that had not responded. This second copy of the survey included a request that it be returned by a specific deadline. In cases where there was no response, a third survey was sent along with a personal letter appealing for a response. The process of conducting the survey took approximately eight weeks. When completed surveys were received, an exclusive “case number” was assigned to each of them to enable matching of individual surveys with summary data collected. Collected raw data was entered into a data file of the software for statistical analysis.
using the Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS). Aggregate data was analyzed using quantitative research methods, and total anonymity of the respondents was honored. To prevent the possibility of matching an institution’s answer to its name, completed survey questionnaires were destroyed after interviews with the vice presidents.

**Interview with Vice Presidents**

Vice presidents (or senior chief directors) were contacted via telephone and/or e-mail if available (see Appendix B: e-mail letter and Appendix C: telephone script). The study was explained to the identified vice presidents and permission was requested to conduct individual interviews. Once vice presidents gave the investigator permission to conduct the interviews, either telephone interviews or face-to-face interviews were offered as two choices from which the participants would select depending on their availability and their preference. When a vice president chose a telephone interview, the investigator mailed that official the Informed Consent Document (see Appendix A) along with a pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope for returning it. Once the signed informed consent document had been received, the investigator made contact with the vice president for the telephone interview. In cases where a vice president agreed to a face-to-face interview, the investigator arranged a time that was convenient for the vice president. At that time, the investigator presented the informed consent document to the vice president to be signed. The informed consent document included a description of the study; information on data collection in the study; information on any risks and benefits to the participants; information on confidentiality and contact information for the investigator in case the participants have any questions or concerns. The informed consent document also contained instructions for participants that participation in the study was voluntary and withdrawal was possible at any time without
repercussions (See Appendix A: Informed Consent Document). Vice presidents were not interviewed until the investigator had received a signed informed consent document either by mail or in person. They were informed that a final report summarizing the results of the study would be available to the vice presidents who would participate in interviews on a priority basis.

The interviews with four vice presidents were conducted either at their university offices or via telephone in January and February 2007. To both supplement the data collected by the survey and corroborate evidence, the interviews were semi-structured and guided by responses to the survey. The length of each interview was between one hour and an hour-and-a-half, and the interviews were audio-taped. To maintain the confidentiality of individual interviews with vice presidents, data collected during the audio-taping of these interviews was transcribed by the investigator following each interview. Transcribed data was de-identified and then the audio-tape of the interview was destroyed in order to protect participant confidentiality.

**Data Analysis**

In this study, results are reported both quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative research analysis involves statistics, both descriptive and inferential. Measures of tendency (i.e., means and standard deviations) are reported along with raw numerical data and percentages of totals compiled from the surveys. The major statistical tools used for the descriptive and inferential statistical analysis of the data included t-tests, chi-square, Fisher’s exact test, correlation, and ANCOVA. The interview data served to supplement and verify the survey data.

Specifically, in order to compare differences of international student enrollment management between the two types of national universities (i.e., more selective and less selective
In reference to their counterparts to two groups of private universities, the following statistical analyses were employed.

- Hypothesis 1: More selective national universities would seek international students mainly for their graduate programs (including those programs that are entirely conducted in English) and would most probably downplay the importance of tuition/cost recovery, whereas less selective national universities would generally recruit international students for their undergraduate programs and unstable graduate programs because of low domestic enrollment. Additionally, less selective national universities would emphasize both tuition/cost recovery and the sustainability of their academic programs.

1. Independent Variables:
   a. Selectivity type (more selective national universities and less selective national university)
   b. Selectivity index (selectivity indices of national universities)

2. Dependent Variables:
   a. Ratios of international students (the ratio of international students to the total student population, the ratio of international undergraduate students to the total undergraduate student population, the ratio of international graduate students to the total graduate student population, the ratio of international undergraduate students to the total international student population, and the ratio of international graduate students to the total international student population)
b. Numbers of international students (the total number of international students, the number of international undergraduate students, and the number of international graduate students)

c. Implementation rates of university’s vision and plans for the recruitment of international students (mission statement, numerical target, and academic programs planned to increase international students)

d. Degree of importance regarding international students’ contribution to the student intake

3. Control Variable:

   a. Overall student populations (the total number of entire students, the total number of undergraduate students, and the total number of graduate students)

4. Statistical Tools/Techniques:

   a. t-test (1-a and 2-a)

   b. Correlation (1-b and 2-a; 1-b and 2-d)

   c. ANCOVA (1-a, 2-b, and 3-a)

   d. Chi-square and Fisher’s exact test (1-a and 2-c)

- Hypothesis 2: More selective national universities would recruit highly qualified students from the international student market outside Japan, whereas less selective national universities would recruit primarily from the international student market within Japan.

1. Independent Variable:

   a. Selectivity type (more selective national universities and less selective national university)
2. Dependent Variable:
   a. Implementation rates of measures for recruiting international students (approaching prospective international students who reside outside Japan)

3. Statistical Tool/Technique:
   a. Chi-square and Fisher’s exact test

- Hypothesis 3: More selective national universities would prioritize applicants’ academic abilities over Japanese language proficiency as admission criteria, however, less selective national universities would prioritize Japanese language proficiency over the academic ability as admission criteria for international applicants.

1. Independent Variable:
   a. Selectivity type (more selective national universities and less selective national university)

2. Dependent Variable:
   a. Implementation rates of requirement of language proficiency test (EJU and TOEFL) and academic programs not requiring language proficiency (Japanese and English)

3. Statistical Tool/Technique:
   a. Chi-square and Fisher’s exact test
Chapter V

Results, Analyses, and Discussions

This chapter presents demographics and background information of surveyed universities, i.e. participants and respondents, study results, and analyses and discussions based on the results. Whereas participant numbers comprise the survey’s total, queried sample, respondent numbers denote actual response quantities.

Demographics and Background Information of Survey Participants and Respondents

The Survey Questionnaire (see Appendix D) was sent to all (78) national universities with both undergraduate and graduate programs, as well as to 40 selected private universities (out of 560 private institutions nationwide), which served as counter-models to the two other national university groups: more selective and less selective. 62 national universities (79.5%) and 27 private universities (67.5%) responded to the survey questionnaire, for a total of 118 survey participant institutions and 89 actual university respondents, with an overall, survey questionnaire response rate of 75.4%. By university type, the number of participants, respondents, and response rates are shown in Table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 Numbers of Participants, Respondents, and Response Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Selective National U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Selective National U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other National U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: National U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Selective Private U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Selective Private U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: Private U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following band graphs (Figures 2.1 to 4.2) illustrate the demographic profiles of both participant and respondent institutions according to total student numbers, international student
numbers, and the ratios of international graduate students to their respective international student populations.

**Figure 2.1 Total Number of Students (Institution Size) in Participants/Sample**

**Figure 2.2 Total Number of Students (Institution Size) in Respondents**
As Figures 2.1 and 2.2 illustrate, half of more selective national universities were relatively large-sized (15,001 to 20,000 students) or large-sized (more than 20,000 students) institutions, while all less selective national universities were either small-sized (less than 5,000 students) or relatively small-sized (5,001 to 10,000 students) institutions. Also, small and relatively small-sized institutions comprised the national university majority, with approximately 70% of national universities having less than 10,000 students, whereas relatively large and large-sized institutions roughly accounted for half of private universities (47.5% sampling and 62.9% of responding private universities had more than 10,000 students).

**Figure 3.1 Number of International Students in Participants/Sample**

![Bar chart showing the number of international students in different types of universities.](chart.png)
Figures 3.1 and 3.2 above indicate that approximately 70% of more selective national universities had more than 600 international students, while about 80% of less selective national universities had less than 200 international students. Moreover, approximately half the national universities had less than 200 international students, whereas 30.0% of sampling private universities and 44.4% responding private universities had more than 400 international students.
Figures 4.1 and 4.2 show, by institution type, the ratios of international graduate students to an institution’s total international student population. In almost all more selective national
universities, the majority of international students were graduate students. However, in less
selective national universities, 35.0% of participant universities and 41.2% of respondent
universities had international graduate students as the minority of their total international student
populations. Furthermore, in over three-quarters of national universities, the majority of
international students were graduate students, and about a quarter of national universities showed a
high concentration (more than 75%) of international graduate students in their total international
student populations. By contrast, in almost all the private universities, international graduate
students were the minority of their total international student populations. In more than a half of
the private institutions, graduate students made up less than 25% of their international student
populations. In other words, in the vast majority of private institutions, international undergraduate
students comprised the majority of their international student populations.

Findings, Analyses, and Discussions

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis stated that more selective national universities would seek international
students mainly for their graduate programs (including those programs entirely conducted in
English) and would most probably downplay the importance of tuition/cost recovery, whereas less
selective national universities would generally recruit international students for their
undergraduate programs and relatively unstable graduate programs due to low domestic
enrollment. Additionally, less selective national universities would emphasize both tuition/cost
recovery and the sustainability of their academic programs.
International Student Ratios and Selectivity Types

In order to first examine this hypothesis in a comprehensive manner, student demographic data for those universities which did not respond to the Survey Questionnaire were supplemented with data from the annual guidebook of Japanese universities: “Daigaku Ranking 2007.” Overall, of the 29 non-responding universities, the total number of students (undergraduates and graduates) and their international student populations (undergraduates and graduates) were entered into the survey’s data-set in order to complete demographic data for the study’s 78 national universities and 40 private universities.

An independent sample’s t-test was conducted on international student mean ratios in order to evaluate significant differences between the 20 more selective and 20 less selective national universities. International student ratios were: (1) the ratio of international students to the total student population (RIS, Ratio of International Students); (2) the ratio of international undergraduate students to the total undergraduate student population (URIS, Undergraduate: Ratio of International Students); (3) the ratio of international graduate students to the total graduate student population (GRIS, Graduate: Ratio of International Students); (4) the ratio of international undergraduate students to the total international student population (RUIS, Ratio of Undergraduates to International Students); and (5) the ratio of international graduate students to the total international student population (RGIS, Ratio of Graduates to International Students). The means and standard deviations of the international student ratios are shown below in Table 4.1, and t-test results are displayed in Table 4.2 respectively.

233 It is a highly reputable guidebook of all universities in Japan and is published by the Asahi Shimbun Company, one of the three major newspaper companies. Daigaku means university in Japanese.
Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics: International Student Ratios by National University Selectivity Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Ratio</th>
<th>Selectivity Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Int'l Students (RIS)</td>
<td>More selective</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less selective</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate: Ratio of Int'l Students (URIS)</td>
<td>More selective</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less selective</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate: Ratio of Int'l Students (GRIS)</td>
<td>More selective</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less selective</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Undergraduates to Int'l Students (RUIS)</td>
<td>More selective</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less selective</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Graduates to Int'l Students (RGIS)</td>
<td>More selective</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less selective</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Results of t-tests: International Student Ratios by National University Selectivity Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Ratio</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Int'l Students (RIS)</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate: Ratio of Int'l Students (URIS)</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate: Ratio of Int'l Students (GRIS)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Undergraduates to Int'l Students (RUIS)</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Graduates to Int'l Students (RGIS)</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01; **p<.005; ***p<.001

Table 4.2 presents the RIS, URIS, and RGIS ratios for more selective national universities, showing statistically higher ratios than those of less selective national universities, RIS: t(23.8), p<.001;234 URIS: t(27.2)=3.15, p<.005; RGIS: t(33.0)=2.76, p<.01. Although GRIS ratios exhibited a similar tendency, they were not statistically significant. Conversely, the RUIS of more selective national universities had a statistically lower ratio of international students than that of less selective national universities, t(30.4)= -4.34, p<.001.235 These results indicated that more selective national universities had significantly larger proportions of international students than

---

234 It should be noted that the variances in the two types of universities are not statistically equal according to Leven’s Test for Equality of Variances in Table 3.2 (F = 8.26, p = .007).
235 It should be noted that the variances in the two types of universities are not statistically equal according to Leven’s Test for Equality of Variances in Table 3.2 (F = 6.35, p = .016).
those of less selective universities in both their entire student populations and undergraduate student populations. Moreover, more selective universities had a significantly larger proportion of international graduate students than those of less selective universities in their total international student populations, and in terms of their total international student populations, less selective universities had a significantly larger proportion of international undergraduate students than those of more selective universities.

In the case of private universities, the URIS of less selective universities (M=.034, SD=.041, n=20) had a statistically higher ratio than that of more selective universities (M=.014, SD=.009, n=20), t(21.0)=-2.15, p<.05. And the RGIS of more selective universities (M=.273, SD=.129, n=20) had a significantly higher ratio than that of less selective universities (M=.131, SD=.155, n=20), t(38.0)=3.16, p<.01. While the RIS and GRIS of less selective universities had higher percentages than those of more selective universities, they were not statistically significant relative to the standard alpha level of .05, though the p-value was still less than .10. Overall, less selective private universities indicated a tendency to have significantly larger proportions of international students than those of more selective private universities in the three student population types: entire student populations, undergraduate student populations, and graduate student populations. However, more selective private universities had a significantly larger proportion of international graduate students in their total international student populations.

- **University Selectivity Indices and International Student Ratios**

For the purpose of examining the relationships between university selectivity indices and the aforementioned five types of international student ratios, selectivity indices of the 29 non-responding universities were extracted from the Selectivity Ranking Charts compiled by the
Yoyogi Seminar\textsuperscript{236} and were entered into the statistical data-set in order to complete the selectivity indices of 78 national universities and 40 private universities. Table 5 below shows correlations between the selectivity indices of national universities and the five types of international student ratios.

**Table 5 Correlations between Selectivity Indices and Ratios of International Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Selectivity Indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Selectivity Indices</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( N )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ratio of Int'l Students (RIS)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( N )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Undergraduate: Ratio of Int'l Students (URIS)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( N )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduate: Ratio of Int'l Students (GRIS)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( N )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ratio of Undergraduates to Int'l Students (RUIS)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( N )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ratio of Graduates to Int'l Students (RGIS)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( N )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**\(p<.001\)

The general tendency, as seen above in Table 5, revealed positive correlations between selectivity indices (\(M=71.56, SD=8.41\)) and the four types of international student ratios, such as RIS (\(M=.041, SD=.023\)), URIS (\(M=.017, SD=.013\)), GRIS (\(M=.143, SD=.086\)), and RGIS (\(M=.625, SD=.176\)). However, among these positive correlations, two relationships, i.e. between selectivity indices and the RIS as well as selectivity indices and the RGIS, were statistically significant at the .001 level, RIS: \(r(78)=.594\); RGIS: \(r(78)=.361\). Also, there was only a negative correlation between selectivity indices and RUIS (\(M=.351, SD=.174\)), being statistically

\textsuperscript{236} See page 69 to 72 as for details about the selectivity index and the Selectivity Ranking Charts.
significant at the .001 level, \( r(78) = -0.451 \). These results indicated: (1) national universities with higher selectivity indices tended to have higher percentages of international students in their entire student populations; (2) national universities with higher selectivity indices tended to have higher percentages of international graduate students in their total international student populations; and (3) conversely, national universities with higher selectivity indices tended to have lower percentages of international undergraduate students in their total international student populations. Although, strictly speaking, statistically significant relationships were not found between selectivity indices and the other two international student ratios: URIS and GRIS, URIS: \( r=.219, \) n.s.; GRIS: \( r=.152, \) n.s., overall, it could be said that selectivity indices were strong predictors with respect to international student proportions in the student populations of national universities.

Regarding private universities, in general, there were negative correlations between selectivity indices (\( M=51.45, \) SD=10.09) and three international student ratios: RIS (\( M=.029, \) SD=0.032), URIS (\( M=.024, \) SD=0.031), and GRIS (\( M=.106, \) SD=0.135). However, only the correlation between selectivity indices and the URIS was statistically significant, \( r(40) = -0.302, \) p<.05. Also, RGIS (\( M=202, \) SD=1.58) was positively associated with selectivity indices, \( r(40)=.572, \) p<.001. These results showed a general trend wherein private universities with less selectivity indices tended to have higher proportions of international students in their three student population types: entire student populations, undergraduate student populations, and graduate student populations. But, private universities with higher selectivity indices also tended to have a higher proportion of international graduate students in their total international student populations.
➢ *International Student Numbers and Selectivity Types*

An *Analysis of Covariance* (hereafter called “ANCOVA”)\(^ {237} \) was performed to determine whether the numbers of international students were significantly different between the two national university types: more selective and less selective, when overall student populations were taken into account. The independent variable was selectivity type, i.e. more selective and less selective national universities, and the control variables, specifically the three student population types, were added as covariates: (1) total number of students (#S); (2) total number of undergraduate students (#US); and (3) total number of graduate students (#GS). Also, dependent variables were numbers of international students, specifically the three types of international student populations: (1) total number of international students (#IS); (2) number of international undergraduate students (#IUS); and (3) number of international graduate students (#IGS). The results of ANCOVA are shown in Tables 6.1 to 8.3 below.

\(^ {237} \) A key difference between multiple comparisons for ANCOVA (Analysis of Covariance) and those performed for ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) is that comparisons within ANCOVA are made as adjusted means rather than as observed means.
Table 6.1 Descriptive Statistics: Total Number of Students by National University Selectivity Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selectivity Type</th>
<th>Total Number of Students (#S)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Selective</td>
<td>13,518.35</td>
<td>6,784.50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Selective</td>
<td>6,107.70</td>
<td>1,861.25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 ANCOVA Results and Descriptive Statistics: Total Number of International Students by National University Selectivity Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selectivity Type</th>
<th>Number of International Students (#IS)</th>
<th>Observed Mean</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Selective</td>
<td>814.65</td>
<td>611.66</td>
<td>455.40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Selective</td>
<td>145.80</td>
<td>348.79</td>
<td>60.85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>480.23</td>
<td>480.23</td>
<td>466.42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Students (#S)</td>
<td>2,822,322.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,822,322.28</td>
<td>87.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selectivity</td>
<td>436,232.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>436,232.87</td>
<td>13.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1,188,389.47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32,118.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: R-Squared=.860, Adj. R-Squared=.852, adjustments based on the total number of Students (#S) mean=9813.03.
*p<.005; **p<.001

Table 6.3 Comparison of Total Number of International Students by National University Selectivity Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Selective vs. Less Selective</td>
<td>262.87*</td>
<td>71.33</td>
<td>118.34, 407.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean comparison based on ANCOVA adjusted means controlling for the total number of Students (#S).
*p<.05
### Table 7.1 Descriptive Statistics: Total Number of Undergraduate Students by National University Selectivity Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selectivity Type</th>
<th>Total Number of Undergraduate Students (#US)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Selective</td>
<td>8,927.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Selective</td>
<td>5,318.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7.2 ANCOVA Results: Number of International Undergraduate Students by National University Selectivity Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selectivity Type</th>
<th>Number of International Undergraduate Students (#US)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Selective</td>
<td>171.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Selective</td>
<td>59.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Undergrad. Students (#US)</td>
<td>14,569.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,569.99</td>
<td>4.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selectivity</td>
<td>55,133.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55,133.15</td>
<td>17.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>119,397.56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3,226.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: R-Squared=.542, Adj. R-Squared=.518, adjustments based on the total number of Undergraduate Students (#US) mean=7123.23.
*p<.05; **p<.001

### Table 7.3 Comparison of Number of International Undergraduate Students by National University Selectivity Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Selective vs. Less Selective</td>
<td>88.19*</td>
<td>21.34</td>
<td>44.96, 131.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean Comparisons based on ANCOVA adjusted means controlling for the total number of Undergraduate Students (#US).
*p<.05
As presented in Tables 6.2, 7.2, and 8.2, three types of overall student populations (#S, #US, and #GS [covariates]) were statistically associated with three types of international student populations (#IS, #IUS, and #IGS), #S: F(1, 37)=87.87, p<.001; #US: F(1, 37)=4.52, p<.05; #GS: F(1, 37)=288.30, p<.001. Regarding all three, international student population types of national universities: #IS, #IUS, and #IGS, on average, both adjusted means for #IS, #IUS, and #IGS, provided in Tables 6.2, 7.2, and 8.2, and the mean differences between the two selectivity types, shown in Tables 6.3, 7.3, and 8.3, indicate that more selective national universities had larger numbers of international students than those of less selective national universities. Even when the influence of the above covariates, i.e. the three types of overall student populations (#S, #US, and
was controlled, selectivity type’s main effect on international student numbers (#IS, #IUS, and #IGS) was significant, and the #IS, #IUS, and #IGS of more selective national universities were also statistically larger than those of less selective national universities as shown in the above Tables 6.2, 6.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.2, and 8.3. #IS: F(1, 37)=13.58, p<.005; #IUS: F(1, 37)=17.09, p<.001; #IGS; F(1, 37)=11.45, p<.005. Thus, amongst all three types of international student populations: (1) total number of international students, (2) number of international undergraduate students, and (3) number of international graduate students, results statistically indicated that more selective national universities had significantly larger numbers of international students than those of less selective national universities. For national universities, ANCOVA results also confirmed selectivity type’s significant main effect on each of the above three types of international student populations.

In the case of private universities, as with national universities, three types of overall student populations (#S, #US, and #GS [covariates]) were statistically associated with three types of international student populations (#IS, #IUS, and #IGS), #S: F(1, 37)=51.10, p<.001; #US: F(1, 37)=17.17, p<.001; #GS: F(1, 37)=138.39, p<.001. Controlling for covariates, i.e. the three types of overall student populations (#S, #US, and #GS), selectivity type’s main effect on international student numbers (#IS, #IUS, and #IGS) were significant, and the #IS, #IUS, and #IGS of less selective private universities were all statistically larger than those of more selective private universities, #IS: F(1, 37)=8.29, p<.01; #IUS: F(1, 37)=5.51, p<.05; #IGS; F(1, 37)=10.59, p<.005. As opposed to the two national university types, these results statistically indicated that less selective private universities had significantly larger numbers of international students than those of more selective private universities in all the three international student population types: (1)
total number of international students, (2) number of international undergraduate students, and (3) number of international graduate students. Additionally, as with the case of national universities, these ANCOVA results revealed selectivity type’s significant main effect on each of the above three types of international student populations.

- **Vision and Plans for Recruitment of International Students and Selectivity Types**

Universities’ vision and plans for the recruitment of international students (to increase the number of international students) were examined according to universities’ responses to relevant survey questions. Specifically, these examined survey questions were: (1) whether a university has a vision and mission statement for admitting international students; (2) whether a university has a numerical target for recruiting international students; and (3) for which academic program(s) a university has plans to increase international student numbers (see survey questions II-3 and 4, as well as III-1-i in Appendix D). A chi-square test and Fisher’s exact test were performed to analyze differences between more selective and less selective national universities regarding their responses to the aforementioned three survey questions. Table 9.1 and 9.2 below depict both response frequencies and percentages of responses by national university selectivity type, as well as the statistical test results of these responses.

**Table 9.1 Vision/Mission Statement and Numerical Recruiting Target for International Students by National University Selectivity Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your institution have...?</th>
<th>Selectivity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Selective</td>
<td>Less Selective</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision and Mission Statement for Admitting...</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>11 (61.1%)</td>
<td>9 (52.9%)</td>
<td>20 (57.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>7 (38.9%)</td>
<td>8 (47.1%)</td>
<td>15 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numerical Target of Recruiting...</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>3 (17.6%)</td>
<td>6 (37.5%)</td>
<td>9 (27.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>14 (82.4%)</td>
<td>10 (62.5%)</td>
<td>24 (72.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2(1, N=35)=0.23, \text{ ns}\]

\[X^2(1, N=33)=1.64, \text{ ns}\]
Table 9.2 Academic Programs Planned to Increase International Student numbers by Institutional and Selectivity Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Programs</th>
<th>Selectivity</th>
<th>More Selective</th>
<th>Less Selective</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange (Undergraduate) Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange (Graduate) Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to both having a numerical target for recruiting international students and planning to admit more international students into their undergraduate programs, as well as into their graduate programs (master’s and doctoral programs), Tables 9.1 and 9.2 above show that less selective national universities had higher frequencies and percentages than those of more selective national universities. Regarding an institution’s vision and mission for admitting international students, more selective national universities had a marginally higher frequency and percentage (61.1%) than those of less selective national universities (52.9%). However, these tendencies were not statistically significant according to the results of chi-square tests and Fisher’s exact tests. Interestingly, however, on one hand, a higher percentage of less selective national universities had their numerical targets of recruiting international students at 37.5% than those of more selective
national universities at 17.6%. On the other hand, less selective national universities showed a lower percentage of having visions and mission statements for admitting international students than that of more selective national universities. Coupled with the aforementioned, less selective national universities’ higher percentages of planning to increase the number of international students for their undergraduate and graduate programs, this could possibly reflect not only less selective national universities’ lack of enrollment management and leadership but also their mere desire to recruit more international students. In other words, compared to more selective national universities, less selective national universities did not have their own visions and mission statements for admitting international students but instead set numerical recruitment goals in order to cope with their current, and/or foreseeable, enrollment problems. In addition, although more selective universities seemed to have established visions and missions for admitting international students, these institutions did not perceive the need for setting numerical targets for recruiting international students, possibly because they neither had ongoing enrollment problems nor perceived future enrollment problems, especially when compared to less selective national universities.

In the case of private institutions, by contrast, more selective private universities had larger frequencies and percentages than those of less selective private universities with regards to: (1) having a vision and mission statement for admitting international students; (2) having a numerical target for recruiting international students; and (3) planning to increase the number of international students within all academic programs. The results of Fisher’s exact tests indicated that the first two findings were statistically significant for both types of institutions. First, with regards to having a vision and mission statement for admitting international students, the percentage of more
selective private universities (50%) was higher than the percentage of less selective private universities at 9.1%, $X^2(1, N=27)=4.91, p<.05$. Second, 40% of more selective private universities had numerical targets for recruiting international students, whereas none of the less selective private universities had such targets, $X^2(1, N=24)=4.80, p<.05$.

Selectivity Indices of Universities and International Students' Contribution to Student Intake

Both the relationship between the selectivity indices of universities responding to the survey questionnaire (62 national universities and 27 private universities) and the degree of importance (the scores ranged from 1 to 5 on the Likert scale) to one survey question related to the admission objectives for international students were statistically examined. This survey question asked how important is it to admit international students in order to solely contribute to meeting an institution’s authorized enrollment quotas (see survey question II-1-vii in Appendix D). Within national universities, selectivity indices ($M=71.56, SD=8.41$) negatively associated with the degree of importance of international students’ contributions to overall student intake ($M=3.15, SD=1.32$) at the .05 significant level, $r(62)=-.267, p=.036$. This correlation indicated national universities with lower selectivity indices tended to attach more importance to admitting international students for meeting their enrollment quotas as authorized by MEXT. Similar results were found within private universities, as selectivity indices ($M=51.45, SD=10.10$) negatively associated with the degree of importance of international students’ contributions to overall student intake ($M=2.78, SD=1.24$) at the .05 significant level, $r(23)=-.420, p=.046$. This correlation also indicated a tendency whereby the lower the selectivity indices of private universities were, the more those institutions placed importance on recruiting international students for meeting their authorized enrollment quotas.
 Interviews

One of the vice presidents (in charge of internationalization) in the group of more selective national universities expressed his views regarding the priority of host programs for international student recruitment as follows:

Our university would definitely like to recruit international students more for our graduate programs. This is partly because we have expanded our graduate schools under the MEXT’s structural reform policy [called “daigakuin jutenka” in Japanese] to prioritize graduate programs over undergraduate programs within leading national universities. In our university, this expansion includes not only the increase of graduate schools’ enrollment quotas but also the establishment of new graduate schools and programs. After the expansion, it hasn’t been easy to maintain the quality of students in larger capacity graduate programs with only Japanese students. Therefore, in order to both maintain the quality of graduate students and the strength of research capability, as well as to maximize the benefits of the graduate school’s expansion, recruiting high-caliber international students for our graduate programs is one of our vital efforts.

In this regard, another vice president of a more selective national university concurred and added his perception regarding international students as an integral part of a global research institution:

Also, to be a global research institution, we really need a large number of international students from all over the world, especially in our graduate programs. We believe that a diversified student population is an essential part to reinforce the international dimension of our research activities.

After he articulated a higher priority for the graduate program to host international students above, he also mentioned the undergraduate program from a viewpoint of hosting international students:

We also understand the importance of increasing more international students in our undergraduate programs in order to cultivate the intercultural awareness and competence of

---

238 In the 1990’s, MEXT took the initiative in reforming graduate schools of leading national universities structurally in order to reinforce the research capacity of these institutions. Before the reform, the undergraduate program/school was the principle body of research and education in the university. Accordingly, faculty members were appointed to an appropriate unit of the undergraduate program/school, and the graduate school was loosely attached to that unit like an appendage. However, under the reform, the graduate school became the principle body of university’s research functions, and the undergraduate program/school was accordingly changed to be an appendage of the graduate school. At the same time, the authorized enrollment quotas of graduate programs, especially master’s programs, were greatly increased as part of this reform. Also, the budget for those leading national universities, where graduate schools were reformed in this way, was increased.

239 Interview with the Vice President of University W, January 30, 2007.

240 Interview with the Vice President of University X, February 9, 2007.
Japanese students during our four-year programs. However, we haven’t taken specific measures to recruit more degree-seeking international students for our undergraduate programs apart from exchange students. We have a plan to increase the number of partner institutions abroad to have more exchange students in our undergraduate programs. In this way, we can also send more of our undergraduate students to those partner universities abroad.

One of the vice presidents (in charge of internationalization) in the group of less selective national universities also stated a higher priority in admitting more international students to graduate programs than into undergraduate programs, yet for a different reason from the above, more selective national universities:

We would like to recruit international students more for our graduate programs first. I am sure not only our university but also many national universities which are situated in provincial areas have varying degrees enrollment problems within their graduate programs. In our graduate programs, enrollment problems are more serious in the humanities and social sciences than in the hard sciences. I hate to admit it, but in fact it isn’t easy to meet the authorized enrollment quotas of our troubled graduate programs without international students. So, we certainly need international graduate students to maintain our graduate programs.241

Similarly, another vice president of a less selective national university also mentioned both graduate school enrollment problems and the necessity of admitting international students to maintain graduate programs, additionally citing another problem relative to this matter:

International graduate students certainly contribute to solving our enrollment problems in some troubled graduate programs. However, at the same time, those graduate programs face difficulties in conducting classes because of the excessive concentration of international students, for example, about 80 percent of enrolled students are international students in some programs.242

Furthermore, he talked about the institution’s undergraduate program and its international students:

Our university is still very attractive to high school students in this region, considering our reasonable tuition fees as well as better educational conditions and reputation, compared

241 Interview with the Vice President of University Y, February 20, 2007.
242 Interview with the Vice President of University Z, February 27, 2007.
with neighboring private institutions. Therefore, we don’t have an enrollment problem as far as the number of applicants is concerned.

The previously mentioned vice president of a less selective national university had almost the same opinion with the above vice president regarding his institution’s undergraduate programs and further mentioned another issue in this regard:

However, some natural science faculties complain about the deteriorating academic ability of [Japanese] undergraduate students. It is mainly caused by the demographic shift of our applicants towards not well-prepared students, stemming from a combination of a sharp decline in the college-age population in Japan and losing interest in science among Japanese children. So, in order to solve this problem, those hard science faculties express a desire to recruit well-qualified international students for their undergraduate programs to maintain the academic ability of students. However, we haven’t implemented specific measures yet.

In terms of tuition/cost recovery and international students, both vice presidents of more selective national universities were not overly concerned about the financial contribution of incoming international students and were not cost-conscious about international student increases.

One of the vice presidents of a more selective national university explained:

In our university, fortunately, approximately 45% of international students are funded by either the Japanese government or its related agencies like JICA [Japan International Cooperation Agency]. And a half of the privately-financed students receive some sort of scholarship from various educational foundations [non-governmental foundations]. We don’t expect an increase of tuition revenue from international students and are not so cost-conscious about it as the number of international students grows. It certainly costs a lot of money to provide special services, such as a Japanese language program, advising services, housing services, and so on, for international students in order to accommodate their special needs. But we have to provide better services for our international students at any cost because these services are also crucial to attracting highly qualified international students.

Moreover, he remarked on his university’s efforts to expand its scholarship program for international students:

---

243 JICA is an independent administrative institution established under legal provisions of 2002, to contribute to economic and social advancement in developing countries and help expedite Japan’s international cooperation.
In order to recruit highly potential international students, we will increase our own scholarships next year in collaboration with our alumni association and companies. In this vein, we have already established our own foundation for education and research to accelerate our fund-raising activities after the national university corporatization.

Also, both vice presidents of less selective national universities, when considering the nature of the government-led promotion aiming to increase the number of international students as a part of the Japanese government’s international aid efforts, said that they did not expect a significant financial contribution from international student intake. Rather, they stressed the importance of the MEXT’s financial support for international students as well as special services and support programs for them. One of the vice presidents of a less selective national university spoke about this matter:

Before the national university corporatization, we received the substantial amount of earmarked funds for our educational and assistance programs, exclusively for international students. However, after the corporatization, the MEXT now gives us block grants without earmarks and we can decide the internal allocation of the grants within the university. This is good for us in general, but it is not so good for international education in particular because, from the broader perspective of the university operation, the priority of international education isn’t considered higher than other educational and research activities, which are so-called “the main functions of education and research.” As a result, it is not easy to maintain those special programs for international students. We are now even considering reducing our tutorial service for international students.

Yet another, vice president of a less selective national university pointed out similar difficulties and added his worries about scholarship allocation problems:

In a way, the number of international students in our university depends on Japanese government scholarships and other financial assistance programs for international students. We worry about the fact that the percentage of Japanese government scholarship students has decreased little by little as the total number of international students has increased in the country. Plus, the total percentage of international students who receive scholarships including non-governmental ones in our university is much lower than those of leading national universities like former imperial universities. And yet we can’t afford to establish our own scholarship programs for international students. Without scholarships, it is difficult for universities in local cities like us to attract a large number of international students.
In summary, the above interviews, with two vice presidents of more selective national universities and two other vice presidents of less selective national universities, attested that: (1) as a host program to recruit international students with different motivations, both types of national universities gave priority to their graduate programs over their undergraduate programs; (2) to both recruit highly qualified students and to strengthen their respective institutions’ international research dimensions, more selective universities’ motivations were to meet the authorized enrollment quotas of their expanding graduate programs; (3) less selective universities’ motivations were to sustain and maintain their current graduate programs, without falling below their authorized enrollment quotas; (4) Japanese government scholarships and financial assistance programs for international students played an important role in, and were important tools for, recruiting international students at both types of national universities; (5) both types of national universities did not expect a significant financial contribution of international students as a result of the government’s international student policy (“foreign-aid approach”); (6) more selective national universities, at their own expense, indicated the financial capacity to provide international students with special programs and support service, in addition to having collaborative scholarship programs for international students with alumni associations and the business sector; and (7) less selective national universities relied heavily upon government subsides and financial assistance programs for international education, eventually, facing financial difficulties in their special programs and support services for international students particularly following national university corporatization.
Summary

The findings of this study partially supported hypothesis 1. Overall, more selective national universities had significantly larger numbers of international students than those of less selective national universities within all three types of international student populations: total (entire), undergraduate, and graduate. And this study revealed selectivity type’s significant main effect on each of the above three types of international student populations. Moreover, in both their entire student populations and undergraduate student populations, more selective national universities had significantly larger proportions of international students than those of less selective universities. Furthermore, in terms of their total international student populations, more selective universities had a significantly larger proportion of international graduate students than those of less selective universities (less selective universities had a significantly larger proportion of international undergraduate students than those of more selective universities). And selectivity indices were strong predictors with respect to international student proportions in the student populations of national universities (national universities with higher selectivity indices tended to have higher percentages of international students in their entire student populations and to have higher percentages of international graduate students in their total international student populations respectively). In addition, national universities with lower selectivity indices tended to place more importance to admitting international students for meeting their enrollment quotas as authorized by MEXT.

Interview findings revealed that both more selective and less selective national universities sought international students mainly for their graduate programs. On one hand, more selective national universities downplayed the importance of tuition/cost recovery and showed the intention
of a self-financing, proactive approach towards international student recruitment. On the other hand, less selective national universities had financial difficulties with their special programs and support services for international students, particularly after national university corporatization, and instead emphasized the sustainability of their current graduate programs regarding international student recruitment.

The following is a summary of the findings of hypothesis 1:

1. **Statistical Analyses of University Survey**

   - Both in their entire and undergraduate student populations, more selective national universities had significantly larger proportions of international students than those of less selective national universities.

   - With regard to total international student populations, more selective national universities had significantly larger proportions of international graduate students than those of less selective national universities.

   - With regard to total international student populations, less selective national universities had significantly larger proportions of international undergraduate students than those of more selective national universities.

   - National universities with higher selectivity indices tended to have higher percentages of international students within their entire student populations.

   - National universities with higher selectivity indices tended to have higher percentages of international graduate students within their total international student populations.

   - National universities with higher selectivity indices tended to have lower percentages of international undergraduate students within their total international student populations.

   - Overall, it could be said that selectivity indices were strong predictors with respect to international student proportions in the student populations of national universities.

   - Statistically, more selective national universities had significantly larger numbers of international students than those of less selective national universities in all the three types of international student populations: (1) total number of international students, (2) number of international undergraduate students, and (3) number of international graduate students. Also, germane and central to this study was selectivity type’s significant main effect on each of the above three types of international student populations.
With respect to having both numerical targets for recruiting international students and plans for admitting more international students into undergraduate as well as graduate programs, less selective national universities had higher frequencies and percentages than those of more selective national universities.

Regarding an institution’s vision and mission for admitting international students, more selective national universities had a marginally higher frequency and percentage (61.1%) than those of less selective national universities (52.9%).

National universities with lower selectivity indices tended to attach more importance to admitting international students for meeting their enrollment quotas authorized by MEXT.

2. Interviews with Vice Presidents

As a preferred, host program to recruit international students with different motivations, both more selective national universities and less selective national universities gave priority to, and favored, their graduate programs over undergraduate programs.

More selective national universities’ motivations were to meet the authorized enrollment quotas of their expanding graduate programs with highly qualified students to strengthen the international dimensions of their research capacity (to be a global research institution).

Less selective national universities’ motivations were to sustain their current graduate programs without falling below their authorized enrollment quotas.

Japanese government scholarships and financial assistance programs for international students played an important role in recruiting international students in both types of national universities.

Neither more selective national universities nor less selective national universities expected a considerable financial contribution from international student populations when considering the government’s international student policy (“foreign-aid approach”).

Having their own scholarship programs in collaboration with support from their alumni associations and the business sector, more selective universities indicated their financial ability to self-finance and provide international students with special programs and support services.

Less selective national universities relied heavily upon government subsides and financial assistance programs for international education and, following national university corporatization, their special programs and support services for international students faced financial difficulties.
Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis stated that more selective national universities would recruit highly qualified students from the international student market outside Japan, whereas less selective national universities would recruit primarily from the international student market within Japan.

Measures for Approaching International Student Market Outside Japan (Implementation) and Selectivity Types

In order to examine this hypothesis, this study initially had a plan to look into the demographic data of international student applicants including the number of applications originating from outside Japan, that were collected from the Survey Questionnaire (see survey question I-7 in Appendix D). However, the number of responses to that particular survey question was insufficient to be statistically analyzed by university selectivity type. Therefore, regarding the implementation of measures for recruiting international students, universities’ responses to the survey’s other questions were examined. Accordingly, relevant responses to survey questions about recruitment approaches for prospective international students residing outside Japan were statistically analyzed as follows: whether a university (1) has a system to recruit prospective international students who reside outside Japan (international student market outside Japan approach); (2) participates in university fairs abroad; (3) is increasing the number of its partner institutions abroad; (4) has a university preparatory or/and Japanese language program for international students before they matriculate; (5) conducts an entrance examination abroad; (6) collaborates with Japanese embassies or consulates or/and governmental agencies’ branch offices abroad; (7) works with a study abroad agent in a foreign country; (8) has an overseas office; (9) has a twinning program with an institution abroad; (10) has a short-term program conducted in
English to accept exchange or study abroad students; (11) has a degree-granting program conducted in English; and (12) has international alumni association chapters (see survey questions V-1 and III-1 in Appendix D). Additionally, for comparison, survey questions relevant to measures for recruiting prospective international students already residing in Japan\(^{244}\) (recruitment approaches for the domestic, international student market) included: whether a university (13) has a system of admission based upon recommendations by Japanese language schools in Japan, and (14) encourages their international undergraduate students to continue their graduate studies at the same institution (see survey question III-1 in Appendix D).

A **chi-square test** and **Fisher’s exact test** were performed to examine differences between more selective and less selective national universities concerning their responses to the above-mentioned 14 surveyed questions. Table 10 below illustrates not only response frequencies and percentages by national university selectivity type but also the statistical test results of these responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your institution have…?</th>
<th>Selectivity Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Selective</td>
<td>Less Selective</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. System to Recruit Prospective International Students Who Reside Outside Japan</td>
<td>Yes Count % within Selectivity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.1% 41.2% 51.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Count % within Selectivity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.9% 58.8% 48.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participating in University Fairs Abroad</td>
<td>Yes Count % within Selectivity</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.1% 87.5% 90.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Count % within Selectivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.9% 12.5% 9.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increasing Partner Institutions Abroad</td>
<td>Yes Count % within Selectivity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.5% 68.8% 72.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Count % within Selectivity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.5% 31.3% 27.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{244}\) They are already enrolled in either Japanese language schools or undergraduate programs of Japanese universities and are eligible to be international student applicants for, and further studies at Japanese higher education institutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Preparatory/Language Program for Non-matriculated Students</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Selectivity</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>N=33, Fisher's exact test, ns.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Entrance Exam. Abroad</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N=33, Fisher's exact test, ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaborating with Japanese Embassies and Gov. Agencies Abroad</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N=33, Fisher's exact test, ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Working with Study Abroad Agent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N=33, No analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Own Overseas Office</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N=33, Fisher's exact test, ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Twinning Program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N=33, Fisher's exact test, ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Short-term Program Conducted in English</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N=33, Fisher's exact test, ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X²(1, N=35)=3.44, p&lt;.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Degree-granting Program Conducted in English</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>N=33, Fisher's exact test, ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X²(1, N=33)=3.69, p&lt;.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Int'l Chapters of Alumni Association</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fisher's exact test, p&lt;.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X²(1, N=33)=8.36, p&lt;.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Admission upon Recommendation by Domestic Language Schools</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N=33, No analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Encouraging Undergraduate Students to Go on to Own Graduate School</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N=33, Fisher's exact test, ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in Table 10, between more selective national universities and less selective national universities, strictly speaking, none of the above 14 items showed statistically significant differences in the implementation of measures for recruiting international students, including item 1 regarding systematic recruitment approaches for the international student market outside Japan. Although item 1 attested to an opposite tendency between the two types of institutions (61.1% of more selective national universities had a system to recruit prospective students residing outside Japan whereas 58.8% of less selective national universities did not), this difference, given the chi-square results, was not significantly greater than what could be expected by chance. Nevertheless, between the two types of institutions, three marginally significant findings were found relative to the .10 alpha level. First, referring to item 10 in Table 10, more selective national universities had a higher overall percentage of short-term programs conducted in English at 72.2%, with less selective national universities showing a lower percentage at 41.2%, $X^2(1, N=35)=3.44, p<.10$. Second, referring to item 11 in the same table, the percentage of more selective national universities having a degree-granting program conducted in English (64.7%) was higher than the overall percentage (31.3%) at less selective national universities, $X^2(1, N=33)=3.69, p<.10$. Third, regarding item 12 in Table 10, 41.2% of more selective national universities had international alumni association chapters, whereas none of the less selective national universities had this kind of international network, $X^2(1, N=33)=8.36, p<.10$. Furthermore, referring to items 4 and 8 in Table 10, a higher percentage of more selective national universities (41.2%) had both a preparatory/language programs for non-matriculated students and overseas office (23.5%) than less selective national university percentages of preparatory/language programs and overseas offices (18.8% and 6.3% respectively), though, both were not statistically significant. Based upon
these statistical analysis results, strictly speaking, while less selective national universities focused primarily on the international student market within Japan, more selective national universities did not appear to actively approach the international student market outside Japan. Nevertheless, from those marginally significant findings and other relevant findings described above, it could be said that more selective national universities, compared with less selective national universities, generally showed a tendency to actively approach the international student market outside Japan.

As with national universities, the statistical analysis of the same items listed on Table 10 for private universities exhibited similar findings. That is to say, there were no statistically significant differences between more selective private universities and less selective private universities relative to the .05 standard alpha level. However, between the two types of institutions, there were three marginally significant findings relative to the alpha level of .10. First (referring again to item 10 in Table 10), a higher percentage of more selective private universities (62.5%) than less selective private universities (27.3%) had short-term programs conducted in English, \( X^2(1, N=27)=3.24, p<.10. \) Second (in item 12 on Table 10), 57.1% of less selective private universities had international alumni association chapters, whereas only 13.3% of more selective private universities did, \( X^2(1, N=22)=4.62, p<.10; \) Fisher’s exact test, \( p<.10. \) Third (in item 13 on Table 10), with regards to having an admission system based upon recommendations by Japanese language schools in Japan, 57.1% of less selective private universities maintained such a system compared with the lower, overall percentage (13.3%) of more selective private universities, \( X^2(1, N=22)=4.61, p<.10; \) Fisher’s exact test, \( p<.10. \)
Both vice presidents of more selective national universities said their institutions had a system to recruit prospective international students from outside Japan, but not all faculties and departments had this system. One vice president explained his university’s situation:

In our university, more than a half of the graduate programs recruit prospective international students residing outside Japan. Those graduate programs which are conducted in English actively approach the international student market outside Japan. However, those graduate programs conducted in Japanese are not so active. In the case of our undergraduate programs, a majority of them don’t recruit prospective international students residing outside Japan because all the undergraduate programs are conducted in Japanese except a special program mainly for exchange students from our partner universities abroad.245

Another vice president of a more selective national university similarly described his institution’s situation and added language and discipline issues in this regard:

From our experiences, approaching the international student market outside Japan is rewarded if a program is taught in English. And English-based graduate programs in the natural sciences and engineering are better to attract prospective international students living in their home countries. We have such kinds of graduate programs and these programs have quite successfully recruited a good number of high-quality students. On the other hand, it is difficult for Japanese-based academic programs to recruit many qualified international students in foreign countries even if there is a larger international student pool outside Japan and these academic programs are well-promoted there.246

Both vice presidents of less selective national universities mentioned their institutions did not have a system to recruit prospective international students from outside Japan. One vice president spoke about his university’s situation and its background:

We accept applications from abroad, but all the academic programs of our university require international student applicants to take their entrance examinations and interviews on campus. Therefore, we have very few international applicants living outside Japan. Also, we don’t have any programs conducted in English, and our university isn’t located in a big city like Tokyo. Under these circumstances, realistically, we don’t think our university can

245 Interview with the Vice President of University W, January 30, 2007.
246 Interview with the Vice President of University X, February 9, 2007.
attract many prospective international students who haven’t come to Japan yet. So, perhaps, approaching the international student market outside has little worth for us.\textsuperscript{247}

Another vice president of a less selective national university shared an almost similar institutional view with the above-mentioned less selective national university vice president, stating difficulties with the establishment of English-based programs:

If possible, we would like to have some English-based programs and approach the international student market outside Japan. However, because of our financial constraints, which are mainly caused by decreasing government subsidies, and a lack of personnel who can teach courses in English, we can’t afford to establish such kind of program. It is very difficult for a university located in a local city like us to acquire internationally trained faculty and staff members in order to establish an English-based academic program. It might be easy for a university in Tokyo, though.\textsuperscript{248}

In terms of screening methods for residing-abroad international student applicants, one, vice president of a more selective national university explained:

“Document screening only” is the basic selection criteria for international students applying from outside Japan. Some of our graduate school departments interview those international applicants either at our overseas branch [liaison] offices or through the Internet [by video cam]. At any rate, for better document screening, we should improve our skills for the foreign credential evaluation process of relative documents submitted by those international applicants.

Another more selective national university vice president remarked on the same methods and issue above, additionally speaking about the recruiting measures for prospective international students outside Japan:

While we are increasing both our English-based academic programs and our scholarship numbers for international students who apply from outside Japan, we are also developing our recruitment activities abroad by utilizing our international networks, for example, our alumni association’s chapters, liaison offices, and partner institutions overseas.

\textsuperscript{247} Interview with the Vice President of University Y, February 20, 2007.
\textsuperscript{248} Interview with the Vice President of University Z, February 27, 2007.
On the other hand, both vice presidents of less selective national universities said they did not have a plan to approach the international student market outside Japan actively in the near future and expressed their concerns about admitting international students without an entrance examination and interview on campus. One vice president referred to this matter:

Considering the size and capacity of our university, probably we will continuously recruit international students from the domestic applicant pool, specifically, students of Japanese language schools, university undergraduate programs, junior colleges, and vocational schools located in Japan. Among faculty and staff, there is a sort of reluctance to admit international students without an entrance examination and interview. Even though the MEXT and JASSO [Japan Student Services Organization] strongly promote the recruitment of international students outside Japan along with the EJU [Examination for Japanese University Admission for International Students] among Japanese universities, we don’t have so much confidence in the so-called “document screening only” evaluation method. We have often heard of credibility problems concerning EJU scores and bogus transcripts and diplomas specifically from developing countries.

Moreover, another vice president of a less selective national university spoke about some benefits of recruiting prospective international students residing in Japan:

A majority of those international students who are already in Japan as students enrolled in language schools or some other form of higher education can acquire enough Japanese language proficiency to be ready to take academic programs conducted in Japanese and are familiar with Japanese culture by the time they are admitted by our university. Therefore, they can pretty much arrange their life and study by themselves and don’t need so much support from us [the university] when entering our academic programs.

In summary, from the above interviews with two vice presidents of more selective national universities and two other vice presidents of less selective national universities, findings attested to: (1) more selective national universities having a system to recruit prospective international

---

249 The Japan Student Services Organization (JASSO) is both an independent administrative institution operating under the auspices of the MEXT and a core and leading organization for the provision of student services. JASSO comprehensively administers scholarship and loan programs, support programs for international students, and various kinds of other student support programs.

250 EJU is a testing program used to evaluate whether international student applicants who wish to study at universities or other kinds of higher educational institutions in Japan possess the Japanese language skills and the basic academic abilities needed to study at those institutions. The EJU test is held at 16 cities in 13 countries outside Japan, as well as at 20 test centers in 15 cities inside Japan. It is administered by JASSO.
students who reside outside Japan, but not in all faculties and departments (in particular, English-based graduate programs actively approached the international student market outside Japan); (2) approaches for recruiting from the international student market outside being successful if a program was taught in English; (3) English-based graduate programs in the natural sciences and engineering were better in attracting prospective students from the international student market outside Japan; (4) less selective national universities not having a system for recruiting prospective international students who reside outside Japan (due to on-campus entrance examination and interview requirements for international applicants, in addition to having no existing English-based academic programs); (5) less selective national universities having difficulties in establishing English-based academic programs because of financial constraints and lack of human resources; (6) “document screening only” was the basic selection criteria for international students applying from outside Japan and that further foreign credential evaluation should be improved to enhance this assessment method; (7) while increasing both their English-based academic programs and the number of scholarships for international students who apply from outside Japan, more selective national universities were developing their recruitment activities abroad by utilizing their international networks, for example, their alumni association’s chapters, liaison offices, and partner institutions overseas; (8) less selective national universities not having plans to approach the international student market outside Japan actively in the near future (they would continuously recruit international students from a domestic applicant pool, such as students already enrolled in either Japanese language schools or some other form of higher education in Japan); (9) less selective national universities were concerned about admitting international students without an entrance examination and interview on campus; (10) less selective national universities found
benefits in recruiting prospective international students already residing in Japan, as they had a better grasp of Japanese language, could readily adapt culturally, and in turn, these international students often did not need much support from hosting universities.

Summary

Overall, the findings of this study partially supported hypothesis 2. First, the findings of the statistical analyses did not clearly support the hypothesis, showing only a marginal tendency that more selective national universities approached the international student market outside Japan more actively than less selective national universities. The interview findings, however, which supplemented the findings of the statistical analyses, found that: (1) more selective national universities tended to recruit prospective international students who reside outside Japan more eagerly than less selective national universities (in particular, more selective national universities’ English-based graduate programs actively approached the international student market outside Japan); and (2) less selective national universities had a tendency to recruit primarily from the international student market within Japan (international students enrolled in Japanese language schools and/or some other form of higher education in Japan). Moreover, while more selective national universities were increasing both their English-based academic programs and scholarship numbers for international students who apply from outside Japan, they were also developing their recruitment activities abroad by utilizing their international networks (their alumni association’s chapters, liaison offices, and partner institutions overseas). On the other hand, less selective national universities had difficulties in establishing English-based academic programs because of financial constraints and a lack of human resources. However, less selective national universities found benefits in recruiting prospective international students residing in Japan: these students had
stronger Japanese language abilities along with better cultural adaptation strategies, and in turn, often did not need much support from hosting universities.

The following is a summary of hypothesis 2 findings:

1. **Statistical Analyses of University Survey**
   - A significantly higher percentage of more selective national universities than less selective national universities had short-term programs conducted in English.
   - A significantly higher percentage of more selective national universities than less selective national universities maintained degree-granting programs conducted in English.
   - A little less than half of more selective national universities had international alumni associations, whereas none of the less selective national universities had this kind of international network.
   - Marginally higher percentages of more selective national universities than less selective national universities had both preparatory/language programs for non-matriculated students and overseas offices.
   - A marginally higher percentage of more selective national universities than less selective national universities had a system to recruit prospective students residing outside Japan.

2. **Interviews with Vice Presidents**
   - More selective national universities (but not all the faculties and departments) had a system to recruit prospective international students residing outside Japan (in particular, English-based graduate programs that actively approached the international student market outside Japan).
   - Approaching the international student market outside Japan was more successful if a program was taught in English.
   - English-based graduate programs in the natural sciences and engineering were more attractive to prospective students in the international student market outside Japan.
   - Due to on-campus entrance examination and interview requirements for international applicants, as well as no existence of English-based academic programs, less selective national universities did not have a functioning system to recruit prospective international students residing outside Japan.
Less selective national universities had difficulties in establishing English-based academic programs because of financial constraints and lack of human resources.

“Document screening only” was the basic selection criterion for international students applying from outside Japan, yet skills for a foreign credential evaluation process should be improved to both enhance and supplement this screening method.

While more selective national universities eagerly attempted to increase both their English-based academic programs and scholarship numbers for international students who apply from outside Japan, these universities were also developing recruitment activities abroad by utilizing their international networks, for example, their alumni association’s chapters, liaison offices, and partner institutions overseas.

Though continuously recruiting international students from a domestic applicant pool: students enrolled in Japanese language schools and/or some other form of higher education in Japan, less selective national universities did not have plans to approach the international student market outside Japan actively in the near future.

Less selective national universities were concerned about admitting international students without taking an on-campus entrance examination and interview.

Less selective national universities found benefits in recruiting prospective international students residing in Japan, as they had a better grasp of Japanese language, could readily adapt culturally and these international students often did not need much support from hosting universities.

Additional Analyses: Recruiting Prospective International Students Outside Japan

Universities’ approaches to the international student market outside Japan were investigated from a different, more comprehensive angle whereby all universities’ responses to survey questions relevant to this topic were examined.

First, responses to the survey question of whether or not a university has a system to recruit prospective international students who reside outside Japan (see survey question V-1 in Appendix D) were tabulated by institutional type below.
As seen in Table 11, in total, half of the responding universities systematically recruited students from the international student market outside Japan. By institutional type, a little less than half (46.8%) of the national universities had this kind of recruiting system, whereas more than half (60.0%) of the private universities did so.

Second, those departments which systematically recruited prospective international students residing outside Japan (see survey question V-2 in Appendix D) were categorized by discipline and turned them into a pie chart, Figure 5.1 below. Also, screening methods of the foregoing departments (see survey question V-2 in Appendix D) were summarized in the following pie chart, Figure 5.2.

**Figure 5.1 Departments that Systematically Recruit Prospective International Students Residing Outside Japan**
As indicated in Figure 5.1, a majority of university departments, which had a system to recruit prospective international students residing outside Japan, were in the natural sciences and engineering fields. Considering the relatively small percentage (21.2%\textsuperscript{251}) of enrolled international students within Japanese universities’ science and engineering departments, this finding could possibly attest to either science and engineering departments simply showing more positive attitudes towards approaching the international student market outside Japan (seeking a new market) than humanities and social science departments, or Japanese universities’ humanities and social sciences departments, which were content with their large international student share (63.6\%\textsuperscript{252}) (mainly recruited from the domestic market), were neither encouraged, nor thus motivated, to approach the international student market outside of Japan.\textsuperscript{253} Moreover, as seen in Figure 5.2, a little more than half (60\%) of university departments, which approached the international student market abroad, used “document screening only” criteria to determine

\textsuperscript{251} Bureau of Policy and External Relations, Japan Student Services Organization, 7.
\textsuperscript{252} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{253} Other factors should be concerned, such as lacking skilled and qualified marketing personnel and viewing recruitment outside Japan as costly.
successful international applicants. Since this screening method has become a kind of international standard, this percentage seemed to be much lower than that of other major host countries of international students, especially when considering the aforementioned finding that only a half of Japanese universities had a system to recruit international applicants residing outside Japan. Also, it should be noted that 32% of university departments either conducted both a document screening and interview (26%) or administered entrance examinations abroad (6%). This finding explained that, even when approaching an international applicant pool outside Japan, still, about one third of the said departments used the same screening criteria (i.e., an interview or/and an entrance examination) for the selection of international student applicants residing in Japan.254

Third, in Table 12 below summarizes advantages and benefits universities found in terms of recruiting prospective international students residing outside Japan (see survey question V-2 in Appendix D).

Table 12. Advantages of, and Benefits from, Recruiting Prospective International Students Who Reside Outside Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages and Benefits</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Able to reduce the financial burden on international student applicants</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A greater possibility that highly qualified international students can be recruited</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. An increase in the number of international student applicants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Able to shorten the study period in Japan for degree-seeking int'l students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 12, those four benefits and advantages could be divided into two categories of international student and applicant benefits as well as institutional advantages. The former was:

(1)255 reducing the financial burden on international student applicants, who need not come to Japan to take university entrance examinations and (4) shortening the study period in Japan for

---

254 They are already enrolled in either Japanese language schools or undergraduate programs of Japanese universities and are eligible to be international student applicants for, and further studies at Japanese higher education institutions.

255 The numbers (1) to (4) in the text correspond to items 1 to 4 in Table 12.
degree-seeking international students by not requiring them to attend a Japanese language school before matriculating to university. The latter was: (2) a greater possibility that highly qualified international students can be recruited and (3) an increase in the number of international student applicants (both advantages are manifested by accessing the larger international applicant pool outside Japan). And benefits for international students and applicants (35.6% + 11.1% = 46.7%) and advantages for universities (26.7% + 15.6% = 42.3%) were balanced.

Fourth, the reasons why universities did not recruit prospective international students who reside outside Japan were illustrated in Figure 6 below (see survey question V-4 in Appendix D).
In Figure 6 above, those Japanese universities which did not recruit prospective international students residing outside Japan expressed their reasons why they did not do so: (1) difficulties in assessing international applicants’ academic ability (25.5%) and Japanese language proficiency (20.0%); (2) concerns about admitting international students without an interview (21.4%); (3) the cumbersome procedures (6.9%) and costs (6.9%) associated with recruiting prospective
international students outside Japan; and (4) the weak credibility of documents and academic records submitted by international applicants (6.9%). In general, these findings implied that: (1) Japanese universities thought screening international student applicants by submitted documents-only was not sufficient (not a reliable method); (2) concurrently, Japanese universities would like to require international student applicants to not only take an entrance examination but also participate in an interview; and (3) a large number of fraudulent and unreliable documents, including transcripts, graduation diplomas, and financial statements, particularly from China, discouraged Japanese institutions from approaching the international student market outside Japan. In short, in determining successful applications for admissions, Japanese universities tend to give more weight to the results of their own “one-shot” entrance examinations and interviews at their campuses than the evaluation of documents and credentials submitted by international applicants regarding their educational qualifications and financial statements. This further explains and supports reasons why neither a foreign/international credential evaluation process nor an organization for that process have been developed in Japan, why international students’ countries of origin have not been well-diversified in the country, and as a consequence, though 120,000 international students study in Japan, international students from three neighboring countries: China, South Korea, and Taiwan, account for approximately 80% of Japan’s international student population.256

➢ Summary of Additional Analyses

- A little less than half (46.8%) of national universities had a system to recruit prospective international students who reside outside Japan, whereas more than half (60.0%) of private universities had this kind of recruiting system.

---

256 Bureau of Policy and External Relations, Japan Student Services Organization, 4
Natural sciences and engineering departments comprised half of university departments that had a system to recruit prospective international students residing outside Japan.

A little more than half (60%) of university departments, with approaches for the international student market outside Japan, used “document screening only” in determining successful international student applicants.

One third of the university departments, which approached the international student market outside Japan, used the same screening methods, i.e. an interview or/and an entrance examination, as selection criteria for international student applicants residing in Japan.

Reasons why Japanese universities did not recruit prospective international students residing outside Japan included: (1) difficult to assess academic ability and Japanese language proficiency of international applicants, and (2) concerns about admitting international students without an interview.

Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis stated that more selective national universities would prioritize applicants’ academic abilities over Japanese language proficiency as admission criteria, however, less selective national universities would prioritize Japanese proficiency over the academic ability as admission criteria for international applicants.

Language Requirements and Selectivity Types

In order to examine this hypothesis, this study looked into universities’ responses to survey questions relevant to the requirement of language (English and Japanese) proficiency test scores for admission and academic programs that do not require language (English and Japanese) proficiency for admission. Accordingly, those universities’ responses to the following survey questions were statistically analyzed as follows: whether a university (1) requires a “Japanese as a Foreign Language” score of the EJU\(^{257}\) for international student applicants; (2) requires a TOEFL

\(^{257}\)“Japanese as a Foreign Language” is a subject of the Examination for Japanese University Admission for International Students (EJU). EJU is administered by Japan Student Services Organization (JASSO). It is a testing program used to evaluate whether international student applicants who wish to study at universities or other kinds of higher educational institutions in Japan possess the Japanese language skills and the basic academic abilities needed to
score for international student applicants; (3) has any academic programs (degree-granting programs) that do not require Japanese language proficiency for international student applicants; and (4) has any academic programs (degree-granting programs) that do not require English proficiency for international student applicants (see survey questions IV-1 to 4 in Appendix D).

Concerning universities’ responses to the aforementioned four survey questions, a chi-square test and Fisher’s exact test were conducted to examine differences between more selective national universities and less selective national universities. Table 13 below shows the frequencies and percentages of responses by national university selectivity type as well as the statistical test results of responses.

**Table 13 Results of Chi-square Tests and Fisher’s Exact Tests: Requirement of Language Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Scores and Academic Programs not Requiring Language Proficiency by National University Selectivity Type</th>
<th>Selectivity Type</th>
<th>More Selective</th>
<th>Less Selective</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Requirement of Score of EJU’s Japanese Language Test</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Requirement of TOEFL Score</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Academic Program Not Requiring Japanese Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Academic Program Not Requiring English Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Selectivity</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=31, Fisher’s exact test, ns. 

$X^2(1, N=32)=6.79, p<.01$ 

$X^2(1, N=34)=1.80, ns.$ 

$X^2(1, N=33)=5.13, p<.05$

study at those institutions. The EJU test is held at 16 cities in 13 countries outside Japan, as well as at 20 test centers in 15 cities inside Japan.
As illustrated in Table 13, statistically significant differences in both the requirement of a TOEFL score and the presence of an academic program(s) not requiring English proficiency for international student applicants were found between more selective national universities and less selective national universities. Specifically, first, referring to item 2 in Table 13, a higher percentage of more selective national universities required a TOEFL score for international student applicants (87.5%) than less selective national universities (43.8%), $X^2(1, N=32)=6.79$, $p<.01$. Second, citing item 4, 76.5% of less selective national universities, as compared to 37.5% of more selective national universities, had an academic program(s) not requiring English proficiency, $X^2(1, N=33)=5.13$, $p<.05$. However, for international student applicants at the two types of institutions, neither statistically significant differences in the requirement of an EJU’s “Japanese as a Foreign Language” score (item 1) nor for the presence of an academic program(s) not requiring Japanese language proficiency (item 3) were attested to in the data. Though, Table 13’s item 3 showed a converse tendency between the two types of institutions (66.7% of more selective universities had an academic program(s) not requiring Japanese language proficiency for international student applicants, and 56.3% of less selective national universities did not have such kind of program), this difference was not greater than what could be expected by chance given the chi-square results. Overall, these results indicated: (1) very high percentages of both more selective national universities and less selective universities requiring an EJU’s Japanese language test score for international student applicants; (2) a significantly higher percentage of more selective national universities than less selective national universities required a TOEFL score for international student applicants; (3) a significantly higher percentage of less selective national universities than more selective national universities had an academic program(s) not requiring
English proficiency for their international student admissions; and (4) although not statistically significant, there was a marginal tendency that a higher percentage of more selective national universities than less selective national universities had an academic program(s) not requiring Japanese proficiency for their international student admissions.

In the case of private universities and relative to the standard alpha level of .05, none of the same four items listed in Table 13 showed statistically significant differences between more selective private universities and less selective private universities. It should be noted, however, that none of the less selective private universities required a TOEFL score for international applicants, and in addition, there was a marginal tendency that a lower ratio (20.0%) of less selective private universities than more selective national universities (50.0%) had an academic program(s) not requiring Japanese proficiency for their international student admissions.

**Interviews**

Both vice presidents of more selective national universities said that an applicant’s academic ability was a very important selection criterion for their international admissions. One vice president referred to this issue:

> The academic ability of international applicants is our first concern and a primary criterion for our international admissions in all the academic programs of our university. It is because our institution is a research university and, ideally, we would like to have academically stronger international students than Japanese students. And we hope those international students stimulate their Japanese peers in class.\(^{258}\)

Additionally, since a majority of their academic programs were conducted in Japanese, the vice presidents indicated that Japanese language proficiency was also a priority for their international admissions. However, they acknowledged that the importance of possessing an academic-level of

\(^{258}\) Interview with the Vice President of University W, January 30, 2007.
Japanese language proficiency varied depending on the discipline. In this regard, another vice president of a more selective national university commented:

In our university, natural science and engineering departments generally tend not to place much importance on Japanese proficiency, compared with other selection criteria of their international admissions. On the other hand, for humanities and social science departments, applicant’s proficiency in academic Japanese is the first priority.259

Also, both more selective national university vice presidents stressed the growing importance of English proficiency for their international admissions across all academic disciplines at their universities. The previously mentioned vice president explained:

English plays an increasingly important and indispensable role in today’s globalized academic world. So, in our university, a TOEFL score is becoming one of the most important application requirements in almost all the academic programs’ international admissions even though these academic programs are conducted in Japanese. It is because we use English books and materials more and more in class.

Furthermore, both the vice presidents (more selective national universities) pointed out that Japanese language proficiency should not be a barrier for high-quality, potential international students to gain admittance to their universities, and therefore, both more selective national universities were increasing English-based academic programs, especially within their graduate schools. One vice president referred to his institution’s vision:

We would like to recruit high-quality international students from various foreign countries and regions, not only from our neighboring countries, which share the same linguistic background with us. Therefore, we are trying very hard to increase English-based academic programs more, especially in our graduate programs. In turn, we will be able to have a better access to a larger international applicant pool in the world and focus more on the academic abilities when screening international applicants.

Another vice president of a more selective national university mentioned an alternative, more specific way for recruiting highly qualified international students:

259 Interview with the Vice President of University X, February 9, 2007.
In reality, it is not so easy to increase the number of English-based academic programs, especially at the undergraduate level, as well as in the humanities and social science departments. So, we are planning to expand our Japanese language program in order to admit international students who are academically well-prepared but don’t have a high command of Japanese. In other words, we would like to recruit international students who have a high, EJU academic subject score, such as in “Science” and “Mathematics”, but don’t have a high, EJU academic Japanese score.

He remarked on the above expansion of the Japanese language programs that included academic preparatory courses leading to graduate studies.

Both vice presidents of less selective national universities said that Japanese language proficiency was a primary criterion for screening international student applicants at their universities, and from their observations, this admission policy would not change in the near future.

One vice president of a less selective national university cited a course of study correlation:

In our university, Japanese language ability is virtually the first priority of our international admission criteria because all the academic programs are conducted in Japanese. From our research, we have found that international students’ Japanese language proficiency has a strong correlation with their academic performance during the course of study. So, we believe we can recruit academically well-qualified international students while screening international applicants, primarily based on their proficiency in academic Japanese.

The other vice president of a less selective national university added the following, student-life acclimation reasons for why his university prioritized Japanese language proficiency:

Not only academic programs but also student services, including the services of libraries and information technology, are mostly provided in Japanese-only. Plus, living here in this local city without a good command of Japanese would be very difficult. So, all in all, prioritizing Japanese language proficiency in our international admissions would be good for both international students and us [the university].

Additionally, both vice presidents (less selective national universities) mentioned that natural science and engineering departments of their universities would like to recruit international

---

260 Interview with the Vice President of University Y, February 20, 2007.
261 Interview with the Vice President of University Z, February 27, 2007.
students who do not have a high command of Japanese language but have advanced abilities in mathematics and science. Behind their desire, according to one vice president of a less selective national university, there was a growing concern amongst faculty and staff that recruiting highly qualified Japanese students was becoming difficult for those departments due to a sharp decline in the college-age population in Japan, academically able students’ trends of applying to universities in a large city like Tokyo, and Japanese students generally losing interest in science. However, one problem was explained by one of the vice presidents:

Our natural science and engineering departments argue that Japanese language proficiency of international students can be improved during the course of study in the departments if special, or intensive, Japanese language training is concurrently provided by the university. And I agree with their idea, however, post-national university corporatization, we can’t afford to expand our Japanese language program due to our budget constraints.

In summary, from the above interviews with two vice presidents of more selective national universities and two vice presidents of less selective national universities, it was found that: (1) in more selective national universities, the academic ability of applicants was a very important selection criterion for their international admissions, but it did not mean that Japanese language proficiency was less prioritized since a majority of their academic programs were conducted in Japanese; (2) in more selective national universities, natural science and engineering departments generally tended not to place much importance on Japanese language proficiency, compared with other selection criteria for international admissions, however, for humanities and social science departments, an applicant’s proficiency in academic Japanese was the first priority; (3) in more selective national universities, the importance of English proficiency for their international admissions increased across all academic programs (a TOEFL score became one of the most important application requirements); (4) since they thought that Japanese language proficiency
should not be a barrier for high-quality, potential international students to be admitted to their universities, more selective national universities were increasing the number of English-based academic programs, especially in their graduate schools; (5) in order to recruit academically well-prepared international students with lower Japanese-language proficiencies, more selective national universities had plans to expand their Japanese language programs; (6) with not only all academic programs but also most student services, including library and information technology services being conducted and/or provided in Japanese, for less selective national universities, Japanese language proficiency was a primary criterion for screening international student applicants; (7) in less selective national universities, natural science and engineering departments would like to admit international students who do not have a high command of Japanese language but have advanced abilities in mathematics and science, providing them with special Japanese language training, however, due to their budget constraints, they could not afford to provide such training.

➢ Summary

The findings of this study partially supported the hypothesis 3. Although statistical analyses’ findings did not clearly support the hypothesis, they nevertheless indicated very high percentages of both more selective national universities and less selective universities that required a score of EJU’s Japanese language test for international student applicants. Also, percentages showed a marginally higher tendency for more selective national universities than less selective national universities to have an academic program(s) not requiring Japanese proficiency for their international student admissions. Moreover, it was found that a significantly higher percentage of more selective national universities than less selective national universities required a TOEFL
score for international applicants. Additionally, a significantly higher percentage of less selective national universities than more selective national universities had an academic program(s) not requiring English proficiency. Thus, it could be said that more selective national universities placed greater importance on English proficiency as admission criteria than less selective national universities. Subsequently, interview findings, which supplemented statistical analyses, revealed that: (1) in more selective national universities, both academic abilities and Japanese language proficiency were regarded as important criteria for international student admissions; (2) more selective national universities were increasing the number of English-based academic programs in order to remove the language barrier in recruiting high-quality, potential international students from a larger applicant pool abroad; (3) in less selective national universities, Japanese language proficiency was a primary criterion in screening international student applicants, for not only were all academic programs conducted in Japanese, but most student-life services also were provided only in Japanese.

Overall, more selective national universities gave importance not only to academic abilities but also to Japanese proficiency as admission criteria for international applicants. On the other hand, less selective national universities primarily emphasized Japanese language proficiency as admission criteria. However, it was not so clear which admission criterion was prioritized over others in the two types of national universities.

The following is a summary of relevant findings for hypothesis 3:

1. Statistical Analyses of University Survey

- Very high percentages of both more selective national universities and less selective universities required an EJU’s Japanese language test score for international student applicants.
• A significantly higher percentage of more selective national universities than less selective national universities required a TOEFL score for international student applicants.

• A significantly higher percentage of less selective national universities than more selective national universities had an academic program(s) not requiring English proficiency for their international student admissions.

• There was a marginal tendency, although not statistically significant, that a higher percentage of more selective national universities than less selective national universities had an academic program(s) not requiring Japanese proficiency for their international student admissions.

2. Interviews with Vice Presidents

• For more selective national universities, without giving less priority to Japanese language proficiency—as a majority of academic programs are conducted in Japanese—, an applicant’s academic ability was seen as a very important selection criterion for international admissions.

• In more selective national universities, natural science and engineering departments, compared with other selection criteria of their international admissions, generally tended not to place much importance on Japanese proficiency, however, for humanities and social science departments, an applicant’s proficiency in academic Japanese was the first priority.

• In more selective national universities, the importance of English proficiency for their international admissions increased across all academic programs (a TOEFL score became one of the most important application requirements).

• Citing lack of proficiency in the Japanese language not being a barrier for high-quality, potential international students to access their universities, more selective national universities were increasing the number of English-based academic programs, especially in their graduate schools.

• More selective national universities had plans to expand their Japanese language programs in order to recruit international students who are academically well-prepared but without a high command of Japanese.

• In less selective national universities, Japanese language proficiency was a primary criterion to screen international student applicants, as not only all their academic programs but also student-life services, including library and information technology services, were conducted and/or provided in Japanese.
In less selective national universities, natural science and engineering departments would like to admit international students who have advanced abilities in mathematics and science but not a high command of the Japanese language, providing them with special Japanese language training, however, they could not afford to provide such training due to budget constraints.

Supplementary Analyses

Importance and Implementation of Recruiting Measures between Selectivity Types

In order to analyze differences between more selective national universities and less selective national universities in terms of measures to recruit international students, the data of importance levels and implementation rates by recruiting measure (see survey question III-1 in Appendix D) were plotted on the following scatter diagrams, Figures 7.1 to 9.2. First, the specific percentages of those more selective and less selective national universities which implemented some 22 recruiting measures were calculated. Likewise, percentages were calculated for those more selective and less selective national universities that rated the importance level of these 22 recruiting measures highly, i.e. checked on either 4 = “very important” or 5 = “extremely important” (on a scale of 1 to 5). Next, by plotting the paired measurements on graphs below, the relationship between the two variables, according to university type, was analyzed. Specifically, points plotted particularly towards the upper left corners of the following three, paired diagrams (Figures 7.1 and 7.2, Figures 8.1 and 8.2, and Figures 9.1 and 9.2) allowed for analytical comparisons by national university type, for example, points moving into the upper left quadrant indicated the measures of “high importance but low implementation” (important, but not implemented, measures)
Figure 7.1 Scatter Plot Graphs of Importance vs. Implementation Percentages for International Student Recruiting Measures Part. 1: More Selective Universities

Figure 7.2 Scatter Plot Graphs of Importance vs. Implementation Percentages for International Student Recruiting Measures Part. 1: Less Selective Universities
As attested to in Figure 7.1 and 7.2 above, more selective and less selective national universities (both at 93.8%) highly regarded the importance of having institutional scholarship programs for international students. However, regarding implementation rates for scholarships, a higher percentage of more selective national universities (52.9%) than less selective national universities (37.5%) actually awarded such scholarships. Second, compared to less selective national universities at 43.8%, a higher percentage of more selective national universities (62.5%) viewed receiving funds from the local community and/or business sector to assist international students as important. However, this measure’s implementation percentage also revealed that less selective national universities’ implementation rate (43.8%) was higher than more selective national universities at 23.5%. These two, seemingly conflicting findings could possibly explain that, in general, more selective national universities’ better financial situation (generous funding from government, alumni associations, and companies) enabled them to administer their own institutional, international student scholarship programs without necessarily needing supplemental (usually small scale) funding from the local community and/or business sector. Notwithstanding, the Japanese government’s recent austerity budget measures have probably changed the dynamic, and thus perception, of more selective national universities, and in this survey, these institutions have started giving more importance to fund-raising activities even at the local community and business sector levels. On the other hand, though less selective national universities’ tighter fiscal conditions (for example, less government funding than more selective national universities) prevented wider allocation of international student scholarships, their geographical locations (all provincial) have afforded, for international student assistance programs (generally small scale programs), historically better funding relationships with local community groups and businesses.
Furthermore, with respect to operating pre-matriculation, university preparatory or Japanese language programs for international students, the different fiscal realities of the two, national university groups probably accounted for the gap of their implementation rates. Specifically, in this regard, although high percentages of both national university types indicated a high regard for the importance of such programs (82.4% of more selective and 75.0% of less selective universities respectively), more selective national universities’ overall implementation percentage was higher at 41.2% than the overall percentage of less selective national universities at 18.8%.

Figure 8.1 Scatter Plot Graphs of Importance vs. Implementation Percentages for International Student Recruiting Measures Part. 2: More Selective Universities
As shown above in Figure 8.1 and 8.2, first, a higher percentage of less selective (93.8%) than more selective national universities (68.8%) considered having their own overseas office(s) as important. However, regarding this measure’s implementation, 23.5% of more selective national universities actually had overseas offices, whereas only 6.3% of less selective national universities had such offices. Similarly, though 100% of less selective national universities, as compared with 94.1% of more selective national universities, rated having an English-based degree-granting program as important, more selective national universities had, in turn, a higher implementation rate at 64.7% than less selective national universities at 31.3%. These two findings indicated, although less selective national universities were aware that English-based academic programs and overseas offices were important, they lacked the indispensable expertise, financial capacity, and human resources to implement and operate these programs. Under these circumstances, less selective national universities alternatively, and realistically, take only those
international student recruitment measures which neither require costly expenditures nor additional highly-skilled/educated human resources. For example, less selective, more than more selective national universities, tended to encourage their undergraduate international students to continue on to their graduate schools, with 31.3% of less selective national universities making such efforts while more selective national universities showed a lower implementation rate at 17.6% (though perceptions of importance by percentage favored less selective over more selective national universities, 93.8% to 75.0%).

Figure 9.1 Scatter Plot Graphs of Importance vs. Implementation Percentages for International Student Recruiting Measures Part. 3: More Selective Universities
As indicated above in Figure 9.1 and 9.2, high percentages of both more selective national universities and less selective national universities perceived the importance of having short-term programs conducted in English for exchange or/and study abroad program students, 87.5% and 82.4% respectively. However, again, implementation rates of such special and costly programs varied, showing a disparity between the two types of national universities. Less selective national universities had a lower percentage at 41.2% than more selective national universities at 72.2%. In addition, though a higher percentage of less selective (82.4%) than more selective (68.8%) national universities viewed having a career placement program for international students as important, more selective national universities’ implementation percentage was higher at 38.9% than less selective national universities at 17.6%. As mentioned earlier, these kinds of programs, which accommodate the special needs of international students, often require high operation cost and internationally-trained experts and academics, often unavailable at provincially-located, less
selective national universities. Compared with affluent, more selective national universities, less selective national universities, largely with less government funding\textsuperscript{262} and lower fund-raising capacity (due to smaller pools of wealthy alumni and not well-established ties with the nationwide business communities of large corporations), cannot afford to have these programs, especially for international students, even though these less selective institutions know those programs are more effective in recruiting international students.

\textsuperscript{262} In 2007, the total amount of Japanese government subsidy allocated to the 20 more selective national universities of this study was 572.41 billion yen (US$4.34 billion using 2007 PPP conversion), whereas that subsidy given to the 20 less selective national universities was 189.41 billion yen (US$1.43). The 20 more selective universities took up 51.5\% of the total amount of the government subsidy for all the national universities. However, the 20 less selective national universities’ share was 17.1\%. 
Difficulties in Promoting Admissions/Recruitment of International Students

Figure 10 below summarizes universities’ perceived difficulties in promoting international students’ recruitment and admissions (see survey question V-2 in Appendix D).

Note: N=277
Figure 10 depicts those major problems which Japanese universities encountered when promoting the admissions of international students (attempting to increase the number of international students) as follows: (1) housing shortage for international students (18.8%), (2) the insufficient Japanese language proficiency of international students (11.6%), (3) financial burden on the institution (10.5%), and (4) burden on faculty members (10.5%). Among those problems, the housing shortage is an age-old and crucial, international education problem for Japanese universities and is focused on discussion in this section. Many Japanese universities, especially those universities in the Tokyo area, do not own and manage residential halls for their students, and of those universities that do, residential hall capacities are limited and cannot meet international student-number demand. Tokyo, which is both the capital of the country and the largest metropolitan area in the country, along with its high concentration of universities (mostly private institutions), has led the nation in the effort to attract the inflow of international students.

Approximately half of Japan’s international student population (50.7%) are concentrated in the greater Tokyo area\textsuperscript{263} (a percentage basically unchanged since the beginning of the Nakasone Plan). However, because of the high land prices in the Tokyo metropolitan area, both a large number of cost-sensitive private institutions with their small campuses, and even a small number of leading national institutions giving priority to their expensive research programs, still cannot afford to build new or additional residential halls. Having, instead, to rely upon expensive, private apartments for international students, it is not only a financial burden on international students but also very difficult for Japanese universities to recruit large numbers of international students without securing own reasonable housing facilities for them. Compared to 2000 (67.8%), the

\textsuperscript{263} Bureau of Policy and External Relations, Japan Student Services Organization, 8.
percentage of international students housed in private apartments rose 9.3% to 77.1%, however, only 22.9% of them lived in dormitories provided either by universities or by public sector/non-profit organizations in 2007\(^{264}\), and this housing situation is not expected to improve in the near future. Therefore, assuming these students maintain residences that will continue to be privately financed by international students during their course of study at Japanese institutions, this housing problem exemplifies one of the main reasons why Japanese universities, by and large, prefer to recruit international students who already reside in Japan.

**Summary of Supplementary Analyses**

- Having their own institutional scholarship programs for international students was highly and equally regarded as important by most of the more selective national universities and the less selective national universities, both at 93.8%. However, regarding the implementation rate, more selective national universities had an overall higher percentage of such scholarship programs at 52.9% than the percentage of less selective national universities at 37.5%.

- The overall percentage of more selective national universities that viewed receiving funds from the local community and/or business sector to assist international students as important was higher at 62.5% than the percentage of less selective national universities at 43.8%. But, this measure’s implementation percentage of less selective national universities was higher at 43.8% than more selective national universities at 23.5%.

- Although high percentages of both national university types regarded having a university preparatory or Japanese language programs for international students as important (82.4% of more selective, and 75.0% of less selective national universities respectively), the implementation percentage of more selective national universities was higher at 41.2% than the overall percentage of less selective national universities at 18.8%.

- A higher percentage of less selective national universities (93.8%) than more selective national universities (68.8%) considered having their own overseas office(s) as important. However, regarding this measure’s implementation, 23.5% of more selective national universities actually had overseas offices whereas only 6.3% of less selective national universities had such offices.

\(^{264}\) Ibid, 9.
• A little higher percentage of less selective (100.0%) than more selective national universities (94.1%) thought having English-based degree-granting programs was important, but more selective national universities had a higher implementation percentage of such programs at 64.7% than that of less selective national universities at 31.3%.

• In terms of encouraging undergraduate international students to continue on to their graduate schools, 31.3% of less selective national universities made such efforts, while more selective national universities showed a lower implementation rate at 17.6% (regarding the two types of institutions’ perceptions about the said measure, 93.8% of less selective national universities thought it was important and 75.0% of more selective national universities did so respectively).

• Both more selective national universities (87.5%) and less selective national universities (82.4%) readily perceived the importance of having a short-term program conducted in English for exchange or/and study abroad program students. However, the said program’s implementation rates showed disparity between the two types of national universities, with less selective national universities having a lower percentage at 41.2% than more selective national universities at 72.2%.

• The percentage of less selective national universities that viewed having a career placement program for international students as important was higher at 82.4% than the overall percentage of more selective national universities at 68.8%. Nevertheless, more selective national universities’ program implementation was higher at 38.9% than the percentage of less selective national universities at 17.6%.

• The top, four major problems (of the eleven difficulties in Figure 10) Japanese universities encountered when promoting the international student recruitment and admissions were as follows: (1) housing shortage for international students, (2) international students’ insufficient Japanese language proficiencies, (3) financial burden on the institution, and (4) burden on faculty members. International student housing stood out at as, and remains, the most serious difficulty.
Chapter VI

Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter presents conclusions with summaries of key findings, international student recruitment policy recommendations as related to university management and government issues in Japan as well as suggestions for further study.

Conclusions

In light of the three, relatively recent, policy and environmental factors: (1) the 2003 international student policy shift from quantitative to qualitative goals, (2) the 2004 national university corporatization mandate, and (3) Japan’s national demographic climate, the primary goal of this study was to examine international student enrollment management differences between two types of Japanese national universities: more selective and less selective universities. Specifically, this study analyzed the international student recruitment policies of national universities’ primary (prioritized) host programs (undergraduate or graduate), target international applicant pools (inside or outside Japan), and required language proficiency standards.

It was hypothesized that distinctive differences would exist between more selective national universities and less selective national universities with respect to the above-mentioned international student recruitment policies and practices. Although the results of the statistical analyses based on university survey responses did not fully support the hypotheses of this study, regarding post-corporatization activities, they did highlight differences and pointed to emerging divergence between the two types of national universities. First, considering three international, student populations (undergraduate, graduate, and total international students) more selective national universities had significantly larger numbers of international students than less selective
national universities. Moreover, a university’s selectivity type (more selective and less selective) significantly influenced those three international student populations. Second, at the undergraduate and entire student levels, more selective national universities had significantly higher proportions of international students than less selective national universities as part of their general/whole student populations. In addition, more selective national universities had a significantly higher proportion of international graduate students in their total international student populations than less selective national universities. Furthermore, a university’s selectivity index was found to be a strong predictor of international student proportions overall (the higher selectivity index a national university had, the higher the proportion of international students). Third, the lower selectivity index a national university had, the more it placed importance on admitting international students to meet their authorized enrollment quotas. Fourth, regarding specific measures to recruit more international students, a higher percentage of more selective national universities than less selective national universities had English-based academic programs (both a short-term program and a degree-granting program) and international alumni association chapters. Fifth, with regard to language proficiency requirements, a significantly higher percentage of more selective national universities than less selective national universities required a TOEFL score for international applicants. Finally, a significantly higher percentage of less selective national universities than more selective national universities had an academic program(s) not requiring English proficiency for their international admissions.

Interview findings\textsuperscript{265} supplemented collected survey data and corroborated survey findings, and these anecdotal accounts amply supported the hypotheses of this study. For international

\textsuperscript{265} Due to the small sample size, caution needs to be exercised in interpreting the findings of the interviews with vice presidents (in charge of international education).
enrollment management considerations, these findings attested to distinctive differences between the two types of national universities. Those differences were partly brought about by national university corporatization, in particular, through non-earmarked block grants newly allocated from the MEXT to each national university corporation.

Overall, the following conclusions can be drawn from this study’s findings. Regarding international student recruitment, both more selective national universities and less selective national universities prioritize their graduate programs over undergraduate programs, but their approaches, motivations, and reasons for doing so are different. On one hand, more selective national universities, particularly in their advanced graduate programs, tend to take a proactive and positive approach for recruiting international students in order to both reinforce their institution’s international dimensions and their institution’s prestige of research and education. On the other hand, less selective national universities, especially with regards to their unstable graduate programs, tend to have passive, ad hoc approaches for recruiting such students in order to solve their immediate and pressing enrollment problems.

National university corporatization, which included the government’s new budget appropriation system, has freed national universities from MEXT’s strict control through bureaucratic regulations and has led to a strengthening of more responsible and self-reliant management practices. In order to maximize corporatization’s benefits and to recruit highly qualified international students, more selective national universities have implemented, increased, and are developing English-based academic programs, institutional scholarship programs, institutional scholarship programs,

---

266 For example, from the academic year 2008, University of Tokyo and Tokyo Institute of Technology will provide a new scholarship for all privately-financed students, including domestic students enrolled in their doctoral programs. The amount of the scholarship is equivalent to the amount of an annual tuition of the doctoral program. Thus, these institutions will eventually waive the tuitions of all privately-financed students.
liaison offices, and alumni chapters abroad, concurrently revitalizing and strengthening their self-financing (fund-raising) abilities for the aforementioned costly programs/measures with an eye towards actively entering the international student market outside Japan. Particularly in the natural sciences and engineering fields, which have the potential to attract academically strong international students without Japanese language proficiency from the large student applicant pool outside Japan, more selective national universities are promoting their English-based graduate programs as well as offering stronger scholarship incentives and support for would-be international applicants. In addition, within their undergraduate programs, more selective national universities are expanding their English-based, short-term programs to increase the number of exchange and study abroad students from their partner institutions abroad. Given more selective national universities’ general geographical advantage and high academic prestige, it is neither difficult for them to partner with higher education institutions abroad nor attract potential exchange students from overseas institutions.

In the case of less selective national universities, however, the MEXT’s new funding (block grant) system for national universities, a core element of the corporatization, has often less than positively affected their international education programs. Under continuous government budget cutbacks and the relatively new, non-availability of the MEXT’s formerly earmarked funds for international education, less selective national universities face difficulties specifically in operating their international student programs and projects, having to shift instead from heavy reliance on government funding to a more “self-financing” approach. Given that these

267 They include the acquisition of increasing MEXT’s application-based competitive funds for universities.
268 All the more selective national universities are located in metropolitan areas.
269 The average ratio of obtained external funds (mainly for research and education projects/programs) to government subsidies (for the operational costs and facilities) in 2007 for less selective national universities was significantly
institutions have no choice but to concentrate their already limited, and now shrinking, financial resources on their priority endeavors, such as the fundamental educational and research activities for a majority of their students, less selective national universities, at times, even consider reducing their special programs and support services for international students (a minority student-group). Under these new management circumstances (corporatization), declining domestic enrollment (especially in graduate programs due to low birthrate and little local demand in provincial areas\textsuperscript{270}), and in order to mainly sustain the authorized enrollment quotas for their current graduate programs, less selective national universities generally recruit international students from the international student market inside Japan. Compared with the market outside Japan, the domestic market of international students has a smaller and less diversified applicant pool\textsuperscript{271}, where international students are either enrolled in Japanese language schools or in some other form of higher education in Japan. Because most have already acquired both a high-level of Japanese language proficiency and cultural adaptation skills through their study and life in Japan prior to university matriculation, these students do not need much special support from universities during their course of study.\textsuperscript{272} After all, without sufficient financial and personnel capacity, such as robust fund-raising, better access to the acquisition of competitive funds and appropriately-trained, skilled staff, international education is not a high priority for less selective universities’ agendas and, for these institutions, a proactive approach to the international student market outside Japan seems to be, despite efforts within their capacities, an unattainable goal. In other words, it

\textsuperscript{270} A majority of less selective national universities are situated in provincial areas.

\textsuperscript{271} In this applicant pool, countries of origin are highly concentrated in Japan’s neighboring countries, such as China, South Korea, and Taiwan.

\textsuperscript{272} From the university’s standpoint, these students are perceived as “less costly” international students.
can be said that less selective universities’ passive and inexpensive approaches to the international student recruitment, which chiefly rely upon the domestic market, in turn reflect their financial constraints, limited resources, and unstable support services to accommodate international students’ special needs.

By and large, while the increased autonomy of national universities has generally benefited a national university’s administrative authority, in particular the self-financing accounts and internal budget allocations of more selective national universities, such is not necessarily the case for their international education programs, especially within less selective national universities. Consequently, as this study found that more selective national universities had larger numbers and higher proportions of international students than those of less selective national universities in their student populations, divergent international enrollment management styles were also found between the two types of national universities. Commencing from the 2004 national university corporatization, the divergent, international recruitment and enrollment management styles between the two types of national universities are expected to become clearer in the future and have further implications for the emerging stratification of national universities under continuing and expanding national university reform projects.

Recommendations

When contemplating possible recommendations from this study, Japan’s international student plan underwent yet another, new policy shift, as Prime Minister Yasuo Fukuda in his January, 2008 policy speech proposed a new target to increase the number of international
students enrolled in Japanese universities to 300,000 by 2025.²⁷³ Perceived as yet another policy change,²⁷⁴ now shifting international student policy from qualitative back to quantitative goals as a result of continuously stagnating inflows of international students to Japan since 2004,²⁷⁵ both the Japanese government and Japanese universities should nonetheless tackle drastic reforms and take innovative steps in various areas of Japanese higher education and society to achieve this ambitious goal. Considering both this newly formulated 300,000 International Student Plan and the context of the aforementioned conclusions, this study recommends the following:

For the Government

- **Diversify and prioritize the vision and mission for hosting international students:**
  
  Given both the government’s recent fiscal austerity measures and in order to increase significantly the number of international students in Japan, the traditional “aid-approach,” once heavily relied upon for many of the country’s “international cooperation” projects, should no longer drive the long-term core policy rationale for the promotion of international education. In addition to supplementing universities’ declining enrollments, particularly considering the country’s low birth rate, rapidly aging society, and declining interest in science and mathematics among Japanese students, the “skilled migration-approach”²⁷⁶ instead should be a substantial part of the vision and mission of Japan’s international student policy. Finally, due to not only the government’s and universities’ financial constraints but also because of the large numbers of privately-financed students from quite a few newly-industrialized countries located nearby Japan—who now comprise a large segment of the

---

²⁷⁴ In 2003, after the achievement of the 100,000 International Student Plan’s quantitative goal, MEXT released a policy paper, “Development of New Policies for International Student Exchanges: Aiming for the Expansion of Student Exchanges and its Quality Improvement.” In this paper, qualitative objectives were particularly emphasized (shifting to “quality” from “quantity”).
²⁷⁵ In Japan, international student numbers increased by a mere 1,196 students for the four-year period from 2004 (117,302) to 2007 (118,498).
²⁷⁶ The “skilled-migration approach” gives stronger emphasis to the recruitment of selected international students, e.g. graduate students in computer science, and tries to attract talented students to work in the host country’s knowledge economy, or render its higher education and research sectors more competitive. [OECD. Internationalisation and Trade in Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges. 232.]
expanding international student market, the “trade and revenue-generating approach”\textsuperscript{277} should be one of the policy rationales for hosting international students.

- **Better coordination between international student policies, and immigration laws and regulations:**
  Employment and migration opportunities are often important factors determining international students’ choice of a country for their higher education,\textsuperscript{278} and in order to both accommodate these international students’ prerequisites and to subsequently retain graduated international students as future, highly-skilled labor in Japan, the Japanese government should substantially amend its immigration requirements and streamline application procedures (e.g. for changing the visa status from an international student visa to a working visa) so that the country’s attractiveness as a study abroad destination can be improved.

- **Establish a “national center” for foreign/international credential evaluation to support universities’ international admissions offices and international student applicants:**
  Coupled with the promotion of the “document screening only” method for universities’ international admissions, the development of expertise and skills for a foreign/international credential evaluation process is an immediate need for encouraging Japanese universities to recruit more international students from a large applicant pool outside Japan. Therefore, the MEXT should provide special funding for the establishment of a “national center” responsible for dealing with the foreign/international credential evaluation process and to support international admissions offices of higher education institutions. Either the JASSO or

\textsuperscript{277} The “trade and revenue approach” offers higher education services on a full-fee basis, without public subsides (developing higher education as an export industry). [Ibid.]

\textsuperscript{278} The importance of migration opportunities for international students is more than adequately attested to in the statistics produced through a 2006 survey undertaken by Australia’s Monash University. According to the findings, 75% of Indian students who completed a university education in Australia in 2003 applied for and were granted permanent residency visas. Michiel Baas (the author of the study) suggests that the most important reason Indian students chose to study in Australia was not the academic reputation of the universities but the opportunity to gain permanent residency visas. [John Garnaut, “Universities Being Used as Immigration ‘Factories,’” Sydney Morning Herald, March 30, 2006, <http://www.smh.com.au/news/national/unis-used-as-immigration-factories/2006/03/29/1143441215915.html#> (March 30, 2008).]
National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE)\textsuperscript{279} can be considered to house this national center.

- **Enhance the promotion of Japanese higher education (study in Japan) abroad through the Japanese government’s already-integrated international networks:**
  Through the government’s already existing international networks, the information and advising offices promoting Japanese higher education (study in Japan) should be enhanced in overseas countries. Compared to the international networks of UK’s “British Council,” France’s “Campus France,” and US’s “Education USA,”\textsuperscript{280} JASSO’s scant four offices abroad are not effective to either tap into, or recruit from, the international student market. The already separately established international networks (offices) of government agencies, such as the Japan Foundation, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Japan Science and Technology Agency, and JASSO, should be integrated under the common goals of promoting Japanese culture, science, technology, and higher education overseas, including, concomitantly, the functions of both advising on “study in Japan” for prospective students and supporting Japanese language education abroad. Plus, in cooperation with Japanese universities and colleges, the government should conduct a marketing campaign actively promoting Japanese higher education to the world through the abovementioned newly integrated international networks.

- **Improve housing for international students:**
  A housing shortage (a limited provision of universities’ residential facilities) is one of the most severe obstacles to hosting large numbers of international students in Japan. Many Japanese universities cannot guarantee housing for newly-accepted international students.

\textsuperscript{279} The mission of the National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE) is to contribute to further development of higher education in Japan. In order to realize the society in which the learning outcomes earned at diversified higher education institutions, such as non-university institutions, are duly appreciated, NIAD-UE both assesses the results of learning provided at the higher education level and awards academic degrees to learners recognized as having fulfilled required academic standards. In addition, in order to raise the quality of education and research at higher education institutions and inter-university research institutes, NIAD-UE conducts evaluations of teaching conditions and research activities at these institutions.

\textsuperscript{280} U.K. has 229 branches of the British Council, France has 80 offices of the Campus France, and the U.S. has a network of nearly 500 centers for the Education USA program around the world.
before they enter universities. Rather, a majority of newly-admitted students are now required
to arrange their own housing (find a commercial apartment by themselves). Both the high
concentrations of universities and international students in the Tokyo metropolitan area,
combined with expensive rents of commercial apartments, exacerbate student-housing
problems. In order to increase the proportion of those international students who maintain
residences in dormitories provided either by universities or by public sector/non-profit
organizations (22.9% in 2007), the central government should cooperate with local
governments, universities, and the private sector to take the following measures: provide
international students with more public housing as a government project, develop homestay
businesses in collaboration with the private sector, and further deregulate restrictions on
national universities’ PPPs (public private partnerships)\textsuperscript{281} or PFIs (private finance
initiatives)\textsuperscript{282} based on housing projects which include university consortia projects to
construct regional dormitories for the consortia’s international students.

- **Create an “education hub in East Asia” under strategic plans:**

The Japanese government should develop strategic plans to turn Japan into the East Asian
hub of higher education and research (a global center for cultural and intellectual exchange)
that attracts and recruits high-caliber international students from a diverse range of countries.
Outside the Tokyo area, strategic plans should include the establishment of regional higher
education and research centers in major regional cities, such as Sapporo, Sendai, Nagoya,
Kyoto, Osaka, and Fukuoka. Those regional higher education and research centers should be
developed alongside, and in collaboration with, the cores of former imperial universities and
corporate research institutes that already maintain large research capacities and outreach
potentials. The Japan-as-East Asian education hub may even attract branch campuses or
research centers of world-class universities abroad. However, the success of such a strategic
initiative hinges on the transformation of established, Japanese leading universities into

\textsuperscript{281} PPPs are either a government service or private business venture which is funded and operated through a
partnership of government and one or more private sector companies or organizations.

\textsuperscript{282} PFIs specify methods to provide financial support for “Public-Private Partnerships" (PPPs) between the public and
private sectors. This has now been adopted by many countries as part of a wider reform program for the delivery of
public services which is driven by the WTO, IMF and World Bank as a part of their deregulation and privatization
drive.
world-class and truly global institutions. In order to improve the quality of those Japanese leading universities, substantial financial and human resources should be strategically allocated. In a way, it can be said that strategic projects to upgrade domestic prime institutions to world-class universities have gradually progressed as part of the higher education reforms enacted since the beginning of the national university corporatization. For instance, the MEXT’s changing funding policy: decreasing the amount of block grants for the operational costs of national universities while concurrently increasing application- and performance-based competitive funding programs, which are, in principle, intended for all Japanese universities based on the supposedly every-institution-is-on-equal-footing principle, is an improvement over past funding protocols. In reality, however, a limited number of leading national universities, such as University of Tokyo, Kyoto University, and Osaka University, have obtained large proportions of those competitive funds along with having higher ratios of acquired external funds to overall government subsidies.\(^{283}\) At any rate, more explicit and aspiring strategies are needed for the creation of an “education hub in East Asia” that can foreground and promote Japan’s commitment to intellectual development around the world. And it would seem that this strategic approach is financially feasible considering the country’s economic power. According to OECD’s statistics, in 2004, the public expenditure on higher education institutions as a percentage of GDP was 0.8% in the U.K., 1.2% in France, 1.0% in Germany, and 1.0% in the U.S., whereas it was only 0.5% in Japan (the lowest percentage amongst OECD countries and well below the mean of OECD countries, which was 1.0%).\(^{284}\)

---

\(^{283}\) In 2007, the ratio of obtained external funds (mainly for research and education projects/program) to government subsidies (for the operational costs and facilities) was very high among leading national universities, for example, University of Tokyo (70%), Tokyo Institute of Technology (63%), Kyoto University (60%) and Osaka University (59%). In addition, the average of that ratio in seven former imperial universities was significantly higher at 53.4% than both national teachers colleges at 5.0% and middle-sized national universities at 19.5% [Mari Jibu et al., eds., Financial Analysis of All National Universities (Tokyo: Japan Science and Technology Agency, 2008), 20.]

\(^{284}\) OECD, Education at a Glance 2007, 208.
For Universities

- **Leadership and initiatives of top management as well as a clearly articulated vision and mission:**
  The top management of a university should articulate a vision and a mission for admitting international students as part of its internationalization policy, and depending on its institutional characteristics, action plans should be accordingly formulated based on the established vision and mission. The leadership and initiatives of university’s top management are important for both the implementation of the action plans and the evaluation of its implemented actions.

- **Strategic approach to international student market:**
  Universities should objectively assess their whole range of activities and resources and identify their core competence, including academic programs that can possibly be marketed internationally. Subsequently, those universities should then develop their mid-term and long-term strategic plans for future activities and projects on the basis of “priority” and “concentration,” and their resources should be allocated according to their strategic plans. In light of international student recruitment, an institution’s limited resources should be concentrated on those prioritized academic programs expected to attract substantial numbers of international students. In this sense, less selective national universities’ potential and targeted markets of international students, as well as their marketable (promotional) academic programs should be different than those of more selective national universities. Furthermore, the operation of costly programs exclusively for international students, for instance, Japanese language programs with many small-sized classes to accommodate students’ diverse levels of proficiency, should be reformed for sustainable management due to their financial constraints. It may also be worthwhile for less selective national universities to provide Japanese language programs in partnership with neighboring Japanese language schools or private universities.
• **Terminate the personnel rotation system to encourage collaborative staff/professional development:**

Since each component of university management is increasingly and highly specialized and complicated, Japanese universities should first terminate the personnel rotation system in order to nurture professional staff not only in the field of international education but also other fields of university administration such as information technology and public relations. Specifically for international enrollment management, including both the recruiting of international students effectively from the international applicant pool outside Japan and for supporting those already-recruited international students, Japanese institutions then need to further reinforce staff/professional development programs in collaboration with the MEXT, JASSO and other organizations of international education so that staff and administrators can acquire the necessary knowledge and skills needed for the better management of international education.

• **Increase universities’ employment of non-Japanese personnel including former international students who have previously studied in Japan:**

Japanese universities should employ more non-Japanese personnel, including former international students who have studied in Japan not only as faculty but also as staff so that the capabilities of their offices can be improved and the number of programs and courses conducted in English can be increased as well.

• **Increase academic programs and courses conducted in English:**

There can be no doubt of the rapid growth in demand for using English as a language of instruction across disciplines and in academic programs throughout the higher education world. Thus, in order to enter the international student market outside Japan, successfully recruit a large number of international students from that market, and, in turn, effectively diversify international students’ countries of origin, Japanese universities should offer more academic programs and courses conducted in English. Specifically, English-based undergraduate programs have proven quite effective in attracting and increasing greater
numbers of exchange students from European, North American, and Oceania countries. Moreover, English-based graduate programs, especially in the fields of natural sciences and engineering, are expected to improve the recruitment of larger numbers of international students from a wide-range of countries around the world. In addition, in order to address the trend of increasing recognition of cross-border education as part of degree-granting programs in Europe and North America, a double, dual, or joint degree program should be a built-in component of those English-based academic programs in partnership with universities abroad.

- **Improve education standards and quality assurance of academic programs:**
  For better assuring students’ learning outcomes, Japanese universities should shift from the “input control” of students, now based on an on-campus entrance examination coupled with an interview for screening international applicants, to “output control” of students’ learning based on both well-structured curricula and the rigorous graduation standards. Because on-campus entrance examinations imposes an unnecessarily heavy burden on international applicants, who cannot easily afford the international travel expenditures to sit such exams, international applicant pools (inside and outside Japan) are now confined to a smaller, domestic segment of those students wishing to study in Japan. Plus, the rapidly growing numbers of privately-financed international students in the world are becoming more sensitive to cost-effectiveness of their education abroad and are increasingly not satisfied with the low quality of education. Finally, from an international perspective, both curriculum development and the upgrading facilities of education and research, namely information technology systems and laboratories, are immediate concerns needing attention so as to improve the quality of education within Japanese universities.

- **Reinforce career guidance and placement services for international students:**
  Together with the “skilled migration-approach,” Japanese universities should reinforce their career guidance and placement services for international students, which need to include cooperative internship programs with the business sector. In addition, for those students choosing to continue their Japan-stay and join the labor force in Japan, these services should
facilitate international students’ smooth transitions from student status at universities to employee status at companies, accordingly expediting the necessary procedures for changing their visa status. Due to their limited resources, less selective national universities should consider offering these kinds of services to their international students in partnership with other neighboring universities (possibly, in conjunction with local municipal governments and business communities, those institutions would be able to jointly establish a regional center of career guidance and placement services for their international students).

Suggestions for Further Study

First, in order to identify possibly more significant differences between the two national university types as national university reform progresses in Japan, it would be worthwhile to conduct a longitudinal study within the same context of international enrollment management for Japanese national universities. Second, given both the large number (580) of private universities (accounting for 76.6% of the university total within the Japanese higher education system), a larger study of more private university types and categories needs to be undertaken to adequately discern private universities’ policies and practices as they relate to these universities’ international enrollment management protocols. Third, in order to analyze both universities’ reasons not to recruit prospective international students who reside outside Japan and their difficulties in promoting international student recruitment and admissions, further micro-studies, specific surveys and interviews of operations at the frontline and personnel/staffing levels should include investigations for those reasons listed in Figure 6 and the difficulties listed in Figure 10 of this study. Fourth, further case studies to examine and ascertain the current, innovative approaches of Japanese universities to the international student market outside Japan need to be conducted. Indeed, some private and local municipal universities, such as Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University and Akita International University, successfully recruit a large majority of international
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students from the international student market outside Japan, and so the comparative factors and reasons behind their successful recruitment/admissions’ efforts are worth studying. Lastly, because this study exclusively dealt with universities’ international enrollment management, within those respective management styles there is a need to conduct an in-depth study on international students’ application behaviors: their perceptions of universities’ recruitment activities; their subsequent motivations to study in Japanese higher education institutions, and the determinant factors behind their school choice. In addition to classifying student subgroups by country-of-origin, these studies should also consider both the different types of international students, such as undergraduate, graduate, and language study students, as well as the different types of institutions, such as junior colleges, universities, private institutions, and national and local municipal institutions.

It is hoped that both the findings and analyses of this study will be helpful to academic administrators of Japanese universities, Japanese government officials, and higher/international education researchers as they assist in formulating, implementing, and coordinating future international student policies, plans, and perspectives within the Japanese higher education system in the years to come.
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UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
Changing Policies and Practices of Japanese National Universities Toward International Students in Light of Financial and Demographic Challenges and the New University "Corporatization"

Informed Consent Document

This consent form explains the research study. Please read it carefully. Ask questions about anything you do not understand. If you do not have questions right now, you should ask them later if any come up.

FOR QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS RESEARCH, CONTACT:

This study is being conducted by Hiroshi Ota (h.ota@srv.cc.hit-u.ac.jp) under the supervision of Dr. D. Bruce Johnstone (dbj@buffalo.edu). Mr. Ota and Dr. Johnstone can be reached through the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy, University at Buffalo, Amherst NY 14260 or by telephone at (716) 645-2471.

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in a research project, you should contact (anonymously, if you wish) the Social and Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board, 515 Capen, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260, e-mail SBSIRB@research.buffalo.edu, phone 716 / 645-3321.

PURPOSE:
You are invited to participate in a research project that examines international enrollment management of Japanese national universities in light of the Japanese government’s policies shifting from quantitative to qualitative goals in international student acceptance in 2003, national universities’ reform of legal and administrative frameworks in 2004, and a deteriorating demographic climate. This project will also examine gaps and conflicts between the government’s implementation of the international student policy and actual practices and intentions of national universities. The results of this study should help to the assessment of international student policy and practice at the institutional level under the newly established relationship between corporatized national universities and the government. In addition, the research findings would be utilized for the future policymaking, implementation, and coordination of international student policy in Japanese higher education. Approximately four participants will be involved in this segment of the study.

PROCEDURES:
If you agree to be a part of this study, you will be asked to participate in an interview about your perceptions, views, and insights towards international enrollment management. Also, you will be asked about your institution’s characteristic and distinctive approach to the international student market in reference to the government’s international student policy. The interview process will be semi-structured and guided by responses to the survey. Some of the questions will be as follows:

• What faculty or department would your university like to increase the number of international students the most?
• How do you analyze the costs and benefits of accepting international students and what is your analysis of the matter?
What kinds of measures are needed for the better coordination among stakeholders in order to recruit highly-qualified international students?

This interview should take about an hour to complete and will be audio-taped. You are free not to answer any questions you do not wish to answer. You may withdraw from the study at any time. Just let the investigator know that you no longer wish to continue with the interview. Withdrawing would have no foreseeable negative effects.

CONFIDENTIALITY:
All data collected by the investigator will be kept confidential. All data collected during the audio-taping will be immediately transcribed by the investigator following each interview. Transcribed data will be de-identified and then the audio-tape of the interview will be destroyed immediately in order to protect participant confidentiality. All participants will be given pseudonyms in the process of transcription in order to protect their true identities.
The only connection between your participation in this study and the study itself will be this signed consent form but there will be no association between your identity and the information you provide in the interview. Your identity will not be made a part of any published findings resulting from this study. De-identified, transcribed data will be kept strictly confidential in a locked cabinet in 428 Baldy Hall, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy, Graduate School of Education, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260. Data will be seen and analyzed only by the investigator.

RISKS:
There are no known risks to participating in this research.
The issues of international enrollment management and corporatized national universities in reference to demographic challenges are discussed openly and widely not only in the higher education community but also in Japanese media as well as the general public. Thus, there are no negative cultural, political, or social consequences.

BENEFITS:
The benefit, which may be reasonably expected to result from this study, is the assessment of international student policy and practice at the institutional level under the newly established relationship between corporatized national universities and the government. Also, the research findings would be utilized for the future policymaking, implementation, and coordination of international student policy in Japanese higher education.

COSTS and COMPENSATION:
There is no cost to you for participation in this research. A final report summarizing the results of the study will be available to you on a priority base for participation in the interview.

JOINING OF YOUR OWN FREE WILL (VOLUNTEERING FOR THE STUDY):
Your participation is voluntary. Your refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled as a vice president of university. You do not have to answer every question and may refuse to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. You may withdraw from the study at any time by contacting the investigator and all data that can still be identifiably attributed to you will be withdrawn by the investigator.
SUBJECT STATEMENT: Audio Tape Release Form

I give consent to be audio-taped during this study:

Please initial:  ____Yes   ____No

I have read the explanation provided to the investigator. I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I HAVE BEEN GIVEN A COPY OF THIS CONSENT FORM.

SIGNATURE OF SUBJECT and DATE

_____________________________________________________________________________________

"I certify that I obtained the consent of the participant whose signature is above. I understand that I must give a signed copy of the informed consent form to the participant, and keep the original copy on file in the repository location designated on my IRB application files for 3 years after the completion of the research project.

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR (or PERSON OBTAINING CONSENT) and DATE

_____________________________________________________________________________________
Dear Vice President XXXXX:

I am a doctoral candidate at the State University of New York at Buffalo, in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy, Graduate School of Education. As part of my Ph.D. dissertation, I am conducting a research project regarding international enrollment management of the national universities in Japan in light of the MEXT’s policies shifting from quantitative to qualitative goals in international student acceptance in 2003, national universities’ reform of legal and administrative frameworks in 2004, and a deteriorating demographic climate. Thus, I would like to ask your participation in this study since your university’s office responsible for international students kindly completed the survey questionnaire of this research I sent before.

Specifically, I am examining international student recruitment orientation and behavior in terms of international student acceptance objectives, target students, programs actively or necessarily accepting international students, and required academic and language proficiency standards. Also, I am analyzing gaps and conflicts between the government’s intended implementation of the 2003 international student acceptance policy and actual practices and intentions of national universities.

You will be asked to be interviewed for about one hour. During this period of time, I will ask you questions related to your perceptions, views, and insights towards international enrollment management. Also, you will be asked about your institution’s characteristic and distinctive approach to the international student market in reference to the MEXT’s international student policy. You will find the attached consent form for you to read and sign upon your agreement to participate in this study.

For further inquires you may have, please feel free to call me at 716-816-9429. You can also reach me via email at h.ota@srv.cc.hit-u.ac.jp or hota@buffalo.edu.

Thank you for your time reviewing these forms.

Sincerely,

Hiroshi Ota
Appendix: C

Telephone Script for Contacting Vice Presidents

Hello, May I speak with Professor _______________.

My name is Hiroshi Ota. I am a doctoral student at the State University of New York at Buffalo in the United States. I am conducting a research project regarding international enrollment management of Japanese national universities in light of the MEXT’s policy changes. Your institution’s office responsible for international students kindly completed the survey questionnaire of this research I sent before. Then, I found your name and contact information on the website of your institution. So, I am calling you to ask if you would be interested in being interviewed about this research topic. The purpose of this interview is to have your perceptions, views, and insights towards international enrollment management. Also, you will be asked about your institution’s characteristic and distinctive approach to the international student market in reference to the MEXT’s international student policy. The interview should take about an hour.

If a vice president says, “NO, I would not”: Okay, thank you very much and have a good day.

If a vice president says, “YES, I would”; Then, carry on conversation as follows:

Thank you very much. Would you like to schedule a telephone interview or face-to-face interview? If you prefer a telephone interview, I first need to mail you a consent form so that you will be fully aware of what will be involved in participating in the interview. Once I receive the consent form from you we can schedule a time for the telephone interview that is convenient for you. Would you like to do that?

If you would prefer a face-to-face interview, let us arrange for a time and place that is convenient for you. When and where would be good for you to be interviewed?

Depending on vice president’s answer, I will either obtain his/her mailing address and mail a consent form or set up a face-to-face interview at which time the consent form will be obtained prior to the beginning of an interview.
Appendix D

Cover Letter and Survey Questionnaire to Universities

Hiroshi Ota
428 Baldy Hall
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy
Graduate School of Education
State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, NY 14260
Phone: (716)-816-9429

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing to ask your assistance in participating in a research project regarding international enrollment management of Japanese national universities in reference to private universities’ management.

Your response to the enclosed survey questionnaire will help to examine international student recruitment orientation and behavior in terms of international student acceptance objectives, target students, programs actively or necessarily accepting international students, and required academic and language proficiency standards. It also helps to analyze gaps and conflicts between the government’s intended implementation of the current international student acceptance policy and actual practices and intentions of universities. I am a doctoral candidate at the State University of New York at Buffalo, in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy, Graduate School of Education. This survey is a part of my Ph.D. dissertation research.

Your participation in the research is of course completely voluntary and if you participate, you need not respond to all the questions unless you wish to do so. If decline to participate, it will not effect your relationship with your employers or government authorities.

The first section of the questionnaire asks the name of your institution. This piece of information is completely optional and will not, if given, be associated with your institution’s other responses. All other information will be coded into a database and the original information destroyed so that your institution’s responses will be anonymous (i.e., not associated with the name of your institution).

Would you please complete the survey (it will take about 60 minutes), and mail it back in the enclosed postage-paid envelope as soon as possible? A summary of the results should be published within the next two years. Should you want a copy of the summary or have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact Hiroshi Ota at the address above or h.ota@srv.cc.hit-u.ac.jp or hota@buffalo.edu. For questions regarding the rights of participants in research, contact the Social and Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board at 716/645-3321 or 515 Capen, Buffalo, NY 14260.

Thank you for your help in this important project.

Sincerely,

Hiroshi Ota
**Survey Questionnaire**

Your completion of this form is an essential part of my research. However, your participation is entirely voluntary and you are free to decide if you want to answer the questionnaire or not. You can omit answering any question you choose to omit, or discontinue answering the questionnaire at any time for any reason. All of your responses are confidential and anonymous. Thank you.

Name of institution: ___________________________ Year of institution’s foundation: _____________

I. The Numbers of (International) Students and Applicants at Your Institution

Please fill in the following items as of May 1, 2005.

1. Total number of students (domestic and international) enrolled: ________________

2. Number of students (domestic and international) enrolled by academic level:
   a. Undergraduate: ___________  b. Graduate: ________________

3. Total number of international students: ________________
   *An international student is defined as a student from a foreign country who is receiving education at your institution and resides in Japan with “college student” visa status.

4. Number of international students enrolled by academic level and type:
   a. Undergraduate (bachelor degree seeking students): ________________
   b. Graduate (Masters degree seeking students): ________________
   c. Graduate (Doctorate degree seeking students): ________________
   d. Research students: ________________
   e. Exchange and Study Abroad students (Undergraduate): ________________
   f. Exchange and Study Abroad students (Graduate): ________________
   g. University preparatory program: ________________
   h. Others: ________________

5. Number of international students by country of origin
   a. China: ___________  g. France: ________________  m. Indonesia: ________________
   c. Taiwan: ___________  i. Canada: ________________  o. Mongolia: ________________
   e. U.K.: ___________  k. Thailand: ________________
   f. Germany: ___________  l. Vietnam: ________________
6. Number of international students by financial means
   a. Japanese government (MEXT*) scholarship students :___________
   b. Foreign government scholarship students :___________
   c. Privately financed students :___________

Note: *MEXT: Ministry of Education, Science, Culture, Sports and Technology, Japan

7. Please fill in the total number of international student applicants and the number of international student applicants from outside Japan (applicants who resided abroad when they applied) in the parentheses by year and by academic level. Also, fill in the total number of international students enrolled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undergraduate Programs</th>
<th>Graduate Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Total number of international student applicants (number of applicants from abroad)</td>
<td>b. Total number of international students enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Objectives and Plans of Accepting International Students

1. Why does your institution accept international students? Please indicate the degree of importance you think by circling one of the numbers in the right column regarding the provided items, using the following scale.

   1 = Not at all important  
   2 = Slightly important  
   3 = Moderately important  
   4 = Very important  
   5 = Extremely important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We accept international students for the purpose of...</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Contribution to assistance to developing countries (ex. human resource development)</td>
<td>1——2——3——4——5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Contribution to international peace and friendship</td>
<td>1——2——3——4——5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Promotion of exchange and collaboration with specific regions or countries abroad</td>
<td>1——2——3——4——5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Contribution to cultivation of foreigners who understand Japan well</td>
<td>1——2——3——4——5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Contribution to intercultural understanding and promotion of internationalization in the local community</td>
<td>1——2——3——4——5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Contribution to provision of highly educated human resources to the industrial world of Japan.</td>
<td>1——2——3——4——5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Contribution to securing the capacity of student intake</td>
<td>1——2——3——4——5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Improvement in institution's image and recognition in society</td>
<td>1——2——3——4——5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. Contribution to attracting highly qualified Japanese students by image of internationalized institution</td>
<td>1——2——3——4——5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Cultivation of intercultural awareness and competence for Japanese students</td>
<td>1——2——3——4——5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. Cultivation of intercultural awareness and competence for faculty and staff</td>
<td>1——2——3——4——5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. Improvement in institution's international recognition and prestige</td>
<td>1——2——3——4——5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. Improvement in institution's education and research by highly qualified international students</td>
<td>1——2——3——4——5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answer "4 (Very important)" or "5 (Extremely important)" in the question iii above, please describe "specific regions." __________________________________________________________________________
2. Does your institution have a plan to either increase or decrease the number of international students and describe the reason of your answer briefly?
   a. Decrease considerably  
   b. Decrease slightly  
   c. Keep the current number  
   d. Increase slightly  
   e. Increase drastically  
   f. Indefinite  
   Reason: __________________________  __________________________

If you answer “d. Increase slightly” or “e. increase drastically,” please answer 3 and 4.

3. Please CHECK ALL the programs or types of international students that your institution has a plan to increase the number of international students.
   a. Undergraduate program  
   b. Graduate (Masters) program  
   c. Graduate (Doctorate) program  
   d. Exchange students (Undergraduate)  
   e. Exchange students (Graduate)  
   f. Short-term* program (conducted in English)  
   g. MEXT’s Japanese Studies Students Program  
   h. Summer (cultural exchange) program  
   i. University preparatory program  
   j. Others: __________________________

Note: *Short-term means a period of one semester to one academic year

4. a. Does your institution have a numerical target of recruiting international students?
   Yes  
   No

   b. If you answer “Yes,”
   What number of international students does the institution wish to have? ___________ and what is its ratio to the student body (ratio of international students)? ___________

III. Strategies and Measures for Accepting International Students

1. What kinds of measures does your institution take to recruit/accept international students?
   Please answer each question by circling “Yes” or “No” in the middle column about the implementation and rate the level of importance by circling one of the numbers in the right column regarding the provided items, using the following scale. Please rate the level of importance about each question even if your answer is “No” in the implementation column.
   1= Not at all important
   2= Slightly important
   3= Moderately important
   4= Very important
   5= Extremely important


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our institution……</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. has a clear vision and mission statement regarding acceptance of international students.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. has a specialized office to support international students.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. participate in university fairs abroad</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. is increasing the number of partner institutions abroad.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. has an own scholarship program exclusively for international students.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. receives funds from the local community and/or business sector to assist international students.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. has a university preparatory or/and Japanese language program that international students may attend before they become matriculated students.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. has credit-bearing Japanese language courses for matriculated international students.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. has international chapters of the alumni association.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. conducts an entrance examination abroad.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. has a system of admission upon recommendation by Japanese language schools in Japan.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. collaborate with Japanese embassies or consulates or/and governmental agencies’ branch offices abroad.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. Work with a study abroad agent in a foreign country.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv. has an overseas office.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. encourages undergraduate international students to go on to graduate school.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. has a multiple language website.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii. has a twinning program with an institution abroad.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii. has a short-term program conducted in English to accept exchange or study abroad students.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. has a degree-granting program conducted in English.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx. has a residential hall for international students.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi. has a support program for international students in collaboration with the local community.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi. has a career placement program/system for international students.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1———2———3———4———5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Language Requirements and Test Scores

1. Does your institution have any faculties or/and departments (degree-granting programs) that do not require proficiency in Japanese?

   Yes  No

   If you answer “yes,” please write the names of relevant faculties or/and departments that do not require proficiency in Japanese
   
   i. _______________________________________________
   ii. ______________________________________________
   iii. ______________________________________________
   iv. ______________________________________________

2. Does your institution have any faculties or/and departments (degree-granting programs) that do not require proficiency in English?

   Yes  No

   If you answer “yes,” please write the names of relevant faculties or/and departments that do not require proficiency in English
   
   i. _______________________________________________
   ii. ______________________________________________
   iii. ______________________________________________
   iv. ______________________________________________

3. Does your institution require a score of the “Japanese as a Foreign Language” of the EJU (Examination for Japanese University Admission for International Students) of international student applicants?

   Yes  No

4. Does your institution require a score of the TOEFL of international student applicants?

   Yes  No

5. Does your institution require a score(s) of academic subjects such as “mathematics” and “Japan and the World” or “Science” of the EJU (Examination for Japanese University Admission for International Students) of international student applicants?

   Yes  No
V. Approach to International Student Market Outside Japan

1. Does your institution have a system to recruit prospective international students who reside abroad (approach the international student market outside Japan)?

   Yes   No

If you answer “Yes,” please answer 2 and 3. If you answer “No,” please answer 4.

2. Please fill in the names of faculties or/and departments that systematically recruit prospective international students residing abroad in the left column and circle one of the numbers, which are correspondent with the following choices, in the right column regarding the screening methods employed by the relevant faculties or/and departments.

   1) Conduct an entrance examination abroad
   2) Document screening and an interview (interview held in a foreign country or by use of a conference telephone or video conference)
   3) Document screening only
   4) Admission upon recommendation by a partner institution abroad
   5) Others (Please explain in parentheses):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Faculty or Department</th>
<th>Screening Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (       )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (       )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (       )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 (       )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please write advantages or/and benefits that your institution has found in terms of recruiting prospective international students who reside abroad.

   i. __________________________________________________________
   ii. __________________________________________________________
   iii. __________________________________________________________
   iv. __________________________________________________________

4. Please CHECK ALL the reasons your institution does not recruit prospective international students who reside abroad (does not approach the international student market outside Japan).

   1) Cumbersome procedure and paper work
   2) Financial reason (costly business)
   3) Difficulty of checking academic ability of applicants
   4) Difficulty of checking Japanese language proficiency of applicants
5) EJU (Examination for Japanese University Admission for International Students) is not user-friendly
6) Difficulty of conducting an interview
7) Weak credibility on documents and academic records sent by applicants
8) Troublesome to admit international students who come to your institution from foreign countries directly
9) Feel safe to admit international students who are studying at domestic Japanese language schools
10) The enough number of international students can be recruited from domestic Japanese language schools
11) Others (please explain): __________________________________________________________________________

VI. Difficulties in Promoting Acceptance of International Students

Please CHECK ALL the difficulties that your institution faces in order to promote the acceptance of international students.

1) Decreasing international applicants
2) Inadequate Japanese proficiency of international applicants
3) Inadequate academic ability of international applicants
4) Financial burden on an institution
5) Imbalance of the number of international student applicants among faculties or departments
6) Insufficient integration of international and Japanese students on campus
7) Housing shortage
8) Administrative burden on offices of an institution
9) Lack of community support
10) Burden on an academic advisor of an international student
11) No policy or mission for the acceptance of international students
12) Others (please explain): __________________________________________________________________________
Informed consent of the subject is one of the fundamental principles of ethical research for human subjects. Informed consent is also mandated by Federal regulations (45 CFR 46) and University policy for research with human subjects. An investigator should seek a waiver of written or verbal informed consent only under compelling circumstances.

The IRB determines which type of consent applies to your research but please check the type that you recommend. The Guidelines for Determining Type of Consent will assist you in this process.

- Waive Written Informed Consent (see Section A)
- Waive Verbal and Written Informed Consent (see Section B)

SECTION A: Waive Written Informed Consent

I believe that this protocol is eligible for exemption of the written informed consent requirement because the protocol meets one of the following criteria:

(NOTE: Even when written informed consent is waived, the investigator is required to give subjects full informed consent verbally.)

(1) The only record linking the subject and the research would be the consent document and the principal risk would be potential harm resulting from breach of confidentiality. Each subject will be asked whether the subject wants documentation linking the subject with the research and the subject’s wishes will govern.

Example: When there is a possible legal, social or economic risk to the subject entailed in signing the consent form, e.g., for immigrants who might be identified as being illegal aliens, or for HIV antibody-positive individuals who might be identified as such by signing the consent form;

- Waive Written Informed Consent (see Section A)

SECTION B: Waive Verbal and Written Informed Consent

I believe that this protocol is eligible for exemption of written and verbal informed consent because the protocol meets ALL of the following criteria:

(1) The research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects
(2) The waiver or alteration will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the subjects
(3) The research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver or alteration.
(4) Whenever appropriate, the subjects will be provided with additional pertinent information after participation.

As the federal regulations note, "in cases where the documentation requirement is waived, the IRB may require the investigator to provide subjects with a written statement regarding the research." The Social and Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board often requires the use of such a written statement, in the form of an information sheet, which includes most or all of the same elements as a consent form, but does not require the signature of the subject. These elements would be as follows:

A) A statement that the study involves research, an explanation of the purposes of the research, the expected duration of the subject's participation, a description of the procedures, and identification of any procedures that are experimental.
B) A statement that participation in the research involves no known risks.
C) An explanation of whom to contact for answers to pertinent questions about the research (the PI and the PI’s office telephone number; faculty sponsor, if applicable) and questions about human research subjects’ rights (Social and Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board at 716.645.3321) and
D) A statement describing the extent, if any, to which confidentiality of records identifying the subject will be maintained.
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