

日本の大学における 弁証法的グローバリゼーションと国際化

The Dialectic of Internationalization and Globalization in Japanese Universities

ウィリアム ブラドリー
William S. BRADLEY

キーワード

[国際化] internationalization ・ [グローバリゼーション] globalization
[イデオロギー] ideology ・ [高等教育] higher education

1. Introduction

The widespread use of the term internationalization (*kokusaika*) in regard to discussions of education in Japan throughout the late 80s and into the middle part of the 90s was only diminished by an ever more intense focus on the processes of globalization and the resultant linkages with education. This does not mean that globalization has simply replaced internationalization, especially since they refer to different processes, dimensions, and practices, however interrelated, as I will argue below. It does mean, however, that the flatulent effects of internationalization discourses have receded and this provides new possibilities to assess the significance of internationalization in relation to the Japanese university, which continues to face a period of transition and change.

While globalization has another set of questions and contradictions that attends its coupling with educational discourse, the use of internationalization as a discourse to get things done, to set agendas, to reform education has been noteworthy, even where it was often excessively hyperbolic. I describe its role as ideological in mobilizing hegemonic consensus to implement certain kinds of openings and changes, while acknowledging the serious shortcomings of internationalization to effectively accomplish much more than basic and incremental changes.

Given the failure to bring to fruition higher forms of understanding and exchange, as sometimes envisioned in the idealized form of internationalization (a theme repeatedly noted by various writers from different vantage points; see for example Hall: 1998; Itoh: 2000; McConnell: 2000), it would be easy to say that the ideology in question is an example of false consciousness in the classic marxian conception. However here I would like to use the term more to index its

function as an “indirect indicator” for revealing values and decisions about educational goals and visions (Burbules: 1995). In other words, I will argue that whenever internationalization is connected to educational policy, there is almost always an implicit (and sometime explicit) normative set of assumptions. This may not appear to be anything other than obvious but when the analysis turns to globalization it becomes clear that a similar tendency is at work. I argue that to offset some of the more dangerous aspects of globalization for the Japanese university, none other than a renewed focus on internationalization is necessary. Argued from a slightly less optimistic perspective, the dialectic relationship between the two concepts entails that globalization conditions the kinds of internationalization that become possible and beneficial to the Japanese university. While it will be impossible to complete this argument with the necessary specificity in describing examples in Japanese universities or even a Japanese university, this paper will conclude with a set of constructive questions that can be used to provide further reflection for proactive internationalization in the context of Japanese higher education.

2. The Uses of Internationalization and Ideological Underpinnings

Educational change in the Japanese university system, since its origin in the 19th century, has often made use of processes of internationalization in one form or another. The importation of foreign scholars, primarily from the industrialized West, to teach their specialized knowledge is a well-known aspect of the early history of modern education in Japan.ⁱ The utilization of internationalization as a vehicle for various projects of reform can be considered a recurring theme when looked at historically. Lincicome’s (1999) detailed analysis of the Taisho era’s (1912-1926) liberal “international education movement” (*kokusai kyôiku undô*) has been useful in showing this to be the case. This episode is furthermore indicative of the occasional counterintuitive goals of actors surrounding any opening to internationalization as Lincicome debunks a common historical misconception that advocates and discourses of internationalization necessarily reject strong forms of nationalism.

The discussions that have taken place regarding reform of the Japanese university since the 1980s have to some degree been ancillary of discussions of the meaning of internationalization in the wider Japanese society. But what exactly are these meanings? First, we can describe internationalization in terms of numbers of people and their movements. A distinction between external (outside of Japan, e.g. Japanese students going abroad) and internal (inside Japan, e.g. foreigners studying and living in Japan) internationalizations is exemplary of this kind of categorical and formalized accounting of internationalization (Sugiyama: 1992). This is also apparent in the targets set by various governmental agencies, as in the infamous goal of 100,000 foreign students first set 20 years ago when Nakasone Yasuhiro was Prime Minister, and finally reached for the first time this year (The Daily Yomiuri: 2003).ⁱⁱ

A second form of internationalization is related to the international political tensions due

to an increasingly powerful Japanese economy in the late 80s and early 90s. Internationalization became a strategy to reduce friction and resist efforts to fully open markets that, in some commentators' opinions, are partly based on a psychological barriers to openness (Itoh, 2000 uses the historical term, *sakoku*, the 229 year "seclusion" during Tokugawa, to make her argument).

A third kind of internationalization is based on the various activities and programs, for or related to internationalization, such as the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Program in which foreign language teaching assistants are placed every year in junior high and high schools around Japan. This program, which was started in 1987 with 848 recent college graduates from the U.S., Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, was later expanded to include participants from other countries including France and Germany in 1988 since then-Prime Minister Takeshita Noboru was eager to improve relations with Europe (McConnell, 2000:73).

Each of these partial aspects for defining internationalization has ideological biases as the second and third forms make clear. If purposes, rationales, benefits, and outcomes are specified, as they are in many definitions, then it is obvious that internationalization is ideologically constructed. An early example of such a perspective is found in Mouer and Sugimoto (1983:269-70) who argue that different groups have employed the term in disparate contexts, *kokusai ni naru koto* (becoming international), *kokusai shugi* (internationalism), and *kokusai no jidai* (age of internationalism). There are at least two distinct meanings available; 1) smooth promotion of Japan's interests and 2) development of some form of systematic goodwill (or government mechanism such as the United Nations) between different peoples and countries.

Even numbers of people, the first category above, can serve to bolster ideological biases or cloak understanding of contradictory processes. Befu (2000), for example, points out that close to 700,000 Japanese were registered as living abroad in 1994 but many of them are linked economically to Japan by their employment in Japanese companies or businesses that cater to Japanese travelling or residing abroad. He hypothesizes that this aspect of internationalization allows an escape valve for those who might otherwise demand more changes in a system which is too rigid to meet their varied needs.ⁱⁱⁱ

I have already defined ideology as an indicator of attendant values and goals that are often only implicit. However it is perhaps useful to sharpen the focus here. Eagleton (1991) describes six different and related ways to move from the more general to the more specific in defining ideology. One of these he defines in the following way. Ideology is "a kind of collective symbolic self-expression ... which attends to the *promotion* and *legitimation* of the interests of [socially significant] groups in the face of opposing interests " (p. 29, italics in original). Put more succinctly, ideology can be simplified to the phrase "meaning in the service of power" (Thompson, 1990, cited in Larrain, 1994:14). Thus the source of strong disagreements about what constitutes internationalization is certainly related to the contestation over legitimacy in goals whether national, institutional, or even local.

This is true with other phenomena and issues that have been frequently discussed in

relation to internationalization in Japan. A short list would include issues of minorities and resident foreign populations in Japan and their integration (Atagi: 1996; Lee: 2002; Okano and Tsuchiya: 1999), student exchange programs for Japanese in other countries and inter-university agreements (Umakoshi: 1997), returnee students (Goodman: 1991), the numbers and status of foreign faculty (Hall: 1998), the proficiency level of foreign language learning in Japan especially of English, capital flows (McCormack: 1996) and contribution to world order (Tanaka: 1994).^{iv}

McCormack (1996) writes that internationalization indexes, among other things, the trilateral relationship between centers of business and technology in Japan, North America and the European Community.

However *kokusaika* has not yet been accompanied by any significant social opening and diversity; instead the established pattern of treatment of minorities - assimilation, discrimination - is reproduced. The very 'success' that creates this *kokusaika* continues to stimulate a Japanese desire to assert its identity more forcefully, which in turn, sharpens tensions internationally and domestically, in an intensifying vicious circle (pp. 274-5).

A further point regarding the geographical assumptions in internationalization discussions is that they often posit a center in Japan and phenomena are either related to Tokyo (the capital) or the peripheries (everywhere else).^v Tokyo in its status as a "global city" receives large influxes of immigrant populations (more than a 30% rise in the period 1990-98 according to Sassen, 2001) but also is the focus of attention on areas such as *Kabukichô* with its extremely high proportion of foreign residents working in the bar, nightclub, and entertainment industries and concern over 'foreign crime.'

Before moving to a more specific account of the use of internationalization in reform of higher education in Japan, the question should be raised as to whether a non-ideological definition is in fact possible. Strictly speaking, it is impossible to speak from outside of any position in the structure of society. However we should be able to identify carefully stated definitions which at least try to balance the many different aspects of a given phenomenon. Knight (2003b) proposes the following:

Internationalization at the national, sector, and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education.

This definition intentionally excludes actors, goals, means, and is therefore very general but it has the advantage of relating in a basic form the types of activities to the sphere of use, i.e. higher education, to the describe the diverse constructs subsumed under one name, internationalization.

3. The Uses of Internationalization in Japanese Educational Reform

At least three competing ideological discourses could be seen as relevant to the

discussion of the meaning of internationalization in Japanese national policy discussions of education since 1980. These have been identified by Atagi (1996:18) as westernization, creation of a New Japan, and anti-internationalization. Befu (1983:232), among others, makes the point that internationalization didn't start in the 80s although the term became fashionable through discussions of *kokusaijin* (international person) and *kokusai-koryu* (international exchange). He writes, "Thus the same process of westernization which has characterized Japan earlier is now perceived as part of its internationalization."

Notwithstanding work on internationalization in earlier periods (such as that of Lincicome mentioned at the outset), a renewed emphasis on the term can be linked to the growing prosperity and economic development of Japan in the late 60's and into the 70's. Befu (1983:262) identifies at least a partial growth of internationalization rhetoric with a purpose of strengthening and inoculating Japan's economy from outside influence, what he refers to as a "u-turn internationalism."

Atagi (1996) comprehensively analyzed policy documents from government and business and describes some of the early linkages of internationalization and education as originating in the Maekawa Reports (1986 and 1987) and the set of 4 reports issued by the *Rinji Kyoiku Shingikai* (National Council on Educational Reform or NCER, 1985-1987). While the Maekawa reports, authored as they were by an economic advisory council to Prime Minister Nakasone, focused heavily on trying to ameliorate economic friction through international exchanges, the NCER reports focused on the reduction of "cultural friction" (2nd Report, p. 209, cited in Atagi, 1996:123). In the 2nd report, one of the five areas was targeted as "*requirements for higher education in Japan from an international perspective*" which was amended to "*restructuring the Japanese higher education system from an international perspective*" in the Final Report (pp. 123-5, italics added). The guidelines of the Council can be clearly seen to fit into the Nakasone administration's push to reform the educational bureaucracy and "contribute to the international community with a Japanese consciousness" (cited in Lincicome, 1993:127).

Stated in its simplest form, a growing awareness of the conflict inherent in Japanese overseas economic expansion produced a need to communicate Japanese interests in the world and for the role of education to mold such a consciousness. Various segments of the educational establishment, the Japan Teachers Union, for example, responded with objections, particularly since the composition of the Council had been made up of a large proportion of industrialists and representatives of major economic organizations (Atagi, 1996:128-137). Critics of the Council have looked through the surface claims for advancing internationalization and demonstrated their nationalistic core (see for example Horio, 1988: Chapter 14).

Meanwhile, internationalization in practice has meant that as a slogan it tends to ring hollow, coupled as it is with the Ministry of Education's (*Monbukagakushō*) emphasis on the firm distinction between Japanese and foreign "culture" and its insistence on schools' utilizing the national flag and anthem at entrance and graduation ceremonies (Aspinall: 2000). Is there much surprise then if academics and researchers tend to appropriate it for their own purposes and agendas? Research on Japanese physicists, for example, found that cleavages by region, gender,

generation, subfield, institution, ties to government agencies, and conceptual and linguistic ways of representing their subject to each other, were then utilized together with appeals to internationalization to acquire funding and resources which match particular local needs (Traweek, 1996:183-184).

In several studies which have recently compared internationalizations across national boundaries, one particularly interesting finding is that internationalization in the U.S. and Britain can be characterized as oriented toward a more competitive approach as opposed to a more cooperative approach favored in continental Europe (Currie et al: 2003; de Wit: 2002). It is still an open question which direction Japan is choosing, but it appears to be one that is more similar to the Anglo-American model with emphasis on deregulation, competition to revive the economy, and administrative reforms (Itoh: 2002). As in other countries around the world, the management of the Japanese university is increasingly being called to account for its ability to create niche markets in a global capitalist system and provide 'useable' skills for the next generation of the workforce. Aware of the positive linkages, progressive image-making, and possible sources of additional income, Japanese universities are eager to set up international exchanges and agreements. This discussion overlaps with developments that are more often considered from the perspective of globalization so it is to that section that I now turn.

4. Globalization Discourses

The first question that should be asked is whether globalization is different from internationalization or not. For some writers it appears that it isn't. Itoh (2000), for example, wrote a book on the globalization of Japan but proceeds to discuss internationalization throughout the entire book. Globalization, however, can be defined most simply as "the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, ideas ... across borders. Globalization affects each country in a different way due to a nation's individual history, traditions, culture and priorities" (Knight and de Wit, 1997, cited in Knight 2003a). This definition is written as an attempt at a non-ideological statement. There are some who would argue that by accepting globalization as a given, a bias has already been filtered into the analysis. Among the most well-known of such critics is the work by Hirst and Thompson (1999) in which they argue that economic trends worldwide lead them to conclude that, far from the power of nation states evaporating in the face of globalization, the liberal multilateral system with the U.S. in hegemonic dominance continues. However this ignores various other aspects that have been identified by numerous authors as evidence of globalization.^{vi}

- 1) There is a strong economic aspect to globalization in terms of commodification of markets and liberalization of goods and services. As we shall see below this is an important point in relation to education. For some, this is the most important aspect, for others it is an aspect which has led to ancillary changes in social and cultural spheres, in some cases transformations which have assumed autonomous aspects.

- 2) Knowledge is viewed as increasingly important for an advanced economy. This has obvious implications for higher education since it is both a provider and a certifier of such knowledge.
- 3) Developments in information and communications technologies (ICTs) are creating easier and more numerous relationships across borders. Moreover, distance education and virtual universities are now threatening to become serious competitors to higher education.
- 4) Science and scientific research become increasingly important as science is seen as able to bridge all of the previous dimensions, from commodification of intellectual goods to participation in the “knowledge society,” and utilization and integration of and through ICTs.

There are undoubtedly other dimensions as well. Stepping back however briefly from the above enumeration of global ‘transformationalist’ phenomena, it is important to look into more elaborate arguments regarding the mistaken claims made about a ubiquitous and unstoppable globalization. To begin with, is globalization to be considered an outcome or a process (Rosenberg: 2000)? It makes a difference because if it is considered an outcome then it needs some other theoretical basis, while as a process it becomes less dynamic and all-encompassing, qualities which give it special purchase as a theoretical tool.

Hoogevelt (2001) identifies three positions, skeptical, transformationalist, and hyperglobalist with respective correspondence to economic, social, and political spheres. She argues that it is possible to be a skeptic and a transformationalist at the same time. While the economic literature shows many parts of the developing world being excluded from the global flows of capital and finance, qualitative changes are still apparent in “*all* cross-border transactions” (p. 121, italics in original).

As with internationalization, it becomes clear that while there are tangible phenomena under consideration in most discussions of globalization, the degree that globalization becomes the explanatory model is almost a wager. Jones (2000), dividing hypotheses into strong (globalization) and weak (internationalization) versions, writes “the practical diversity of their consequences complicates the task of establishing the character and extent of internationalization and/or globalization from the available evidence.” The two constructs are consequently bound to remain controversial as theoretical tools although “the challenges posed to established states and conventional modes of public governance are many, and potentially profound” (p. 115).

Thus, as I have already argued, there are phenomena which look categorically to be in need of a theory or a “disciplining strategy,” as MacLean (2000) refers to it. But of equal importance, “The starting point for analysis is not the concept of globalization itself, but a reflexive appreciation by scholars of the possible forms of their own existing relationships with globalization” (p. 64).

Before turning to a more specific discussion of education and globalization, it is important to note another wide range of literature which seeks to uncover the connections between globalization and rising levels of economic inequalities (Goulet: 2002). Terminology such as the “race to the bottom” (Brecher and Costello: 1998), “predatory globalization” (Falk:

1999), and “the 20:80 society” (Martin and Schumann: 1997) is used to describe the devastating effects of unregulated global capital, particularly on the life chances and surrounding environment of the poorest 80% of the world’s population. For these authors and others, globalization is certainly a palpable and recognizable set of conditions, which allows them to be lumped together under the label of ‘anti-globalizers.’ It is to the point of this essay to note, however, that they utilize the ideology of globalization for their own purposes, just as those who argue ‘in favor of’ globalization do. It has also been frequently noted that the possibilities for organizing collective action, such as the cyclical protests against the WTO and G8 meetings, have been greatly enhanced by the networks of ICTs.

5. Globalization’s Relationships to Education

Having argued that a skeptical and transformationalist stance is at least a possibility, I now wish to explore briefly some of the arguments regarding the connections of globalization and education. As with the conclusion that I arrived at in the previous section that one needs to be a skeptic at the same time as trying to identify important changes that are occurring, so with education is it the case that across many contexts change is notable.

Once again the changes start with financial and economic issues and concerns. Many authors point to the way in which governments are attempting to cut the costs of higher education as a central aspect of globalization. However the list extends to the focus on performativity and standardization. In other words, educational institutions must prove their worth in ways that are standard and accountable. One form such practice takes is the use of tests which can be used for sectoral or international comparisons. Another form is the rise of “managerialism,” borrowing practices from the business world to ensure efficiency and “value for money” (Mok: 2000).

Furthermore, universities in particular are charged with providing practical skills, making their students more useful for future employment and work opportunities. Terms like “competence” and “enterprise” are tied to programs for making the national human capital more competitive (Yang: 2003).

Academic material, courses and lectures, is reformulated to include popular culture, so that it can be more amenable to packaging as profitable commodities (Burbules and Torres, 2000:16; Miyoshi: 1998). Pressure is on the professors to speak the globalized common idiom rather than educate youth in the language of “high” culture. The ‘marketization’ of higher education involves the gradual transition of professors into ‘providers’ and students into ‘consumers’ (Fairclough; 1995) with all of the negative implications for critical thinking and challenging education that these roles entail.

Networks and ICTs are making impacts both in terms of delivery of course content and new forms of institutions (virtual universities and course providers) but also in terms of lowering costs (Carnoy and Rhoten: 2002; Currie et al: 2003).

All of these developments ultimately affect that way universities look at their

international profiles. This is why the relation of dialectic seems to make the most sense in describing how globalization fits with internationalization. Kwiek (2001) provides the example of Central and Eastern European universities faced with the pressures of globalizing requirements for training their future workforces. “Internationalization practices can both save the social and cultural status of [higher education] and contribute to the overall competitiveness of states and regions.”

Jones (1998) uses the term ‘internationalism’ which, because of its long historical usage to describe democratic cooperation across borders, seems best suited to providing some vision of how the worst effects of globalization can be preempted. Scott (1998) also sees the two terms internationalization and globalization as dialectically linked. Similarly, de Wit (2002) uses the term “integrated internationalization” which he posits as the proper response of higher education to globalization.

One of the main challenges, in a phrase, is how universities can avoid the “secrecy that develops in corporatized universities and the commodification that comes with commercialized universities” (Currie et al, 2003: 197-8). Another is in convincing governments that it is in their interest to continue to support higher education as one of the most potent forces for societal integration (Green: 1997). In a polemic titled “The Globalization of Nothing,” Ritzer (2004) describes how it is non-descript places and products (e.g. airport lounges, fast food restaurants) that are most easily globalized. The process can be resisted best by the creation of, not surprisingly, something. This is to say that higher education institutions are likely to be more successful to the degree that they are able to strategically target their internationalization agendas to fit with their profiles. Of course this is not an easy task but it is one that globalization appears to bring to the forefront, regardless of context.

6. Globalization and the Japanese University

The question of what is specific to the Japanese case needs first to address an obvious problem of the directional vector in the process of globalization. This question has been raised by Befu in stating that the West is often seen as the prime agent of globalization (Befu, et al: 2000). However it would appear that the strategies and techniques of neo-liberal governance of higher education, which are already in evidence in many countries, are similarly being modeled by the Ministry of Education in Japan.

It is certain that many universities have been slow to acknowledge the changes that are taking place in their governance and finances. Few seem to know what consequences a situation in which 100% of university applicants in Japan will be able to enter a university in a few years from now will have both on entrance requirements and financial resources. Much uncertainty remains as to how the transformation of national universities into independent administrative institutions (IAIs, *dokoritsu gyôsei hôjin*) in April 2004 will affect their finances (Murasawa: 2002). As illustrated above, the strategy of creating competitive environments is apparent in the Ministry of Education’s reforms of higher education as a way of cutting costs and promoting a

sink or swim mentality.

Funding for science research has been paramount in the past few years as *Monbukagakushô* attempts to promote research that will provide some paybacks to the economy. The introduction to the 2nd Science and Technology Basic Plan (Government of Japan: 2001) begins with an overview that notes the grim situation of the mid 90s both in the economy and in research conditions, “the grave situation of Japanese S&T level and the deterioration of competitiveness of Japanese companies.” From there, the themes of competition, mobility of human resources, and evaluation are given great prominence. The amount of competitive research funding is to be doubled in this period and more money is to be designated for basic research. Fixed-term appointments for researchers and university personnel are advised, especially for young researchers as one of the prime components of flexibility. Japanese universities are to be more cognizant of industry needs and collaboration across government-industry-university boundaries is to be encouraged.

Similarly, *Monbukagakushô* uses the rhetoric of “mega-competition” based on rapidly advancing globalization in promoting its plan of cultivating “Japanese with English Abilities” (MEXT: 2003). This would seem to confirm the supposition above that a model of competition, following the common type in the U.S., Britain, Australia, and other “Anglo-American” countries is being used to structure Japanese education. Why this necessarily has to be the case is not clear, although several interpretations are possible. Competition is certainly a much more attention-forming device than cooperation. Globalization and risk can be conjoined (Beck:2000) in a way that makes it difficult to discuss the pre-ordained goal of putting higher education strictly and foremost in the service of the economy.

7. Conclusion: Return to Ideology

In a recent publication, Barnett (2003) argues that ideology is “alive and well” in discourses about the future of higher education. However he also argues that there are “pernicious” ideologies and “virtuous” ideologies. Without elaborating this argument in great detail, I think he has identified the central problem as being that ideologies exist and are not being effectively confronted or mobilized as such. Although Barnett prefers the concept of supercomplexity to globalization, the resultant stresses on the university are similar. The university finds itself unable to mediate between the complex and diverse projects that spread its mission so thin that it risks getting lost. In brief, he concludes that the university must work toward “process goals not operational goals and collective understanding rather than corporate performance” (p. 114).

The ‘facts’ of globalization, in the way it distributes effects on the university are very much here to stay but at the same time they are waiting to be defined, to be made concrete, in each particular context. Globalization can be a stimulation to new forms of international cooperation and exchange agreements, or integrated internationalization (following de Wit: 2002) as a way of coping with the stresses that fall under its rubric. However for this to happen, the

ideologies that are circulating in the university must be open and debatable. It would be difficult in the absence of a specific context to make a more general prescription than this. So instead I will end with several questions that are adapted from the discussion in Barnett (2003).

- 1) Does the proliferation of knowledges (associated with the thesis of university as a “spearhead institution” in the knowledge economy (Stromquist:2002)) tend to contribute to greater societal reflexivity or to confusion of agendas? In other words, does the public understand what the university is trying to do in expanding the range of areas in which it has an interest?
- 2) Do universities still maintain the collective energy and initiative to pass constructive evaluation on societal projects, such as the way scientific research is structured or are they becoming overwhelmed by the problems of competing for funding and their ties to industry and the government?
- 3) How does a university see itself in participating in international networks? How much time, effort, and resources should it expend and should such efforts be structured rather than left simply to individual initiatives of interested faculty?
- 4) What does it mean to be a university? How does the university institute practices that are more than papering a trail over the terminology of accounting and transparency?
- 5) Whose responsibility is it to plan for complexity? If as Barnett (2003) argues this is a feature of the ontological reality of the 21st century university, then what kinds of decision-making processes become necessary to ensure the proper mix of bold vision and adequate caution?

Acknowledgment

My sincere thanks to Harumi Befu, Rebecca Jennison, Pauline Kent, and Bernard Susser for their comments on an much earlier version of this paper.

Endnotes

ⁱ I note all the well-placed objections to creating lump categories; the scholars in the Meiji period, as well as the countries of Western Europe together with the U.S. isomorphed as the 'West.' Notwithstanding current renewed interest in Asia by Japanese academics as well as the generation of college students that we teach, the comparative framework that Japanese educational leaders have used to measure Japan's achievement has been the Western universities. Kobayashi (1979:167) writes, for example, that higher education in the Meiji era was "virtually synonymous with internationalization or westernization."

ⁱⁱ The number of foreign students in Japan has been a widely cited figure ever since the Monbusho set a goal in 1983 of 100,000 by the year 2000. Figures from May 1999 put the figure at 55,755 a small increase over the previous year but essentially a static figure since 1993 when the number was over 52,000 (The Daily Yomiuri, 2000). Cross-national comparisons can be somewhat misleading, however, as a simple comparison, Australia (A) had only 7,131 self-supporting foreign students in 1987 while Japan (J) had 17,702. The corresponding figures for the following years are; 1988: A 21,128, J 20,549 1989: A 32,198, J 25,852 1990: A 47,882, J 35,360 1991: A 47,882, J 38,775 1992: A 52,540, J 41,804 1993: A 63,013, J 44,783 1994: A 69,819, J 45,577. Statistics are from Smart and Ang (1996) and Atagi (1996:207). In the past two years the number in Japan has surged and is now at 109,508 (The Daily Yomiuri, 2003), while the number in Australia has continued to grow faster and now stands at 210,411 (The Australian, 2003).

ⁱⁱⁱ Kelsky (1999) and Stefansson (1994) have written similarly about the gender of internationalization, in that young women often utilize opportunities to internationalize themselves by studying languages, travelling and working abroad, or in businesses related to foreign trade and travel. While they gain certain benefits when successful, they also 'voluntarily' remove themselves from a system that sometimes makes it harder for them than men to succeed without internationalizing.

^{iv} Here one could add perennial conflicts over the degree to which the Japanese government should apologize for wartime atrocities, the issue of comfort women, the uncertainty over gaining a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council, the despatch of the Self Defense Force to Iraq, and the revision of the Constitution, particularly Article 9.

^v Robertson (1997) has written about the role of *furusato* (home town) in relation to internationalization, particularly how rural areas attempt to market their images vis-a-vis the metropolis in an attempt to sustain local economies of scale.

^{vi} The following criteria are a composite of descriptors found in de Boer et al (2002), de Wit (2002), and Knight (2003a).

References

Apple, M. W. (2001). Comparing neo-liberal projects and inequality in education. *Comparative Education*, 37(4): 409-423.

Aspinall, R. (2000). Policies for 'Internationalization' in the contemporary Japanese education system. *Nagoya University Gengo Bunka Ronshu*, 21-2: 3-21.

Atagi, R. (1996). *Japan's Internationalization Policy in Education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Michigan. UMI 9624557.

The Australian. (2003). Foreign students worth \$5.2 bn a year. December 23, 2003. Available <http://www.theaustralian.new.com.au>

Barnett, R. (2003). *Beyond All Reason: Living with ideology in the university*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Beck, U. (2000). *What is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Befu, H. (2000). Globalization as human dispersal: From the perspective of Japan. pp. 17-40. In J.S. Eades, T. Gill, and H. Befu (Eds.), *Globalization and Social Change in Contemporary Japan*. Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.

Befu, H. (1983). Internationalization of Japan and Nihon Bunkaron. pp. 232-266. In H. Mannari and H. Befu (Eds.).

Befu, H., Hannerz, U. Featherstone, M., Moeran, B, Ben-Ari, E., and Gill, T. (2000). Globalization workshop. *Kyoto Bunkyo University Jinkan Kenkyushô*, Vol. 1.

Brecher, J. and Costello, T. (1998). *Global Village or Global Pillage: Economic reconstruction from the bottom up*, 2nd Ed. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Burbules, N.C. (1995). Forms of ideology-critique: A pedagogical perspective. In P.L. McLaren

and J.M. Giarelli, (Eds.), *Critical Theory and Educational Research*. pp. 53-70. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Burbules, N.C. and Torres, C. A. (2000). Globalization and education: An introduction. pp. 1-26. In N.C. Burbules and C. A. Torres, (Eds.), *Globalization and Education: Critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Carnoy, M. and Rhoten, D. (2002). What does globalization mean for educational change: A comparative approach. *Comparative Education Review*, 46(1): 1-9.

Currie, J. and Newson, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Currie, J. DeAngelis, R., de Boer, H., Huisman, J., and Lacotte, C., (Eds.). (2003). *Globalizing Practices and University Responses*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

The Daily Yomiuri (2003). Number of overseas students hits 109,500. Nov. 12, 2003.

The Daily Yomiuri (2000). Number of foreign students hits record high in 1999. Jan. 13, 2000.

de Boer, H., Huisman, J., van der Meulen, B., Theisens, H. and van der Wende, M. (2002). *Academia in the 21st Century: An analysis of trends and perspectives in higher education and research*. Adviesraad voor het Wetenschaps en Technologiebeleid. Available http://www.utwente.nl/cheps/publications/downloadable_publications/downloadablesenglish.doc/index.html

de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction*. London: Verso.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of the universities. pp. 130-166. *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.

Falk, R. (1999). *Predatory Globalization: A critique*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Goodman, R. (1993). *Japan's 'International Youth': The Emergence of a New Class of Schoolchildren*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Goulet, D. (2002). Inequalities in the light of globalization. *Kroc Institute Occasional Paper*

#22. Available http://www.nd.edu/~krocinst/ocpapers/abs_22_2.htm

Government of Japan. (2001). *The Science and Technology Basic Plan (2001-2005)*. March 30, 2001. Available <http://www8.cao.go.jp/estp/english/s8tmain-e.html>

Green, A. (1997). *Education, Globalization and the Nation State*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Hall, I. (1998). *Cartels of the Mind: Japan's closed intellectual shop*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Hirst, P. and Thompson, G. (1999). *Globalization in Question, 2nd Ed.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hoogvelt, A. (2001). *Globalization and the Postcolonial World: The new political economy of development, 2nd Ed.* Houndsmill, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Horio, T. (1988). *Educational Thought and Ideology in Modern Japan: State Authority and Intellectual Freedom*. Tokyo: Tokyo University Press.

Itoh, A. (2002). Higher education reform in perspective: The Japanese experience. *Higher Education*, 43: 7-25.

Itoh, M. (2000). *Globalization of Japan: Japanese sakoku mentality and U.S. efforts to open Japan*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Jones, P. (1998). Globalisation and internationalisation: Democratic prospects for world education. *Comparative Education*, 34(2): 148-155.

Jones, R. J. B. (2000). *The World Turned Upside Down?: Globalization and future of the state*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Kelsky, K. (1999.) Gender, modernity and eroticized internationalism in Japan. *Cultural Anthropology*, 14(2):229-255.

Knight, J. (2003a). Internationalization: Developing an institutional self-portrait. *Readings for EOTU Project*. Available <http://www.eotu.uiuc.edu/events/2003-04global.htm>

Knight, J. (2003b). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33. Available http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News33/text001.htm

Kobayashi, T. (1979). The internationalization of Japanese higher education. In W.K. Cummings, I. Amano, and K. Kitamura (Eds.), *Changes in the Japanese University: A Comparative Perspective*.

NY: Praeger.

Kwiek, M. (2001). The Internationalization and globalization in Central and East European higher education. *Society for Research into Higher Education International News*. London: Open University Press. Available <http://www.policy.hu/kwiek/SRHE.html>.

Larrain, J. (1994). *Ideology and Cultural Identity: Modernity and the Third World Presence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lee, S. (2002) Koreans-A mistreated minority in Japan: Hopes and challenges for Japan's true internationalization. In R. T. Donahue, (Ed.), *Exploring Japaneseness: On Japanese enactments of culture and consciousness*. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Lincicome, M. (1999). Nationalism, imperialism, and the international education movement in early twentieth-century Japan. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 58(2): 338-360.

Lincicome, M. (1993.) Nationalism, internationalization and the dilemma of educational reform in Japan. *Comparative Education Review*, 37(2): 123-151.

MacLean, J. (2000). Philosophical roots of globalization and philosophical routes to globalization. pp. 3-66. In R.D. Germain, (Ed.), *Globalization and Its Critics: Perspectives from political economy*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Mannari, H. and Befu, H. (Eds.) (1983). *The Challenge of Japan's Internationalization*. Nishinomiya, Japan: Kwansei Gakuin University and Kodansha.

Martin, H-P. and Schumann, H. (1997). *The Global Trap: Globalization and the assault on prosperity and democracy*. London: Zed Books.

McConnell, D.L. (2000). *Importing Diversity: Inside Japan's JET Program*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

McCormack, G. (1996). Kokusaika: Impediments in Japan's deep structure. pp. 265-286. In D. Denoon, M. Hudson, G. McCormack, and T. Morris-Suzuki (Eds.), *Multicultural Japan: Paleolithic to Postmodern*. Cambridge Cambridge University Press.

MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology). (2003). Regarding the establishment of an action plan to cultivate "Japanese with English abilities." Available <http://www.mext.go.jp/engl15/topics/03072801.htm>

Miyoshi, M. (1998). Globalization, culture and the university. pp. 247-270. In F. Jameson and M. Miyoshi (Eds.), *The Cultures of Globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mok, K. H. (2000). Impact of globalization: A study of quality assurance systems of higher education in Hong Kong and Singapore. *Comparative Education Review*, 14(2): 148-174.

Mouer, R.E. and Sugimoto Y. (1983). Internationalization as an ideology in Japanese society. pp. 267-297. In H. Mannari and H. Befu (Eds.).

Murasawa, M. (2002). The future of higher education in Japan: Changing the legal status of national universities. *Higher Education*, 43: 141-155.

Okano, K. and Tsuchiya, M. (1999.) *Education in Contemporary Japan: Inequality and Diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ritzer, G. (2004). *The Globalization of Nothing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Robertson, J. (1997). Empire of nostalgia: Rethinking 'internationalization' in Japan today. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 14(4):97-122.

Rosenberg, J. (2000). *The Follies of Globalization Theory*. London: Verso.

Sassen, S. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. 2nd Ed. (2001). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Scott, P. (1998). Massification, internationalization and globalization. pp. 108-129. In P. Scott (Ed.), *The Globalization of Higher Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Smart, D. and Ang, G. (1996) The Internationalization of Australian Education. *International Higher Education*, 6. November, 1996. Available at
<http://www.bc.edu/bc.org/avp/soe/cihe/center1.html#News>

Stefansson, H. (1994). The 'outside' and the 'outsider' in Japan: the gender of *kokusaika*. *Osaka Gakuin University Bulletin of the Cultural and Natural Sciences*, 29: 1-22.

Stromquist, N.P. (2002). *Education in a Globalized World: The connectivity of economic power, technology, and knowledge*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Stromquist, N. P. and Monkman K. (Eds.). (2000). *Globalization and Education: Integration and contestation across cultures*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Sugiyama, Y. (1992). Internal and external aspects of internationalization. In G.D. Hook and M.A. Weiner (Eds.), *The Internationalization of Japan*. London:Routledge.

Tanaka, A. (1994). Rhetorics and limitations of Japan's new internationalism. *Japanese Studies Bulletin* 14(1):3-33.

Taylor, V. (1994). Internationalization that sticks to the rules: Nationality, gender, ethnicity and the law in Japan. *Japanese Studies Bulletin*, 14(1):105-127.

Traweek, S. (1996). *Kokusaika, gaiatsu, and bachigai*; Japanese physicists' strategies for moving into international political economy of science. pp. 174-97. In L. Nader (Ed.), *Naked Science: Anthropological Inquiry into Boundaries, Power, and Knowledge*. New York; Routledge.

Umakoshi, T. (1997). Internationalization of Japanese higher education in the 1980s and early 1990s. *Higher Education*, 34: 259-273.

Yang, R. (2003). Globalisation and higher education development: A critical analysis. *International Review of Education*, 49 (3-4): 269-291.