

(セミナー報告)

**“Globalization” in European Universities: A Different World?
The View from EAIE 2013.**

Matthew CLAFLIN · Junya KUNIMASA · Paul CHURTON

高等教育フォーラム 第4号抜刷 平成26年3月

“Globalization” in European Universities: A Different World? The View from EAIE 2013.

Matthew CLAFLIN¹

Junya KUNIMASA²

Paul CHURTON²

This paper will examine what models internationalization in Europe can provide for Kyoto Sangyo University. There will be three components: a brief discussion of why Europe and the European Association for International Education (EAIE) may provide good role models for internationalization at the tertiary level, an examination of internationalization at home and how it is determined by MEXT grants, and a discussion on the lessons that can be learnt from presentations at EAIE and how they relate to the Global programs currently being worked on at Kyoto Sangyo University. The conclusion will relate how, while Europe is ahead in this field, there are a lot of lessons to be gained from an examination of the more ‘internationalized’ institutions that attend conferences concerned with this theme, such as EAIE.

Keywords: Globalization, internationalization, internationalization at home, EAIE

‘Internationalization’ and ‘Globalization’ have become key words in the Japanese higher education sphere, which can be seen in MEXT’s Global 30 Project, and in the more recent Project for Promotion of Global Human Resource Development, in which Kyoto Sangyo University has been granted a type B grant. Universities, not only in Japan, but across the globe are struggling to find their place and role in a rapidly changing world, and so looking not only inside Japan, but also around the world becomes essential for the success of any globalization program.

There are three primary organizations with large annual conferences that cover this field: NAFSA: Association of International Educators¹, which is based in the United States, the Asia Pacific Association for International Education (APAIE) in Asia, and the European Association for International Education (EAIE) in Europe.

One of the benefits of attending an international conference in a field such as this is that through participating in a range of formal events such as presentations, poster sessions and plenary sessions combined with informal events

such as welcome parties and chance encounters at booths and over lunch, one gains a more comprehensive grasp of what is currently thought important in a field, and where developments might be going as people will say informally much more than they are willing to write down. It was for these reasons that Kyoto Sangyo University’s Center for International Programs (CIP), in cooperation with Global grant management, decided to send three members of staff to participate in the European Association for International Education (EAIE) conference in Turkey, 2013.

Founded in 1989, EAIE is, as their website states, “the acknowledged European leadership centre for expertise, networking and resources in the internationalisation of higher education.” (EAIE, n.d.)

As a global region, Europe is very advanced in the ‘internationalization’ of its higher education. At a trans-national level, the Bologna Process exists “to make European Higher Education more compatible and comparable, more competitive and more attractive,” (European Commission, 2013a) while, for students and staff, there is the

¹ Faculty of Foreign Languages, Center for International Programs, Kyoto Sangyo University ² Center for International Programs, Kyoto Sangyo University

Erasmus program, “the most successful student exchange programme in the world... (which) also offers the opportunity for student placements in enterprises, university staff teaching and training, and... funds co-operation projects between higher education institutions across Europe.” (European Commission, 2013b) For links to outside Europe, there is Erasmus Mundus, which “aims to enhance quality in higher education through scholarships and academic cooperation between Europe and the rest of the world,” (European Commission, 2013c) and all of this will continue when Erasmus+, which starts in 2014, begins to come into effect. (Salden, 2013)

While attendance at the conference provided an enormous amount of information in a wide range of fields and led to at least three new global partner universities, this paper will concentrate in general on “Internationalization at home” and in particular on one important aspect of this, English medium instruction.

Internationalisation and MEXT grants

When considering “internationalization”, a common approach is to consider the number of students, academic staff (and, more recently, office staff) being sent abroad and the availability of exchange programs, which is usually directly affected by the number of exchange partners. This is often labeled international mobility.

There is no doubt that a period of study abroad is of great benefit and so student and staff mobility is essential to any internationalization program. However, the majority of students, even in top-level institutions, will not study abroad, so the question becomes how to provide the benefits of an international experience without leaving the country. This is the role of “internationalization at home.” Longoni and Van Heule (2013), in a presentation entitled “A Newcomers’ Guide to Internationalization and the EAIE” further clarified the differences between the two fields as:

1. Internationalization abroad, which includes international mobility of staff, students and administration, as well as cross border or transnational education, an area that covers activities such as joint and double degrees and franchising, and

2. Internationalization at home, which is “a concept embracing all international activities that do not involve mobility” such as internationalization of the curriculum

and of research, English language teaching and the encouragement of language skills, and the development of intercultural understanding, as well as international recruitment of staff, students and services for international students. (Longoni and Van Heule, 2013)

Interestingly enough, this difference can also be seen clearly in the grants being offered by MEXT. The Global 30 project, which included such aims as to attract 300,000 international students to Japan, is clearly focused more on the first area, as can be seen in the description of the program in the Global 30 website:

13 universities were selected by the Japanese Government to be a member of the “Global 30” Project. These selected universities aim to nurture internationally competent individuals by creating an academic environment where international and Japanese students can learn from one another and build lasting international bonds that will propel them into the international scene. (MEXT, n.d. 1)

This is in contrast to the Project for Promotion of Global Human Resource Development, in which Kyoto Sangyo University has been given a Type B grant. Type B indicates that the grant is faculty or school specific, and that, “the selected universities are required to promote the globalization of the specific faculties/schools within the university, as well as to contribute to the internationalization of the university as a whole.” If one looks at the overall description of the grant, it states:

The Project for Promotion of Global Human Resource Development is a funding project that aims to overcome the Japanese younger generation’s “inward tendency” and to foster human resources who can positively meet the challenges and succeed in the global field, as the basis for improving Japan’s global competitiveness and enhancing the ties between nations. Efforts to promote the internalization of university education in Japan will be given strong, priority support. (MEXT, n.d. 2)

Thus, it would seem that the grant that Kyoto Sangyo has been given, with its focus on home students and faculties with the goal of improving the workforces’ global competitiveness, falls clearly in area 2, or “internationalization at home”, which means that consideration and knowledge of this field is essential for success in the use

of MEXT funds.

To examine current ‘best practice’ for internationalization at home, perhaps the most appropriate model would be the University of Helsinki, which was the 2013 EAIE Institutional Award for Innovation in Internationalisation winner.

The University of Helsinki presenters, who included members of staff from all areas of the university, with multiple people presenting each time, came to the following conclusions: 1. “In order to be excellent, the university must be international.” 2. “In order to attract international students and staff, the university needs to operate also in English.” 3. The university needs “to operate responsibly in English”, and 4. There must be “strategic decisions and informed choice at all levels” so that there is a clear answer to the question, “Why?” (Koponen, 2013) A wide range of presentations discussed these points, so they would seem a good framework for consideration of this field.

1. *In order to be excellent, the university must be international.* To do this, Helsinki has moved from having an International Office in the late 1980’s to having an International Affairs coordinating office of just two people who coordinate the efforts of international officers in all departments of the university, thus decentralizing the international efforts of the university, and, in effect, making the entire university an international body. Some examples of this are the personnel department, which provides support for incoming international staff as well as handling intercultural awareness and language training for staff, and the public relations office, which maintains internal and external communication in English and handles publicity and promotion at the international level. Even the financial offices provide English financial reporting for EU and other international funding, while also providing English support to help international staff understand payslips and issues relating to local tax and healthcare conditions. (Laitinen, 2013) This has had a range of benefits, in particular taking pressure off the International Office, which in the case of the majority of universities has to become a jack of all trades and handle “international” problems in all fields, a duty that is often overwhelming and prevents them from spending enough time on the primary roles of any international office.

2. *In order to attract international students and staff, the university needs to operate also in English.* In fact, it is becoming clear that an English working environment “enables (world-class universities) to attract the most talented people, and open (the universities) to new ideas and approaches.” (Salmi, quoted in Koponen, 2013) This does not mean that the home language or languages are ignored, as will be outlined in 3.

3. *The university needs to operate responsibly in English.* Teaching, research and learning in English is important, but in no way should they be exclusively in English. Universities must have a clear language policy, and there needs to be language support in English for non-native academic staff, office staff and students, as well as, in the case of Japan, in Japanese for non-native academic staff, office staff and students.

4. *There must be strategic decisions and informed choice at all levels, so that there is a clear answer to the question, “Why?”* Staff involvement at all levels is essential to the success of any international program as there will be “a wide range of understandings across and within institutions and disciplines about what internationalizing the curriculum at home means.” (Beelan, Jones and Leask, 2013) It is particularly important to involve and engage academic staff, have clear roles, focus on outcomes (not inputs), and develop a long-term incremental plan which involves ongoing networking, negotiation and reflection. (Beelan, Jones and Leask, 2013) In addition, any university contemplating a global focus must look beyond the local market and compare itself internationally, where awareness of professional, ethical and legal issues in the global environment becomes essential. (Beelan, Jones and Leask, 2013)

It can thus be seen that there are a wide range of aspects of an ‘international’ institution. A range of presentations at the conference made it clear that English taught programs as well as English language support for academic and office staff and students becomes essential, and so it would seem appropriate to examine this aspect of “internationalization at home” on its own.

Teaching, researching and working in English

The first and most important question that should be asked is, why teach in English?

Since the turn of the millennium, the balance shifted

and the number of L2 speakers of English now outnumber the number of L1 speakers, and those “L2 speakers increasingly use English among themselves, and in non-language-learning situations (so they are) users of English, (and not just learners.) English as a Lingua Franca is used to achieve common goals in research and education, not to identify with a community that uses it as a national language.” (ELFA project, quoted in Koponen, 2013). As Salmi (2009) states, “the international dimension is becoming increasingly important in determining the configuration of these elite institutions” as “world-class universities have students and faculty who are not exclusively from the country where the university operates (which) enables them to attract the most talented people, no matter where they come from, and open themselves to new ideas and approaches.” (Salmi, 2009) But internationalization is not only concerned with research and creating multi-cultural campuses. Appropriate courses are important as well as, as Leask (2009) points out, “An internationalised curriculum purposefully develops all students’ international and intercultural perspectives as global professionals and citizens.” (Leask, 2009, quoted in Beelan, Jones and Leask, 2013)

Thus it can be seen that English learning support, opportunities and academic programs are vital to the future of any university - not just to educate students about the culture and language of English-speaking countries, but also to attract global talent and equip students and staff to participate on the global stage in the debate concerning cross-cultural goals in research and education. Many European institutions are very aware of this need, a fact that can be clearly seen in the rapid expansion in Europe of English taught programs, especially at the graduate level.² Throughout the conference, it was very clear many universities are looking to create partnerships and exchanges with institutions with effective and sizable English programs, thus it was clear having English programs is proven to attract foreign interest and students. However, there are a number of concerns with providing English-taught programs, in particular with the level of teachers’ English.

The issue of teacher English level was a common topic in a range of presentations in the conference. A spoken level of C1 on the CEFR scale was recommended for giving lectures. (Valcke, 2013) C1 is labeled ‘Effective Op-

erational Proficiency’ and, according to Council of Europe (2001), the spoken interaction proficiency indicates a C1 user of English “can present clear, detailed descriptions of complex subjects integrating sub-themes, developing particular points and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion.” (Council of Europe, 2001, p.27)

However, it was pointed out that this is actually an imperfect tool as, in teaching, it is not just language competence, but also pedagogical competence which is key. Actually, teachers with levels as low as B2 were regularly giving effective, high-level classes in English. If a teacher’s pedagogy is particularly good, even a teacher with a B1 level of English can provide a challenging and well-regarded class. (Valcke, 2013) The key lies in providing language and pedagogical support for teachers, with support and advice utilizing such approaches as CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) being found effective.

In terms of quality of programs, teacher English language ability is not the only concern. Student language proficiency, the effects on learning and the effects on learning outcomes are all significant matters for concern. Interestingly, the Dean of a renowned European business school affirmed that with the introduction of English only programs in his school came a more student-centered and active learning style of teaching, which led to overall improvement of program quality at the school. (Koponen, 2013)

How all this effects the situation at Kyoto Sangyo University

It would seem that, in addition to continuing to provide the opportunity for students and staff to go abroad (international mobility), “internationalization at home” offers a wide range of possibilities for Kyoto Sangyo University. However, before discussing these possibilities, it is necessary to consider the English language learning situation at Kyoto Sangyo.

The receipt of the Type B Project for Promotion of Global Human Resource Development MEXT grant coincides with a range of significant changes in English language education, including English taught programs, at the university. From 2013, the General Education classes changed significantly, with the focus of instruction becoming the domestically well-recognized TOEIC test, and

English becoming required for all students. Coinciding with this, the Global Japan Program (GJP) program, which is part of General Education, has been supplemented with the creation of a foundation level of English-taught content programs that came online in 2012 and 2013. From 2014, the focus of all GJP classes will change from serving mainly foreign students to more for local students, with the courses themselves moving from the ‘other’ area to the core academic areas that can count towards student graduation requirements. This will raise student awareness of the courses, and should attract more students.

At the same time, the Faculty of Foreign Languages has been going through significant restructuring, with the new curriculum and new departments to come into line in 2014. A greatly expanded *Tokubetsu Eigo* program will provide a wide range of classes divided by level primarily in skills support and study abroad support including CLIL lecture courses, with a range of courses tailored to fit the needs of the science faculties involved in the grant.

In addition, the university has completed a Learning Commons, partly with money from the grant, and, when the new foreign language faculty building 2 is ready, there will also be what is currently being called a ‘Global Village’ which will have a combination of self-access learning center, language learning support, and study abroad support functions.

In terms of testing, in addition to the continued use of the internationally-recognized TOEFL test by the Faculty of Cultural Studies and the English and International Relations departments, in the last two years IELTS test³ preparation courses have been put in place, and the university has become a testing center for the IELTS test, with the university providing financial support for certain numbers of students to take the test.

Finally, the Center for International Programs has been given clearance to put together the GET portal, with GET standing for ‘Global studies, Education and Training,’ to provide a central advertising and packaging mechanism for all of the above.

Once all of this is active, the university will provide, in combination to existing services:

1. A wide range of skill and content-based courses to bring students’ English level, knowledge base and cross-

cultural understanding up to a level they can make the most of not only study abroad, but also domestic English courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. (i.e., internationalizing the curriculum.)

2. Access to a means of measuring progress in language learning against an internal and international scale (through offering a range of appropriate tests.)

3. Access to experiences outside the curriculum to encourage and motivate language learners, while equipping them with life skills a traditional classroom cannot provide (such as internship and volunteer opportunities, an area that will always be ‘under development.’)

4. Opportunities for language learners to choose to study in English, with academic courses at all levels. With the changes in GJP, the creation of the English Career Course and the Global Science Course, and other faculties also considering English programs, this area seems promising.

5. Support for language learners through study support and study resources as well as information relating to all of the above with physical people to give the advice and make it human. This is where the new learning centers, the Learning Commons and ‘Global Village’, have an important role to play. As yet, it is too early to say that the university is doing this, but the direction of current plans and policies shows promise.

6. A central portal that makes all of this more accessible and understandable. This is the role of the new GET portal.

All of this combines to create a very powerful base for “Internationalization at home” at Kyoto Sangyo University. However, there are several apparent weaknesses.

- a. While there is a committee at work on this, and a range of initiatives exist, it would appear that the efforts to ‘internationalize’ staff have a considerable way to go, in particular in comparison to European institutions.

- b. While the Center for International Programs does receive inquiries about the possibility of doing graduate work at Kyoto Sangyo in English, the administrative support for students to be able to study only in English (and thus requiring English services from all appropriate areas of the university) is not in place. As graduate work in English in particular is booming in Europe, this would appear to be an area the university should work on.

c. While there is an informal network that supports research in English that exists among staff, the university does not seem to have any plans for a more systematic program to aid non-native researchers with their written submissions and English presentations.

d. While successful institutions in Europe provide FD support for faculty who wish to teach in English, along with a range of incentives, there seems to be little recognition of the challenges and need for support of Japanese academic staff who may be persuaded to teach English courses. (Some Japanese institutions have recognized and acted upon this need, including training seminars for academic staff by the Faculty of Agriculture at Kyushu University.)

e. While some of the more well-known Japanese universities have started to set up links for degree programs with universities in China and Korea, Kyoto Sangyo still seems to be keeping to the more traditional study abroad patterns. A number of current partners have expressed an interest in forming joint degree programs with Kyoto Sangyo. However, due to the limited number of specialist courses offered in English, it is not possible for Kyoto Sangyo to adequately reciprocate.

f. While the staff of international offices at European universities are seen as professionals, and they build their career in those offices with even relatively new and young staff regularly taking part in conferences such as EAIE, the office staff system at Kyoto Sangyo continues to see full-time office staff as generalists, which results in the transfer of staff out of the office at about the time that their experience and abilities begin to approach a professional level.⁴

Conclusion

As has been discussed, the field of internationalization at home would seem to provide an effective model for the current needs of Kyoto Sangyo University, and the university has built a solid base for internationalization, although there are a number of areas that would seem to need work. The question remains: Are we behind Europe institutions, or, as the title of the paper asks, is 'globalization' in Europe a different world? A recent European Commission (2013) report on 'European higher education in the world' answers this:

...the highest priorities of internationalization policies

for EU Member States and individual HEIs (*Higher Education Institutions*) are still the outgoing mobility for students, student exchanges, and attracting international students. However, mobility will always be limited to a relatively small percentage of the student and staff population: higher education policies must increasingly focus on the integration of a global dimension in the design and content of all curricula and teaching/learning processes (sometimes called "internationalisation at home") to ensure that the large majority of learners, the 80-90% who are not internationally mobile for either degree or credit mobility, are nonetheless able to acquire the international skills required in a globalised world. (p.6)

Thus the simple answer is no, Europe is not a different world. In many ways Europe is more advanced than in Asia, especially among the 'aware' institutions that chose to attend the conference on this area, EAIE. This means there is much for us to learn from these institutions and the organization as a whole. However, as speakers for the University of Helsinki said on several occasions, English is a means, not an end. So the question is, to what end does Kyoto Sangyo intend to head with regards to internationalization and in what manner will English be made use of to achieve that end? The university's '*Challenge Seishin*' would seem appropriate here. And if we try but don't succeed, at least we can award ourselves the '*Good Try Prize*.'

¹ The acronym NAFSA, which stands for the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs in North America, is less important than the latter part of the title, and has only been kept in the name "to reflect NAFSA's proud past and broad name recognition." http://www.nafsa.org/Learn_About_NAFSA/History/

² A 2012 report by the Institute of International Education on the number of English-Taught Master's Programs listed on MastersPortal found that, in Europe, the number was 1,028 in 2007, increasing to 4,644 in 2011. To give one example, of the Masters programs at the Universite Libre De Bruxelles, 37% of the economics and management degrees are English-taught, as are 29% in the Engineering schools and 26% in the sciences. (Valcke, 2013)

³ "The International English Language Testing System

(IELTS) is the world's most popular high-stakes English language proficiency test for higher education and global migration, with more than 2 million tests taken in the last year.” http://www.ielts.org/test_takers_information/what_is_ielts/ielts.aspx

⁴ There have been, in fact, 5 directors, 5 managers, at least 8 full-time staff, and more than 10 contract staff in CIP in the past 10 years.

References

- Beelan, J., E. Jones, B. Leask (2013) Windmills, bowler hats and kangaroos: internationalizing the curriculum at home. Paper presented at the annual EAIE conference, Istanbul, Turkey
- Brenn-White, M., Van Rest, E. (2012) English-Taught Master's Programs in Europe: New Findings on Supply and Demand, Institute of International Education. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Publications-and-Reports/IIE-Bookstore/English-Language-Masters-Briefing-Paper>
- Council of Europe, (2001) Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. *coe.int* Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/elp/elp-reg/Source/Key_reference/CEFR_EN.pdf
- EAIE, (n.d.) Who we are. *eaie.org*. Retrieved from <http://www.eaie.org/home/about-EAIE/who-we-are.html>
- European Commission, (2013a) The Bologna Process - Towards the European Higher Education Area. *ec.europa.eu*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/higher-education/bologna_en.htm
- European Commission, (2013b) The ERASMUS Programme - studying in Europe and more. *ec.europa.eu*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/erasmus_en.htm
- European Commission, (2013c) Erasmus Mundus - Scholarships and Academic Cooperation. *ec.europa.eu*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/external-relation-programmes/mundus_en.htm
- Koponen, E. (2013) Teaching in English: successful institutional policies. Paper presented at the annual EAIE conference, Istanbul, Turkey
- Laitinen, M. (2013) Innovation in Internationalisation - Embedding it at the University of Helsinki. Paper presented at the annual EAIE conference, Istanbul, Turkey
- Longone, D. and K. Van Heule (2013), A Newcomers' Guide to Internationalization and the EAIE. Paper presented at the annual EAIE conference, Istanbul, Turkey
- MEXT (n.d.2) Project for Promotion of Global Human Resource Development. *mext.go.jp*. Retrieved from <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/highered/1326713.htm>
- MEXT (n.d.1) About Global 30. *mext.go.jp*. Retrieved from <http://www.uni.international.mext.go.jp/global30/>
- MEXT (2012) Higher education in Japan. *mext.go.jp* Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/english/highered/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2012/06/19/1302653_1.pdf
- Salden, N. (2013) Erasmus+: opportunities for non-EU institutions. Paper presented at the annual EAIE conference, Istanbul, Turkey
- Salmi, J. (2009) The Challenge of Establishing World-Class Universities, *unesco.org*, Retrieved from <http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/files/55825/12017990845Salmi.pdf/Salmi.pdf>
- Valcke, J. (2013) Teaching in English at University: Training Teachers and Supporting Students. Paper presented at the annual EAIE conference, Istanbul, Turkey

“Globalization” in European Universities: A Different World? The View from EAIE 2013

クラフリン・マシュー¹, 國正 淳弥², ポール・チャートン²

本論の目的とするところは、ヨーロッパの大学の国際化モデルが、京都産業大学の国際化において、どのように応用できるかを考察するものである。本論は、「ヨーロッパとヨーロッパ国際教育団体(EAIE)が、なぜ高等教育の国際化において良質なロールモデルを提供できるのか」、「大学の国際化への取り組みと文部科学省助成金との関わり」、「EAIEでの発表からの学びと教訓、それをどのように京都産業大学で実施されている国際的な教育と結びつけていくのか」の三つの部分から構成されている。

ヨーロッパは国際教育分野において先行している。その差をアジア諸国の大学が埋めていくためには、ヨーロッパ諸国と同様に、EAIEのような高等教育の国際化をテーマにする会議に積極的に参加し、国際的な先進事例を持つ機関の検証へ繋げていくことが必要である。

キーワード: グローバリゼーション、国際化、大学の国際化への取り組み、EAIE (ヨーロッパ国際教育団体)

2013年11月27日受理

1京都産業大学 外国語学部・国際交流センター

2京都産業大学 国際交流センター