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Table 1. Inbound mobile students to three Western countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>349,610</td>
<td>453,787</td>
<td>584,814</td>
<td>1.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>126,762</td>
<td>170,574</td>
<td>247,510</td>
<td>1.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>56,726</td>
<td>197,188</td>
<td>330,078</td>
<td>5.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>533,098</td>
<td>821,549</td>
<td>1,162,402</td>
<td>2.180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>6,174</td>
<td>41,211</td>
<td>162,695</td>
<td>37.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>22,260</td>
<td>17.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>14,960</td>
<td>53,511</td>
<td>130,124</td>
<td>8.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,612</td>
<td>78,409</td>
<td>315,079</td>
<td>15.286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers of international students in Japan (by Regions)

Numbers of international students in Japan (Top 2 Countries)

Numbers of international students in Japan (without top 2 countries)

Numbers of international students in Korea (by regions)

Chinese students in Korea

Japanese and Vietnamese students in Korea

Numbers of international students in Korea (without top 3 countries)

Numbers of international students in China (by regions)

South Korean students in China

Japanese students in China

Thai students in China

Vietnamese students in China

Indonesian students in China

Numbers of international students in China (without top 5 countries)

Growing number of students move from Asia to Asia

- Inbound mobile students:* 1999 or circa ⇒ 2007 or circa

Source: UNESCO Statistical Yearbook & UNESCO Global Education Digest

Note: Numbers in parenthesis indicate the percentage growth
Accumulated numbers of transnational programs in Japan (by regions)

Source: Japanese Ministry of Education
Accumulated numbers of transnational programs in Korea (By regions)

Source: Korean Educational Development Institute (2007)
Inter-university agreements (Japan)
Professorial exchange based on Japanese inter-university agreements
Japanese university branch offices abroad by regions

- Asia: 132
- N. America: 22
- Europe: 17
- Africa: 8
- Oceania: 3
Japanese university branch offices abroad by countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Universities</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>All Universities</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  China</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Thailand</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  USA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Indonesia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>S. Korea</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Vietnam</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/19/09/07090416.htm
De facto of international higher education in Asia

- Growing presence of Asian countries as hosts of international students.
- Growing number of students move from Asia to Asia.
- Possible growing number of inter-university linkages and transnational programs within Asia.

“Asianization of Asia” is also confirmed in international higher education.

Necessity to discuss Asian Regional Governance from the perspective of international higher education.
Possible policy objectives for Asian regional governance in higher education

International and Regional Peace & Mutual Understanding

□ Based on the spirit of the UNESCO Constitution:
  • “That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed”

□ Considering Asian history of conflicts and wars, and political and cultural diversity of the region, this policy dimension is specially important.

Nurturing Global and Regional Identities

□ Creation of a ‘People’s Europe’ and promotion of ‘European’ identity have been recognized as main objectives of international student mobility within Europe in the process of European integration.
Possible policy objectives for Asian regional governance in higher education

Promoting Regional Competitiveness and Economic Development

- Increased recognition of “Brain Circulation”.
- International student mobility has been recognized as a human resource development strategy for enhancing regional economic competitiveness in European integration.

Healthy Regional Education Market

- Formulation of Asian regional education market
- Necessity to build sound regional system to assure quality of higher education and an efficient credit transfer system.
Searching for guiding principles of Asian regional framework of higher education

The Kuala Lumpur Declaration
First East Asian Summit (in 2005)

- **Article 6** – We will enhance people-to-people exchange aimed at developing a "we" feeling.
- **Article 7** – We will encourage the sharing of ideas through greater interaction between students, academicians, researchers, artists, media, and youths among countries in East Asia.
- **Article 8** – We will conduct regular exchange of intellectuals, members of think tanks, religious personalities and scholars, which will benefit East Asia and the world through deeper knowledge and understanding so as to fight intolerance and improve understanding among cultures and civilizations.
Recent Moves

• SEAMEO/RIHED International Conference Series on Raising Awareness 2008
  “Exploring the Ideas of Creating Higher Education Common Space in Southeast Asia”

• ASEAN + 3 Higher Education Policy Dialogue 2009
  “Intellectual Contribution to Enhancing Future Cooperation of Higher Education in East-Asian Community”

• CAMPUS Asia (Collective Action for the Mobility Program of University Students) was just started to be discussed among China, Korea and Japan in 2010
Prospecting Asian regional governance framework in higher education

1. Should it target
   (1) elite exchange through promoting linkages among elite institutions or
   (2) popular exchange through promoting system-wide harmonization?
   - Given factors
     Large diversity within a country and across countries → more feasible to start with elite exchange
     On the other hand,
     System-wide harmonization can sustainably promote student mobility.
     → “Asian Bologna Process” rather than “Asian ERASMUS”?

“Melting Pot” Integration vs. “Mosaic” Integration
– Higher Education “ASEAN Way”? 
Prospecting Asian regional governance framework in higher education

2. What countries should be in this framework?
   Does Northeast Asia (Korea, China and Japan) need another framework?
   How do they cooperate with ASEAN?
   How about Australia and NZ?
   - ASEAN, East Asia and Asia-Pacific.

(1) Hub-spoke system or opposite-hub-spoke system
- ASEAN can lead harmonization of higher education in East Asia.
- Northeast Asian Cooperation is rapidly progressing.
(2) More functional to include Australia and NZ
(3) Multi-layered regional governance frameworks should be established.
Prospecting Asian regional governance framework in higher education

3. Theoretical Implications of Regionalization

(1) Fast developing Asian higher education may not be explained by “Dependency Model” or “Neocolonial Model” any more.

(2) Regionalization of higher education in Asia can be considered as a counter-force against “Core” control on “Periphery” universities?

(3) Applicability of “Flying Geese Model” for Asian higher education
JICA Research Institute
Research Project (2009-2011) on

“Political and Economic Implications of Cross-Border Higher Education in the Context of Asian Regional Integration”
Research Core Team by JICA-RI

**JICA-RI Team**
- Leader: Kuroda & Yuki
- Advisor/Member: Yoshida & Koda
- RA: Kang & Hong

**Consultant Team**
for Survey and Follow-up:
ASIASEED (from Japan)

Consultants in
Indonesia, Vietnam, Cambodia for Part I

Consultant team in
Malaysia
For Part I & II
Overall Structure of Research Project

Objective: To assess socio-economic implications & challenges of cross-border higher education in East Asia

PART 1: Overview of Cross-border Higher Education in Asia
Current status, expected outcomes, Changes towards regionalization of Asia? Features of cross-border collaborative degree programs

PART 2: Case of Malaysia
Effects of cross-border (collaborative degree) program in labor market
Structure of PART 1

**Overall question:**
What are political and economic implications of internationalization of higher education in Asia?

**Three types of surveys:**

- **PART 1-1**
  Leading universities in ASEAN plus 5 (about 300)

- **PART 1-2**
  Cross-border collaborative degree programs in leading universities (about 1000 programs) (e.g. twinning)

- **PART 1-3**
  Industry organizations (15 orgs)
Previous relevant studies

- What is different from 2005 IAU Global Survey
  - Different recipients
    - IAU: 3,057 IAU member institutions in 95 countries with relatively low response rates of approximately 14%,
    - JICA: analytically selected 300 “leading” universities in 15 Asian countries with relatively high response rate of approximately 43%.
  - JICA included additional dimensions to survey
Overview of the survey for 300 “leading” universities
Survey for 300 universities

• **Selection method**

• **Survey Target**
  – Identify approximately 300 institutions that can be considered as "leading universities" in ASEAN and plus 5 countries, while ensuring representatives from ASEAN countries & avoiding over-representativeness from non-ASEAN.

• **Selection Method**
  – 1st step, we identify universities that appear in any list of 3 university rankings* and 8 international (or regional) university organizations‘ memberships* (*next slide) ★
    ⇒ *Applied for 8 ASEAN countries*
  – 2nd, identify universities that appear at least twice in the above lists  ⇒ *Applied for 2 ASEAN countries and China*
  – 3rd, identify universities that appear at least three times in the above lists  ⇒ *Applied for the rest of countries*
  – Lastly, added 22 universities suggested by the participants from the Bangkok Workshop.

*next slide*
• **Selection method (continued)**

⭐ University rankings used

1. Times Higher Education-QS World University Rankings 2008 (Complete Rankings) (400 ranked)
2. Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Academic Ranking of World Universities 2008 (500 ranked)
3. Ranking Web of World Universities 2008, by Webometrics (5000 ranked)

⭐ International (or regional) organizations used

1. UMAP: University Mobility and Asian and the Pacific (324)
2. AUN: ASEAN University Network (21)
3. IAU: International Association of Universities (593)
4. IARU: International Alliance of Research Universities (10)
5. APRU: Association of Pacific Rim Universities (42)
6. AERU: Association of East Asian Research Universities (17)
7. ASAIHL: Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning (165)
8. AUAP: Association of Universities of Asia and the Pacific (206)
### Survey for 300 universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (RWWU)</th>
<th>2 (Shanghai)</th>
<th>3 (THE-QS)</th>
<th>1 (UMAP)</th>
<th>2 (AUN)</th>
<th>3 (IAU)</th>
<th>4 (IARU)</th>
<th>5 (APRU)</th>
<th>6 (AERU)</th>
<th>7 (ASAIHL)</th>
<th>8 (AUAP)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brunei Darussalam</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cambodia</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indonesia</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laos</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malaysia</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Myanmar</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singapore</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vietnam</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philippines</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thailand</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japan</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Korea</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Zealand</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey for 300 universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Step</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Step</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; step</th>
<th>(Sub total-by criteria)</th>
<th>Added by participants</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASEAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Sub total-ASEAN )</strong></td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>196</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Sub total-Plus 5 )</strong></td>
<td><strong>791</strong></td>
<td><strong>178</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1071</strong></td>
<td><strong>288</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>278</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workshop in Bangkok, Thailand (June 30, 2009)

• Collaborated with SEAMEO-RIHED
• Discussed the research project to receive inputs and endorsements.
• Attended by policy makers and researchers from ASEAN +3+1 countries
Survey for 300 universities

### Response rate as of April 22, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Response rate (%)</th>
<th>Number of Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* May be less due to the effective answer rate by questions
Structure of research questions & dimensions of survey

• Outline of research questions
  - Q1: Significance of cross-border activities
  - Q2: Significance of expected outcomes
  - Q3: Regional preferences
  - Q4: Overarching questions

• Dimensions of survey
  - D1: Cross-border activities
  - D2: Expected outcomes
  - D3: Regional partnerships

Survey for 300 universities
Research questions 1: Activeness of cross-border activities

• To what extent is “internationalization” considered significant and/or active among leading Asian universities?

• How does this perception and/or activeness vary across types of “cross border activities” (ex. outgoing mobility of students, cross-border research collaborations, collaborative degree programs), countries, fields of study (ex. engineering, business), and/or any other characteristics of universities?

• Is the overall internationalization (and/or specific type of cross-border activities) getting more significant and/or active as compared to the past and/or is it considered more significant for the future?
Dimension 1: Cross-border activities

**Institution**
- Cross-border institutional agreement
- Cross-border collaborative degree programs (e.g. Double degree, twinning)
- Use of ICT for cross-border distance education

**Faculty**
- Outgoing mobility opportunities
- Recruitment of full-time foreign faculty members
- Cross-border research collaboration

**Students**
- Outgoing mobility opportunities
- Acceptance of foreign students

Past (10yrs ago) → Present (2009) → Future (10yrs later)
Research questions 2: Significance of expected outcomes

- What are expected outcomes of “internationalization” for leading universities?
- How do the expected outcomes vary across types of cross-border activities (ex. outgoing mobility of students, cross-border research collaborations), countries, and/or any other characteristics of universities?
- And what types of cross-border activities are perceived appropriate for some expected outcomes or particular regions? What kinds of expected outcomes of each cross-border activity have become more significant and will likely to be?
Dimension 2: Expected outcomes

**Academic**
- To promote intercultural/international awareness and understanding
- To achieve research excellence
- To improve quality of education

**Political**
- To promote global citizenship
- To promote regional collaboration and identity of Asia
- To promote national culture and values
- To improve international visibility and reputation of your university

**Economic**
- To meet the demand of global economy
- To meet the demand of Asian regional economy
- To meet the demand of your national economy
- To generate revenue for your own institution

Past (10yrs ago) → Present (2009) → Future (10yrs later)
Research questions 3:
Regional preferences

• How do the regional preferences vary across types of cross-border activities (ex. outgoing mobility of students, cross-border research collaborations), counties, and/or any other characteristics of universities?
• And what types of cross-border activities are perceived appropriate by Asian leading universities with some particular regions?
• With which region(s), is “internationalization” considered significant and/or active among leading universities in Asia, and how is this regional preference differ as compared with the past and will likely to be in the future?
Dimension 3: Regional partnerships

Survey for 300 universities
Research questions 4: Overarching questions

- Is internationalization of higher education in Asia directing towards regionalization or globalization?
- Is regionalization of higher education in Asia a stepping stone of globalization of higher education?
- What is Asia in the context of internationalization of higher education in Asia?
Summary of the preliminary findings from the survey for 300 “leading” universities
Activeness of cross-border activities: All countries

Active level of cross-border activities for all countries

Highly active: 4, Fairy active: 3, Moderately active: 2, Slightly active: 1, Not active: 0
Activeness of cross-border activities: Northeast Asia

Highly active: 4, Fairy active: 3, Moderately active: 2, Slightly active: 1, Not active: 0
Activeness of cross-border activities: ASEAN

Preliminary findings

Highly active: 4, Fairy active: 3, Moderately active: 2, Slightly active: 1, Not active: 0
Significance of expected outcomes for overall cross-border activities: All countries

Highly active: 4, Fairy active: 3, Moderately active: 2, Slightly active: 1, Not active: 0
Significance of expected outcomes for overall cross-border activities (Past): ASEAN & Northeast Asia

Important level of expected outcomes of overall cross-border activities for ASEAN and Northeast Asia (Past)

Highly significant: 4, Fairy significant: 3, Moderately significant: 2, Slightly significant: 1, Not significant: 0

***: Pr(|T| > |t|) < 0.1  **: Pr(|T| > |t|) < 0.05  *: Pr(|T| > |t|) < 0.1

Academic expected outcome  **  Political expected outcome  **  Economic expected outcome

ASEAN  
Northeast Asia
Significance of expected outcomes for overall cross-border activities (Present): ASEAN & Northeast Asia

Important level of expected outcomes of overall cross-border activities for ASEAN and Northeast Asia (Present)

Highly significant: 4, Fairy significant: 3, Moderately significant: 2, Slightly significant: 1, Not significant: 0

***: Pr(|T| > |t|) < 0.1  **: Pr(|T| > |t|) <0.05  *: Pr(|T| > |t|) <0.1
Significance of expected outcomes for overall cross-border activities (Future): ASEAN & Northeast Asia

Important level of expected outcomes of overall cross-border activities for ASEAN and Northeast Asia (Future)

Highly significant: 4, Fairly significant: 3, Moderately significant: 2, Slightly significant: 1, Not significant: 0

***: Pr(|T| > |t|) < 0.1  **: Pr(|T| > |t|) < 0.05  *: Pr(|T| > |t|) < 0.1
Significance of expected outcomes for overall cross-border activities: All countries

Highly significant: 4, Fairy significant: 3, Moderately significant: 2, Slightly significant: 1, Not significant: 0

Preliminary findings
Activeness of regional partnerships for overall cross-border activities: ASEAN

Highly active: 4, Fairly active: 3, Moderately active: 2, Slightly active: 1, Not active: 0
Activeness of regional partnerships for overall cross-border activities: Northeast Asia

Highly active: 4, Fairy active: 3, Moderately active: 2, Slightly active: 1, Not active: 0
Activeness of regional partnerships for “Outgoing mobility opportunities for students”: ASEAN & Northeast Asia

Highly active: 4, Fairy active: 3, Moderately active: 2, Slightly active: 1, Not active: 0
Activeness of regional partnerships for “Cross-border research collaboration”: ASEAN & Northeast Asia

Highly active: 4, Fairy active: 3, Moderately active: 2, Slightly active: 1, Not active: 0
Activeness of regional partnerships for “Cross-border institutional agreement”: ASEAN & Northeast Asia

Highly active: 4, Fairy active: 3, Moderately active: 2, Slightly active: 1, Not active: 0
Activeness of regional partnerships for “Acceptance of foreign students”: ASEAN & Northeast Asia

Highly active: 4, Fairy active: 3, Moderately active: 2, Slightly active: 1, Not active: 0
Activeness of regional partnerships for “Cross-border collaborative degree program”: ASEAN & Northeast Asia

Highly active: 4, Fairy active: 3, Moderately active: 2, Slightly active: 1, Not active: 0
• **Summary**

1. **Cross-border activities:**
   1) Innovative cross-border activities are less active than conventional cross-border activities, but innovative cross-border activities are expected to grow significantly in the future.
   2) The active levels of all cross-border activities are lower for ASEAN than Northeast Asia in the past and present period. But as the growth rate of the active levels increased rapidly in ASEAN, in the future, the active level for Northeast Asia and ASEAN are not much different.

2. **Expected outcomes:**
   1) Although the level of significance is not much different among the expected outcomes, in general the level of significance for academic and political expected outcome is slightly higher than economic expected outcomes.
   2) In the past and present, Northeast Asia places significantly more importance on academic and political expected outcomes in comparison with ASEAN.
   3) In the future, ASEAN is expected to place significantly more importance on economic expected outcomes in comparison with Northeast Asia.
   4) In the past, national expected outcome is regarded more important than the others, but in the present and future, global, regional, and institutional expected outcomes are regarded and are expected to be regarded more important than national expected outcome.
3.1 Regional partners (for overall cross-border activities):
**ASEAN**: Southeast & Northeast Asia are the most active partners followed by North America and Western Europe.
**Northeast Asia**: Southeast Asia & North America are the most active partners, while Northeast Asia and Western Europe are almost equally active partners.

3.2 Regional partners (for each cross-border activity):
1) **ASEAN**: ASEAN is the most active regional partner for the different types of cross-border activities, except for “cross-border collaborative degree programs,” which has Western Europe as the most active regional partner.
**Northeast Asia**: North America is the most active regional partner for the different types of cross-border activities, except for “Acceptance of foreign students,” which has Northeast Asia as the most active regional partner followed by Southeast Asia.
3.2 Regional partners (for each cross-border activity):

2) **ASEAN:** the top 5 active regional partners are the same for the different types of cross-border activities, except for “acceptance of foreign student,” which includes South and West Asia instead of North America.

**Northeast Asia:** the top 5 active regional partners are the same for the different types of cross-border activities, except for “Acceptance of foreign students,” which has South and West Asia instead of Oceania and Pacific as one of the top 5 active regional partners.

3) The active levels of all cross-border activities are lower for ASEAN than Northeast Asia in the past and present period. But as the growth rate of the active levels increased rapidly in ASEAN, in the future, the active level for Northeast Asia and ASEAN are not much different from each other.
Overview of the survey for 1,000 cross-border collaborative degree programs (Part 1-2)
Definition of cross-border collaborative degree programs:

- Higher education degree programs, which are institutionally produced/organized with cross-border university partnership by at least 2 institutions in 2 countries or more; or higher education programs organized by foreign provider.
  - Main examples: double/joint, twinning, and sandwich

- Not include, for example, conventional student exchange programs based on international university agreements
• **Identification method**
  
  – **1st step:** Identify all “cross-border degree programs” in 300 leading universities, mainly through:
    
    - MOE site, if available
    - Key country publication, if available
    - Website of each university’s international office or equivalent
    - Key word search in website of each university (key words such as double/joint, twinning, and sandwich), possibly in English as well as each country language
    - Key word in Google site (with country, university, and program type’s name)
  
  – **2nd step:** Grouping the programs with the similar criteria (e.g. Partner university, major, degree type)
Survey for 1,000 programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st step</th>
<th>2nd step</th>
<th>Total leading university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of &quot;cross-border collaborative degree programs&quot;</td>
<td>Number of programs after grouping</td>
<td>Leading university with at least one program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cambodia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Indonesia</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Laos</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Malaysia</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Myanmar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Philippines</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Singapore</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Thailand</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Vietnam</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>529</strong></td>
<td><strong>385</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Sub total of ASEAN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 China</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Japan</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Korea</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Australia</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 New Zealand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>494</strong></td>
<td><strong>438</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Sub total of plus 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>1023</strong></td>
<td><strong>823</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research questions

• **Status:** What is general status of “cross-border collaborative degree programs” in Asia? What kinds of “cross-border collaborative degree programs” exist, and how can we develop universal definition of specific forms (ex. twinning, double degree, and joint degree programs)?

• **Expected outcomes:** What expected outcomes do “cross-border collaborative degree programs” have? Are these expected outcomes of the programs different depending on their forms, partner regions, or field of study?

• **Regional preference:** Is there any change over the years regarding partner region for cross border collaborative degree programs in Asia?

• **Risks:** What kinds of perceived benefits and costs/risks are involved in promoting “cross-border collaborative degree programs”? 

Survey for 1,000 programs
Dimension 1: About the program

1. Partner institutions
2. Countries of the institutions
3. Starting year of this "cross-border degree program"
4. Type of degree
5. Degree Provider
6. Field of study
7. Length of study in each institution
8. Number of graduates
9. Number of enrolled students per year
10. Nationality of students
11. Curriculum Provider
12. Professors
13. Financial subsidy
14. Tuition and scholarship
Dimension 2: Expected outcomes

• Same as the survey for 300 universities

Academic
- To promote intercultural/international awareness and understanding
- To achieve research excellence
- To improve quality of education

Political
- To promote global citizenship
- To promote regional collaboration and identity of Asia
- To promote national culture and values
- To improve international visibility and reputation of your university

Economic
- To meet the demand of global economy
- To meet the demand of Asian regional economy
- To meet the demand of your national economy
- To generate revenue for your own institution

Past (10yrs ago) → Present (2009) → Future (10yrs later)
Dimension 3: Costs and risks

- **Social**
  - Inequity of access
  - Brain drain
  - Homogenization of curriculum
  - Overuse of English for teaching
  - Loss of cultural or national identity

- **Administrative**
  - Unstable financial situation
  - Miscommunication with partner univ.
  - Difficulty of credit transfer recognition
  - Differences in academic calendars
  - Difficulty of recruiting students
  - Difficulty of resolving language issues

- **Academic**
  - Difficulty of assuring quality
  - Irrelevance of education content
  - Lack of accreditation

Survey for 1,000 programs

Past (10yrs ago)  Present (2009)  Future (10yrs later)
So far: number of responses as of April 22, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total number of responses</th>
<th>Number of programs with Japanese university as &quot;partner university&quot;</th>
<th>Number of programs in engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Sub total of ASEAN)</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>241</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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