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English Medium Instruction as Internationalization Strategy in Japanese Higher Education: Review of the Literature

ISHIKURA Yukiko

Abstract

English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) has been used as an internationalization strategy by Japanese universities since the 1960s. The launching of the Global 30 Project (G30) in 2009 by Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) signified the expansion and growing acknowledgement of EMI in the context of Japanese higher education. Between 2009 and 2014, there has been a dramatic increase in degree programs delivered in English. This has generated a small but growing body of literature on EMI in the context of internationalization in Japanese universities.

This paper offers a review of government reports and scholarly literature available both in English and Japanese concerned with a development of EMI in Japanese universities. While it offers brief historical reviews, it focuses primarily on the literature generated by the launching of G30. This review reveals that while government reports focus overwhelmingly on the positive benefits of EMI, the scholarly literature tends to narrow in on the challenges involved for Japanese higher education institutions. Both bodies of literature fail to offer inside perspectives on EMI programs resulting in a lack of balance in expectations and assessments. It will be argued that a more balanced assessment on current practice and future potentials of EMI is warranted, and this requires incorporation of insider perspectives. This paper offers timely reviews of the field.
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Introduction

Japan has been experiencing dramatic demographic changes which are impacting higher education. Universities have shifted from a "mass" phase to a "universal" phase in enrolment. The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) (2013) data shows that the percentage of those who go on to tertiary education (both university and junior college) is at 53.2% as of 2013. Universities also face declining numbers of secondary school graduates going on to university study (MEXT 2013) in spite of increasing numbers of universities (Statistics Bureau, 2014). These contradicting phenomena cause the "open college admission" phenomena, which indicates that the number of places at universities is reaching parity in regards to the number of university applicants. This new situation results in the university student population becoming more diverse in terms of individual student’s motivations towards studying and their level of academic achievements. Small-sized and lower level private universities in particular tend to face a
shortage of applicants. According to Yonezawa (2010), 47.1% of the private universities face difficulties in meeting internal recruitment quotas (131-132). This necessitates the admission of students with more diverse motivations towards studying and a wider range of academic abilities. As a result, these universities are presented with significant challenges to consider how best to provide those students with appropriate education and support in order to enhance their motivations and achievements.

In addition, the Central Council of Education (2012) has highlighted that Japanese students spend fewer hours studying in college compared to students in other countries. This raises the question of whether or not Japanese higher education fosters lifelong and independent learners who can be globally competitive in the globally connected society. In order to nurture those learners, the council insists on the need for universities and instructors to re-examine university education and to shift their teaching methods from teacher-centered to learner-centered teaching (Central Council of Education 2012).

The demographic and pedagogical challenges faced by Japanese higher education institutions reflect not only changes occurring in Japanese society, but are indicative of a range of global issues significantly impacting the role of higher education. For example, greater emphasis is placed on universities becoming learning institutions rather than merely teaching institutions. Universities are re-examining and learning what kinds of roles they need to take in global society, rather than restricting their attention to local or regional settings. Such internationalization may be critical for higher education to foster students with appropriate skills and knowledge to live in an increasingly globalized world (Knight 2008).

In response to these local and global trends, Japanese universities have been striving to internationalize their campus. Recently English as a Medium of Instruction, or EMI, has been a key internationalization strategy at Japanese higher education institutions. This paper consists of two parts and explores literature on internationalization of Japanese higher education from past to present with a primary focus on EMI. The first part of this paper examines what internationalization means to Japanese higher education. The second part then provides a detailed focus on EMI, in order to examine gaps in the recent literature. While there are currently increasing demands for EMI, literature on EMI in Japanese higher education is scant. This paper can enrich the current literature on EMI and move beyond the current EMI implications for future research.

**Methodology**

This paper explored literature available in the MEXT and international and domestic scholarly literature on higher education using Osaka University databases. Since Japanese internationalization projects are initiated by MEXT, MEXT documents are a necessary starting point from which an understanding of policy implications can be ascertained. The university database system showed approximately 25,000 hits with the keywords of English as a Medium of Instruction, university, and Japan from 1963 to the present. The time frame was specified since it was 1963 when EMI was first introduced in Japan. Hits that focused on English education rather than EMI, non university education, or other countries were excluded from this study. The majority of the journal articles on EMI in Japanese higher education were written by international or domestic authors in English before or around 2009, when the
G30 Project (G30) was launched. Brown (2014) and Bradford (2012) provide the most recent literature on EMI, examining G30. Although the literature on EMI is still far from adequate, as EMI gathers attention, literature is being produced with greater intensity.

**Internationalization of Higher Education in the Japanese Context**

This section explores the definitions of internationalization in Japanese higher education to understand the unique internationalization approaches and strategies in Japan. Each country has different meanings, approaches, and strategies of/to internationalization since it has its own contexts.

The term ‘internationalization’ is widely used in higher education fields, however it appears to be deployed with a diverse range of interpretations and implications across different institutions, regions, and countries. There have been disputes over the definition of internationalization in literature or higher education practices, since each person sees internationalization differently through his or her own lens. Knight (2008) reminds us that internationalization “means different things to different people, it appears in literature in a variety of ways” (1). Also, definitions are still evolving as the society is changing. A widely used definition is Knight’s (2008) definition: “the process of integrating international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of higher education at the institutional and national level” (21). Ellingboe (1998) supplemented Knight’s definition by adding that internationalization is “an on-going, future-oriented, multidimensional, interdisciplinary, leadership-driven vision that involves many stakeholders working to change the internal dynamics of an institution to respond and adapt appropriately to an increasingly diverse, globally focused, ever-changing external environment” (199). For the purpose of this paper, I will examine how intercultural dimension is integrated in the Japanese definition of internationalization.

In the Japanese context, it has been suggested that understandings of the meaning of internationalization incorporate a sense that Japan has to change something so as not to remain behind western countries (Ebuchi 1997; Abe 2004). Ebuchi (1997) explored the different use of the word “internationalize” in both Japanese and English cultural contexts. He found that the verb “internationalize” in the Japanese context was used as an intransitive verb while as a transitive verb in the English context. He characterizes internationalization in the context of Japanese culture based on the assumption that “Japanese people usually focus on how we could be globally accepted by the rest of the world through internationalization, rather than simply improving the quality of curriculum by adding international aspects” (as cited in Horie 2006: 17). Abe (2004) also points out that the definition of internationalization has an implication of self-change to be accepted by the rest of the world (300). He also added that the rest of the world specifically means Western countries, as Japan has had an ideology of “leave Asia, enter the West,” since the Meiji era, which has been rooted deeply in some of the educators’ notions (300). In their definitions, internationalization functions as a tool to catch up on the new educational trends and to be accepted by the rest of the world by introducing some new educational concepts from western countries.

For some scholars, internationalization is a way of changing and opening up their country to be a member of global community, but some argue that internationalization opens up but closes in the country.
by protecting and strengthening the national identity at the same time. Goodman (2007) examines that one of the earliest definitions of internationalization emphasized idea of modernist nationalism in Japanese society, and it was used as a tool to strengthen an individual perception of his or her Japaneseness and to spread Japanese values to the world (72). Japan looks to open up its country through internationalization but at the same time closing itself by protecting and strengthening its identity. Burgess et al. (2010), for example, argues that G30 internationalization holds two contradicting discourses, nationalistic “closing in” with a cosmopolitan “opening up.” This reflects the notion of “a desire to protect and strengthen Japanese national identity in the face of foreign pressure while at the same time acknowledging the necessity of embracing global trends, currents and standards” (471). Those global (opening up) and local (closing in) powers are, however, rather balancing in Japan than contradicting one another. Ishikawa (2011) states that Japanese HE holds two roles of balancing local and global as well as regional and global (Ishikawa 2011: 214). For example, “Japanese universities have the role of maintaining the cultural autonomy of local languages and values, in the face of the homogenizing and standardizing power of globalization” (Ishikawa 2011: 214-215).

While people define internationalization differently, Goodman (2007) points out the significance of paying attention to “in what context who is using the rhetoric, who and for what purpose” rather than simply referring to the policy of internationalization” (86) when exploring the meaning of internationalization. Goodman (2007) describes how differently it means depending on types and levels of the universities in Japan. Since national and private universities prioritize different things, they have different attitude, strategies, and approaches toward internationalization. For example, “the universities with a large enrolment of foreign undergraduate students are mainly private mass-oriented universities, while those with a large enrolment of foreign graduate students are mostly national research-oriented universities” (Yonezawa 2010: 134). He added that 60.1% of universities are setting internationalization as at least one of their top priorities, with this figure rising to 89.6% at national universities while only 54.5% at the private universities. National and private universities have different perspectives and management approaches to internationalization. For their internationalization focus, national universities tend to focus on more research, and private universities on undergraduate education providing international experience (Yonezawa 2009: 139-140). Goodman (2007) describes different attitude toward internationalization more narrowly by types and levels of the universities.

In the case of elite national universities, overseas students are an important part of their image as institutions which participate seriously in the global research culture; at top private universities, they are part of the commercial repositioning of institutions as they seek to maintain the number of applicants they receive each year; in lower-level private universities, they can be part of a desperate policy for survival as a source of fee-income (84)

Universities at different types and levels target different populations and value different things for different purposes. This can shape the meaning of internationalization as well as the university strategies and approaches toward internationalization.
Backgrounds of EMI in Japanese Universities

Asian countries are known as countries that send students abroad, but these countries are making efforts to attract more international students (Mori 2011: 66). The development and provision of English-medium programs are one of the key strategies undertaken by Japanese higher education institutions in order to attract more international students. The recent university internationalization project in Japan, G30 Project accelerated the trend with its requirement to establish English-medium degree programs. English-medium degree programs are the programs that enable international students to take courses in English and get a degree regardless of their proficiency in the local language. As a result, English-medium programs attract a heterogeneous student population, especially those who do not have a high enough Japanese proficiency to study in Japan. Tsuneyoshi (2005) notes that English-medium lectures have provided opportunities to study in Japan to a larger and more diverse group of international students (75-76).

Over the past few decades, English as a medium of instruction has expanded from incoming short-term study abroad programs, to graduate degree seeking programs. Japanese universities first adopted English as a medium of instruction for short-term educational programs in 1963. Tsuneyoshi (2005) states that Waseda University was a pioneer—the first university to initiate an English-medium short-term program for American students (71). It was approximately 30 years later, when national universities first introduced English as a medium of instruction for programs or courses in short-term study abroad programs. Kyushu University was the first national university to implement English-medium courses for a short-term exchange program in 1994, and the University of Tokyo did so in the following year (Tsuneyoshi 2005: 68). The aim of offering English-medium courses was to increase the number of overseas students by lessening the burden of learning Japanese for degree-seeking students at graduate level, and to attract international students for short-term programs (Lassegard 2006: 129).

In addition to short-term programs, there have been an increasing number of English courses available for degree-seeking students at graduate level, largely in science programs (Lassegard 2006: 129). The 1990s experienced "a huge expansion in the number of English-taught programs, including programs especially designed for international students and programs open to all students" (Huang 2006: 113). In 1997, a government report emphasizes the importance of both creating English-medium programs or courses as a tool for attracting high-quality international students and offering them not only to international students, but also to domestic students.

It is necessary to create English-medium education programs in order to lessen the burden of learning Japanese for prospective international students, as well as attracting more high-quality international students. Those English-medium programs should be offered not only to international students but also to Japanese students. Each university is encouraged to offer courses delivered partially in foreign languages or in both Japanese and foreign languages for regular Japanese courses.

(MEXT, 1997)
Due to governmental pressure, there has been an increasing demand for creating English-medium programs and courses. According to MEXT (2008), 194 universities at undergraduate level and 177 at graduate level offered English-medium courses as of 2007. There are also an increasing number of English-medium degree programs, where students can graduate by undertaking the entirety of their required coursework in English. There were 68 universities and 124 graduate English-medium degree programs available; however, there were only six undergraduate English-medium degree programs (MEXT 2008). There was a noticeable lack of English-medium degree programs at undergraduate level.

The recent internationalization project launched in 2009, G30, required 13 selected universities to create English-medium degree-seeking programs at both undergraduate and graduate level for international students, which allowed for larger and more diverse student groups to study and obtain a degree in Japan. G30 also aimed “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.: 4). Through this project, each university was required to provide “high quality” education to foster “high quality” students (MEXT 2009: 2). In order to do so, institutions were required to develop internationally attractive educational curriculums and secure talented foreign faculty members or Japanese faculty members with international educational experience (MEXT 2009: 3). These government reports focus on the positive benefits of introducing EMI as an internationalization strategy to Japanese higher education.

Creating English-medium degree-seeking programs at undergraduate level, particularly in a national university setting, was a new undertaking in Japanese higher education. According to MEXT (2014), 33 undergraduate and 123 graduate English medium degree-seeking programs have been newly created for the G30 since 2009. These programs and courses have greatly impacted on Japanese undergraduate education and student teaching and learning.

**Challenges with the Adoption of EMI**

An increasing number of the English-medium degree programs have been established in Japan through the G30 project. In response to this, a small but growing number of studies conducted focusing on English-medium programs or courses over the past years. These studies have explored the challenges that arose with the introduction of English-medium programs or courses in Japan (Bradford 2012; Mori 2011; Jon and Kim 2011; Burgess et al. 2010; Kuwamura 2009; Lassegard 2006; Tsuneyoshi 2005). Taken together, these studies have identified three interrelated issues: linguistic, cultural, and structural challenges. Literature conveys students’ and instructors’ voice on issues in English-medium programs and courses, however; it lacks painting how the international learning environments and opportunities impact student learning and what kinds of learning outcomes students gain.

**Language and Cultural Dilemma**

Mori highlights two issues regarding the quality of lectures when courses are taught in English in non-
English linguistic settings: 1) instructors cannot teach effectively in non-native language and 2) students cannot properly understand because of lack of English proficiency (68). Bradford (2012) and Mori (2011) point that Japan is not the only non-English speaking country, but even European countries that is considered to hold a high level of English proficiency experience various kinds of linguistic issues with the implementation of English-medium programs and courses. Japan, known as the country with low level of English proficiency, then face greater challenges to adopt English-medium programs. Many observe the difficulty of finding instructors with sufficient skills to teach English-medium courses (Bradford 2012; Burgess et al. 2010; Kuwamura 2009; Lassegård 2006; Jon & Kim 2011, Mori 2011; Tsuneyoshi 2005). Kuwamura (2009) noted issues such as “excessive workload of faculty, shortage of English-speaking faculty, and the quality of instruction” (195). Those cultural challenges as well as linguistic challenges can make even more difficult to find instructors who have appropriate skills and who are willing to teach. Japanese faculty members found it challenging to “incorporate the Western style of instruction” (Jon & Kim 2011: 166), and the effort required to prepare English-medium courses was four to five times greater than that for Japanese courses (Tsuneyoshi 2005: 80). If finding instructors with appropriate skills, training instructors would be another option. However, finding instructors who are willing to have commitments with training and teaching. They usually obtain very little or no additional compensation even if they take on an increased workload to teach courses in English (Tsuneyoshi 2005: 84). While many studies identify that teaching English-medium courses brings instructors challenges, Brown (2014) points out that teaching English-medium classes also bring the opportunity to improve their own for professional growth (60).

Some studies have noted how linguistic issues create boundaries between different groups of the campus community. The community-divide phenomenon limits the scope of internationalization. For example, Burgess et al. (2010) identified as a negative effect of English-medium courses because of Japanese students facing linguistic challenges in taking English-medium courses. Japanese students find it difficult to complete English-medium courses without support although the government claims the significance of Japanese students participating in these courses (Burgess et al: 470). Burgess et al. (2010) added that this results in Dejima-ization, a term used to describe the isolation of international students and Japanese returnees from the rest of the campus community (470). However, it is important to note that this issue is not unique to Japan. A study on English-medium courses in South Korea also notes how linguistic challenges can create a boundary between communities. Jon and Kim (2011) state that English-medium courses can cause an “English divide” (154). Students whose level of English proficiency is low tend to obtain lower grades on their assessments. Those students, therefore, avoid English-medium courses because they value their grade point average.

Although most of the concerns are course-related, the challenges continue after the graduation. Burgess et al. (2010) also raise the important issue of what international students do after completing their study at English-only programs such as G30. Those students whose Japanese is insufficient face difficulty finding a job in Japan after completing their university study (470). The government implications of attracting high quality students and keeping them as global human resources in Japan seem not appropriately reflecting in the society. Although universities are providing linguistic obstacle free learning environments, the Japanese society is not prepared to accept those students at the workplaces.
Some literature identifies not only the linguistic challenges but also the cultural challenges that are accompanied with English-medium courses, such as cultural norms and expectations (Bradford 2012; Jon & Kim 2011; Tsuneyoshi 2005). Tsuneyoshi (2005) states that English-medium programs and courses broaden study opportunities to more diverse student groups, but it also means that those students have diverse needs and expectations in terms of the format and style of lectures (79). However, local students also have different expectations and demands in English-medium courses because of different language instruction and delivery. Bradford (2012) notes that “English instruction leads to an ‘Americanization’ of classroom and accountability practices, partly due to the difficulty of separating English from its dominant culture and to the need for international transparency in the program” (3). This challenges local students who get used to the traditional ways of course delivery in Japan. “For Japanese students, the American type of class structure, using multiple evaluations and detailed descriptions of what to do in a syllabus, made them feel unprepared and did not acknowledge them as independent scholars” (Jon & Kim 2011: 167). More specifically, concerning Japanese students’ cultural challenges, Yamashita (2012) concludes that they have difficulty participating in course activities not only because they may lack English proficiency but also because their sensitive guessing ability hinders them from actively participating in those activities. Japanese students employ this sensitive guessing ability, or Sasshi, as a way to behave in socially appropriate ways depending on the context, taking into consideration factors like place (ba) and space or timing (ma) to create and preserve harmony (wa) (37).

Bradford (2012) and Jon and Kim (2011) note that EMI brings “American” way of teaching practices and structure. This shows their ethnocentric interpretations. There are several English-native countries. They however decided to call it as “American” style of teaching. There is a clear identification to show from where these teaching practices come.

While Japanese students experience challenges with different delivery of the course, some groups of international students are not satisfied with the course. Western students tend to criticize those courses for not being Americanized or Westernized enough (Tsuneyoshi 2005: 79). On the other hand, Hashimoto (2013) argues that G30 English-medium programs do not meet Asian international students’ expectations. In this respect, the G30 implementation of English-medium degree programs with compulsory Japanese language and culture courses do not match with the expectations of students (Hashimoto 2013, p. 27). She added that G30 is not providing what the majority of the international students in Japan (Asian students) want, which is courses in English with a focus of western method or thought (Hashimoto 2013: 27). Cultural diversity of students can bring great diverse perspectives but different kinds of needs and expectations in class. While students holding different expectations and demanding different needs, it is a great challenge for instructors to respond all different expectations and demands. Understanding the student diversity and their different needs would be the first step for them to consider how to deliver English-medium courses and meet as many demands as possible.

Despite all of these challenges, Brown (2014) points to some benefits for local students who choose to take English-medium programs and courses on campus. For example, “EMI classes can provide students with learning opportunities which parallel those they will experience abroad” (Brown 2014: 60). This entails that students can use these opportunities as preparation for study abroad, internships or other.
information experiences (Brown 2014: 60). He also added that “EMI programmes run for domestic students can help give a university a sense of academic rigor, which, stakeholders hope will attract higher-level students” (59).

**Structural Dilemmas**

In addition to linguistic and cultural challenges, Bradford (2012) and Tsuneyoshi (2005) identified an additional challenge to introducing English-medium programs or courses in Japan: structural issues. This challenge is related to the extended administration and management of the program to cater to and support more diverse student and faculty groups in English (Bradford: 4). Bradford (2012) noted that government-involvement with university internationalization also create structural challenges. For example, the government-initiated G30 project was a 5-year project. Although universities were required to sustain their programs by their own after the funding cycle, the 5-year G30 project placed significant time constraints on universities who were required to establish new programs with limited human resources available. As argued by Ishikawa (2011), universities had little time to create, develop, and consolidate new English-medium programs for G30 (205). Especially creating English-medium degree programs in the undergraduate level needs a lot more effort and time for universities. Undergraduate degree programs require more credits and classes from a wider range of disciplines compared with graduate level (Ishikawa, 2011: 200). This might be the reason why larger numbers of English-medium graduate degree programs have been available than undergraduate degree programs.

In addition to the limited time, universities face difficulties with securing human resources for internationalization initiatives. Ishikawa (2011) also raised another challenge on securing internal support for the new internationalization initiatives (200). Members of faculty may be required to increase their workload in response to the demands of education reform or education quality enhancement; however, universities may suffer a lack of human resources because of budget restrictions or termination of funding. This results in further increasing faculty workloads and individual faculty members having resistance or hesitance to committing to the provision of new English-medium courses (Ishikawa 2011: 201). Tsuneyoshi (2005) has also identified the Japanese organizational system itself presenting as a structural challenge. For example, the rotation system for administrators makes it difficult for international programs to maintain adequate administrators who have both English proficiency and specialized knowledge of international education (81-82). Securing human resources is the fundamental step for internationalization initiatives. However, the government and universities have failed to prepare institutional systems for faculty and administrators in implementing internationalization initiatives.

Some note that curriculum design and delivery as structural issues can create the community divide phenomenon. English-medium programs and courses are isolated from the mainstream of university education or community (Brown 2014; Hashimoto 2013; Burgess et al. 2010). Different researchers view this issue differently. As previously discussed, Burgess et al. (2010) argues that linguistic challenges create Dejima, the international community isolated from the community. Brown (2014) highlights that while English of medium as instruction (EMI) programs are growing, those programs are offered only to limited
numbers of students and are not becoming the main stream of the education. Brown argues that there are four reasons for the relatively low student numbers in the EMI programs: 1) little demand from students for the expansion of the programs 2) lack of human resources such as qualified, experienced and willing faculty limited expansion 3) small-sized designed program to be manageable or for the university to get an elite status and 4) program size kept small from the pressure from the wider university community (56). In addition, Brown suggests that EMI stakeholders hold a sense that a growth of EMI may pose a threat to the Japanese identity of the university (57). As an alternative to this, Hashimoto (2013) has argued that one of the major impediments to G30 implementations involve the segregation of the G30 degree programs and courses from the rest of the university curricula, in addition to the limited student eligibility to apply to G30 programs. For example, the majority of the G30 universities are open only to international students, with G30 “aimed at bringing Others from overseas to educate them as Others in a carefully tailored but isolated environment (Hashimoto 2013: 28).

“Englishization as a strategy for internationalization” brings international effects and creates pressures for change to the Western model, which is recognized as a powerful model (Tsuneyoshi 2005: 85). Mori (2011) argues that providing more courses in English indicates how competitive Japanese universities are becoming (65). However, English-medium programs and courses have brought universities many kinds of challenges, which can lead to quality concerns regarding the programs and courses. Therefore it is important to clearly identify those issues and find strategies for the challenges in order to provide quality education and attract quality students.

In consideration of the materials reviewed here, it may be profitable to consider that the dilemmas posed by the adoption of English-medium programs and courses in Japan can be characterized as involving linguistic, cultural and structural dilemmas. English-medium programs and courses bring more diversity of students and instructors, enriching linguistic and cultural diversity in the programs and courses. However, they also create linguistic and cultural dilemmas. Limited English proficiency can hinder students and instructors from teaching and learning effectively. Also the student diversity brings diverse norms and expectations. Instructors face difficulties to meet students’ diverse expectations and needs.

The government involvement with internationalization initiatives make the dilemmas even more complicated. While the central government implements internationalization projects that are constrained by limitations in terms of financial and time resources, more local constraints are operative in university faculties in the form of insufficient human resources and workload increases. These three interrelated dilemmas raised quality issues and community divide issues. Identifying challenges paying attention to key stakeholders such as students and instructors who are directly influenced by internationalization initiatives is necessary for the future improvement and development of the programs and courses, but the recent literature on English-medium programs lacks looking at concern to the kinds of benefits and outcomes students and instructors may gain in English-medium programs. Moreover, it is important to examine how best to enhance the quality of programs and maximize student learning and outcomes.
Discussion and Conclusion

Examining the government reports and scholarly literature currently available on EMI, it is clear that while government reports focus overwhelmingly on the positive benefits of EMI, the scholarly literature tends to narrow in on the challenges for Japanese higher education institutions. Both bodies of literature fail to offer inside perspectives on EMI programs resulting in a lack of balance in expectations and assessments.

All literature on G30 EMI examined the early stage of the project from the “outside” perspective (Ishikawa; 2011, Mori; 2011, Bradford; 2012, Hashimoto; 2013, Brown; 2014). Hence there is a lack of deeper insight into university internationalization: what is truly happening in the universities and programs. Internationalization is a process wherein a variety of stakeholders are working to change the internal dynamics of an institution, in order to respond to and adapt to a rapidly changing society. Reflecting this definition of internationalization, it is vital for scholars to examine the long-term internationalization process from both “inside” and “outside” perspective: being in the university and program and examining the on-going process on how universities and key stakeholders are achieving internationalization.

Another observation is that all literature identifies primarily challenges at the early stage of G30 without concern for the kinds of benefits and outcomes universities and key stakeholders may gain through EMI. The early stage of the internationalization implementations usually underscores stands out many issues, which hinders scholars from exploring positive aspects of G30 EMI implementations. It is, however, vital to examine how these challenges can turn into future opportunities. While internationalization brings various challenges to higher education sectors in Japan, those challenges have brought opportunities to re-examine the policies for the future internationalization strategies and approaches. EMI has been one way for Japanese universities to attract more international students and to be more internationally competitive. After reaching the G30 funding cycle from the government in March 2014, G30 universities are required to keep sustaining the programs. Running programs and delivering courses in English in Japan as non-English speaking country has challenged universities, but those challenges will reshape the future internationalization initiatives and turn into positive future opportunities to re-examine education and its quality and lead to the positive outcomes.

In October 2014, the government announced the selected 37 universities for the new internationalization project, “Top Global University Project.” Through this project, universities will further strive to reform and internationalize education with all elements for the next ten years: admissions, educational infrastructures, education quality, teaching and learning, English-medium programs and courses, education curriculum and systems, and university governance. The project seems an aggressive plan, however; this project implies an urgent need for Japanese universities to make changes in response to the globalized society and be more internationally competitive. For the next ten years, various changes can be expected in higher education sectors. The research that can examine and analyze those changes will play a vital role to make further positive progress. Future research needs to critically examine the current internationalization trends from “inside” and “outside” standpoints as well as encapsulate both challenges and benefits internationalization can bring to universities and key stakeholders.
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日本の高等教育における教授言語としての
英語（EMI）に関する先行研究

石倉 佑季子

要旨

本稿では、近年大学の国際化の戦略として用いられている「教授言語としての英語（EMI）」の
先行研究の課題と展望を検討する事を目的としている。2009年に開始された大学の国際化ネット
ワーク事業（Global 30）により英語学位取得コースや英語を媒介言語にする授業数は大幅に増加
した。しかしながら、EMIに関する先行研究は非常に限られているのが現状である。本稿では、
EMIに関する文部科学省の文書や国際・国内学術誌の分析と考察を行い、課題と今後の展望を明
らかにした。文部省の文書はEMIの肯定的な側面に焦点を当てられているのに反して、国際・国
内学術誌は否定的な面に重きが置かれている。特にGlobal 30の先行研究に関して言えば、Global
30導入時の大学が抱えている課題のみに焦点が当てられている傾向にある。また、大学や英語学
位コース外からの視点からの考察で、大学内・プログラム内の現場の様子や声が伝えられていな
いのが現状である。大学の国際化とは「プロセス」であり、一時的な外部からの視点では「プロ
セス」としての国際化を考察する事は出来ない。今後の大学の国際化研究の展望として、国際化
に直接関わる教職員や学生に目を向け国際化の現場どのような取組みが行われ、大学にどのような
肯定的・否定的影響を及ぼしているのかを考察する必要がある。