



Title	A Cross-Case Analysis of Internationalization at National Universities in Singapore and Japan
Author(s)	Sanders, Justin
Citation	大阪大学, 2019, 博士論文
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://doi.org/10.18910/72474
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

Abstract of Thesis

Name (Justin S Sanders)	
Title	A Cross-Case Analysis of Internationalization at National Universities in Singapore and Japan (シンガポールと日本の国立大学における国際化のクロスケース分析)
<p>Abstract of Thesis</p> <p>Governments and universities are increasingly turning to internationalization as a way to respond to the opportunities and challenges of the globalizing 21st century knowledge economy. This study explores the phenomenon of internationalization of higher education (IoHE) at the global, national and institutional levels through the lens of two East Asian contexts: Singapore and Japan. Though not geographically located in East Asia, existing models suggest that Singapore shares more similar characteristics with East Asian than South East Asian nations. This study moves from a review of the literature of IoHE at the conceptual level, down to an in-depth review of the IoHE policy context in each nation, and finally into an institutional level exploration at two case study national universities in each context: The National University of Singapore, Nanyang Technological University, Kyoto University and Osaka University. Drawing on document analysis and interviews with institutional leadership and administrators, the study provides detailed descriptions of the case universities' approaches to international strategy, management structures, partnerships, international students and faculty, internationalization of the curriculum, activities abroad, and international reputation management. The study then uses these case narratives as a platform to move back up and engages in a cross-cases analysis of the connections between institutional approach, institutional circumstances, individual stakeholder rationales and agency, broader national context and global trends. From there it moves into a discussion of the process of developing and implementing a vision and strategy for effective internationalization. Finally, the study concludes by exploring what the evidence presented herein suggests about the conceptualization of internationalization as a response to globalization, as well as implications for the concepts of an 'East Asian' model of higher education or IoHE.</p>	

論文審査の結果の要旨及び担当者

氏 名 (Justin S Sanders)			
	(職)	氏 名	
論文審査担当者	主 査	教授	山本 ベバリーアン
	副 査	教授	石川 真由美
	副 査	教授	中澤 渉
	副 査	教授	齊藤 貴浩

論文審査の結果の要旨

Title: A Cross-Case Analysis of Internationalization at National Universities in Singapore and Japan

This study fits within the research field of the internationalization of higher education (IoHE), which is a growing body of inquiry that seeks to understand the processes involved in internationalizing university campuses, curriculum and administrative processes. This doctoral research specifically explores IoHE primarily at the national and institutional levels focusing on policy. It takes a comparative case study approach to investigating two different national contexts, Singapore and Japan, and four different institutional contexts, two universities in each country.

While Singapore is geographically located in South East Asia, it is sometimes regarded as sitting within the East Asian cultural sphere in the IoHE literature due to various influences, but especially the legacy of Confucianism. This thesis accepts this designation rather uncritically in the view of the Examining Committee, but this does not invalidate the comparison given that Singapore and Japan are leading economies in the region with globally top ranked universities producing world class research. In-depth empirical analysis of Asian universities is a welcome contribution to the field. While the primary focuses in this study are at the national and institutional levels, the thesis also attempts to place the study within the global context of IoHE.

This again was highly evaluated by the Committee.

The study is well structured and the exploratory research design is appropriate to its aims. The study combines an analysis of primary and secondary documentary sources to conduct a detailed investigation of internationalization strategies, structures and activities of the four case study universities. This is followed up with semi-structured interviews with key administrators and faculty who are leading internationalization in their respective institutions. The choice of case study institutions was made on the basis of equivalency – two leading research universities in each country, with the Japanese cases taken from the Kansai region where access was easier for the researcher.

The thesis is structured into two relatively focused chapters introducing the research aims and the design, followed by two length literary review chapters, a results section followed by an analysis/discussion chapter and then a short conclusion. The standard of writing is high and each individual section is quite readable. Overall, though, the thesis at over 360 pages and would have benefited from further editing to allow for a more focused narrative through line.

The literature review chapters cover changes in higher education and IoHE on the one hand, and the backgrounds to the two national case study contexts, on the other. The former offers a comprehensive overview of the literature, but heavily relies on the frameworks of a small number of Western authors. While the synthesis of the major Western works has been done very competently, a higher degree of critical engagement would have given the researcher a clearer voice and possibly added new and novel perspectives to the debate. The context chapter offers a competent and reasonably critical summary of IoHE in the Japanese context, but it was felt there were few critical insights in the introduction to the Singaporean context. Running to close to 100 pages, these two chapters show exceptional dedication to the review process, but could have benefited from being more streamline in in terms of narrative. Nevertheless, I am

sure they will be regarded as a real resource to students new to the field who we be able to access a well written synthesis of key literature in the field in this one thesis, albeit with a Western framing.

The results of the documentary analysis of the four cases are highly detailed and offer a close-up snap shot of policy, strategy, student mobility and curriculum developments associated with IoHe policy at this moment in time. This chapter reads very much as a presentation of raw data with the main analysis following in the next chapter. The documentary research is supplemented by interviews with 6-9 administrative staff and leading faculty involved in internationalization in the four universities. Given these are in-depth interviews a large volume of data was generated using this approach. One issue, however, is a lack of transparency about who was actually interviewed. The researcher was concerned that providing details would result in informants being identified, which from an ethical point of view is a clearly valid concern. However, from a methodological perspective we learn little about the sampling rationale and/or any biases. This creates problems when considering the meaning of the results.

The results of the interviews reveal that informants from the two Singaporean Universities were able to articulate the IoHE policies at their institutions much more clearly than those in the Japanese institutions. The former were far less critical about their institutions IoHE policies than the Japanese informants. This is an interesting result, but the discussion chapter does not sufficiently consider a sampling bias as a possible source of this outcome. Instead, the discussion highlight the ability of the Singaporean leadership to impose policy in a top down approach, compared to Japanese institutions where there is a reasonable concentration of power at faculty level to thwart top down initiatives. The ability of the Singaporean leadership to effectively and efficiently impose policy on faculty and the campus body was identified as a positive driver of effective internationalization in the dicussion. This is an interesting and credible conclusion, but

one that needs further study.

The researcher sets as a caveat that he is not judging whether IoHE is good for universities or not, but investigating coherence, transparency and centrality of policy. The thesis does a good job of describing IoHE in the four case study institutions and then explaining the contextual factors that may explain the similarities between the two institutions within each national setting and the differences observed between the institutions across national settings. As a study that focuses on the Asian context, this kind of detailed study makes a much needed contribution to the field.