



Title	Mapping Global Citizenship Education at Japanese Universities from Articulation to Implementation: A Mixed Methods Study Emphasizing Student Perspectives
Author(s)	Fast, David Thomas
Citation	大阪大学, 2022, 博士論文
Version Type	
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/87801
rights	
Note	やむを得ない事由があると学位審査研究科が承認したため、全文に代えてその内容の要約を公開しています。全文のご利用をご希望の場合は、 https://www.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/thesis/#closed 大阪大学の博士論文について https://www.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/thesis/#closed をご参照ください。

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

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

The University of Osaka

論文内容の要旨

氏 名 (Fast Thomas David)

論文題名

Mapping Global Citizenship Education at Japanese Universities from Articulation to Implementation: A Mixed Methods Study Emphasizing Student Perspectives
 (日本の大学におけるグローバル・シチズンシップ教育の設計から実施までのマッピング：学生の視点を主とした混合研究法を用いて)

論文内容の要旨

In 2014, the Japanese Ministry of Education (MEXT) launched the Top Global University (TGU) project. Among its goals were to educate students to become future global *jinzai* (global human resources), who are seen by leaders in government and the business community as essential for Japan to maintain its presence and leadership in the world. In response, TGUs and other Japanese institutions have opened new “global” faculties offering internationalized curricula and English Medium of Instruction (EMI) for local and international students.

Global human resource education can be seen within the larger field of global citizenship education (GCED). Scholars have proposed that global citizens have a particular set of competencies (cultural knowledge, communication skills, open-mindedness, etc.) that allow them to better understand how the world works, and to take actions that bring benefits beyond the region where they were born or reside. By educating students in these “global competencies” they can become global citizens. But the global human resource model is often criticized by GCED scholars as being too nationalistic, as those who are expected to use their global competencies primarily for the benefit of their nation, not the betterment of the world. Researchers stress the need for GCED to foster more *transformative* global citizens who utilize their powers for the good of humanity and the planet.

The aim of this study is to investigate how GCED is being articulated and fostered in Japanese universities, and to find the best ways to cultivate global competencies in students, in an effort to help Japan *transformative* global citizens. This study seeks to answer the following questions: How is global competence defined and developed at Japanese universities? Do students in global programs feel like they are developing global competencies? If so, what type of global citizens are they becoming? Moreover, what best practices on Japanese university campuses can help foster *transformative* global citizens?

To answer these questions, a mixed methods approach was utilized. First, an investigation of the literature of GCED and the ideologies of established education organizations such as UNESCO, Oxfam, International Baccalaureate (IB), the OECD, etc., and a thorough review of recent GCED literature from Japan. This was followed with a document review of frameworks from Japanese universities, which participated in the Go Global Japan (GGJ) Project from 2012 to 2016. The next phase of research involved two case study universities. The original plan was to recruit two TGUs however, most would not allow their students to be surveyed or interviewed. Ultimately, studies at a TGU with a new global program (GP) for Japanese and international students, and another at a foreign language university (UFL) with an established International Relations Program (IRP) consisting mainly of Japanese students were granted. Both institutions were originally selected for global reputations and their potential to be models for other universities seeking to foster global students. To measure students’ impressions of their global competency development, the IB Learner Profile, which is widely accepted as a *transformative* GCED framework, was utilized. Five competencies from the Learner Profile (Knowledgeable, Inquirer, Open-minded, Caring, and Communicative in English) became the basis for surveys and focus interviews.

The data revealed that GCED in Japan continues to be vaguely understood (e.g. equated with English ability), articulated as global *jinzai*, (global human resources) or serve primarily as a tool for institutional branding. While there are many frameworks for GCED in Japan, they are seldom actually implemented. The data from the IRP revealed students were not confident in their global competency development. In particular, students reported not becoming more inquisitive, caring nor communicative in English, despite the institution’s reputation.

On the other hand, students in the TGU GP reported they were becoming more knowledgeable, inquisitive, open-minded, communicative, and caring, which suggests they were developing into *transformative* global citizens. GP students attributed their positive development to the fact that they are part of a culturally diverse Japanese and international cohort who incorporate the best practices of studying together every day in small, active discussion-centered classes with international-minded professors.

These findings are significant in that they are a window into the GCED shortcomings and successes currently occurring on Japanese university campuses. According to the literature, uninformed attempts at fostering global human resources may actually perpetuate existing regional and global imbalances. Japanese universities should heed the advice of GCED researchers in Japan and overseas to train *transformative* global citizens who are equipped to address, not only the concerns of their nation, but those of the planet as a whole.

論文審査の結果の要旨及び担当者

氏 名 (Fast Thomas David)			
	(職)	氏 名	
論文審査担当者	主 査	教 授	山本 ベバリー・アン
	副 査	准教授	Etzrodt Christian
	副 査	教 授	藤川 信夫
	副 査	教 授	齊藤 貴浩

論文審査の結果の要旨

Title: Mapping global citizenship education at Japanese Universities from articulation to implementation: a mixed methods study emphasizing student perspectives

This research took a mixed-methods, case study approach to investigate how global citizenship education (GCED) is articulated by and implemented in Japanese universities. The starting premise was that the discourse of fostering global human resources (*jinzai*) and/or global graduates could be analyzed in terms of an overarching framework of GCED. This premise was successfully backed up through the literature review chapter on GCED currents in Japan (chapter 4). GCED provision in Japanese universities was then evaluated against widely accepted global framework and sets of good practices. A normative argument was developed to justify the measures used for evaluation.

The research design was multimodal and grew out of a wide ranging reading of the international (chapter 2) and Japanese literature written in English on GCED (chapter 4), as well as a literary review of internationally recognized best practices in GCED (chapter 3). The design of the research and the rationale for the methods employed was clearly laid out in chapter 5 (for a summary see table 5). The rationale and analytical frameworks for each part of the data collection were clearly recorded.

The data collection methods aimed to generate data to analyze both articulation and implementation of GCED. To investigate how GCED was being articulated in Japanese universities, an analysis of website content and funding application documents of ten universities that made a successful bid for the 2012-2016 Project for the Promotion of Global Human Resources was conducted. This clarified the type and range of GCED competencies that the programs were expected to develop. A second investigation was made of ten universities currently receiving Top Global University (TGU) funding, both A and B types. A comparison was made of the global competency frameworks extracted from the TGU reports from these universities, which were compared against a variety of global frameworks, ranging from neoliberal to transformative, in order to understand how GCED was being defined by these institutions. This analysis forms the content of chapter 6. The results from this analysis were accepted for publication in the Journal of Comparative and International Education (JCSIE) (December 2021) but actual publication is pending.

To address the issue of implementation, data was collected from two case study institutions, one a

foreign languages university and another a TGU. These universities were chosen on the basis that they had global programs and were willing to engage with the research, which required extensive data collection. Quantitative data was collected from a target group of students enrolled in the global programs at the two universities (n=112) and a control group of students at the same universities not enrolled on these two programs (n=128). The aim was to clarify whether the global programs were fostering global competencies over and above those learned through the wider university environment. At the same time, the data collection sought to identify which and to what extent a range of globally recognized competencies were being taught through these programs.

Qualitative data was collected from workshops and semi-structured interviews with students enrolled in the global programs at the two universities. The inquiry sought to understand the students' perceptions of their own acquisition of global competencies and the meanings they assigned to them. Interviews with two administrators of these global programs were also conducted to understand how the program was structured, and whether prominent global programs and internationally recognized good practices were used as a reference or not. While the empirical data is taken only from two case study universities, the multimodal approach generated a rich range of data that provides insights into the implementation of GCED at the institutions. The data collection was completed before the COVID-19 pandemic altered the higher education landscape, especially in terms of the internationalization of education.

The reporting on the case study data and analysis (chapters 7-10) are clear and well written. The statistical analysis is solid, well laid out and addresses the relevant research questions to draw convincing conclusions. The workshop and interview data of global program student provided more in-depth insights into what the students felt they were learning and their expectations of their global program. A comparison of the data set showed that the TGU program, with a clearer curriculum framework was more successful in nurturing a range of global competencies. The administrator interviews provide insights into the ways in which broadly articulated goals around the creation of global graduates or even global human resources were being implemented, through the global programs, especially in the TGU. Some reference was made to well-established frameworks and good practices but there was a lack systematic implementation of these into the curriculum. Based on the research, recommendations were made for improving both the articulation and implementation of GCED based on good practices of the major GCED programs introduced in chapters 2 and 3. These recommendations are reasonable and informative providing the normative position is regarded as acceptable.

The contribution of this research is the application of different definitions of global citizenship education to the case of higher education in Japan and the evaluation of which of these approaches is dominant on different levels. In addition, the research attempted to provide normative arguments as to why specific global citizenship educations are superior to others. On the basis of these argument, the thesis concluded that internationalization programs are still fulling short of what could be done based on global standards.

Tom Fast's thesis is of a sufficiently high standard that the committee agrees that he deserves to receive a PhD.