

In fact, individuals now have to wonder whether they can recover their investment and even whether they will find a job after graduation at all. The concern about future opportunities on the job market now motivates people to consider studying part time at one of the better-quality programs at home while continuing to work.

Conclusion

Students will most certainly continue to go abroad, but more out of preference than necessity or the promise of fantastic salaries. While going abroad might once have been the only way for many talented young people to get a high-quality education, this is no longer the case. Likewise, an international degree no longer guarantees significant financial rewards, let alone a job. But much as on-line education has not eliminated the desire for a classroom experience, an education at home that meets international standards does not offer the same experience as studying in another country. The numbers of people moving about the planet will not be as grand as they once were, but the migrations will continue. Visa processing, prejudice, and, perhaps most important, economic conditions will determine which countries will send students and which countries will benefit by receiving them. ■

Japan and Transnational Higher Education

Fujio Ohmori

Fujio Ohmori is a professor at the Research Center for Higher Education, Kumamoto University. Address: 2-40-1 Kurokami, Kumamoto-shi, 860-8555 Japan. E-mail: f-ohmori@ge.kumamoto-u.ac.jp.

As early as this year, the Japanese government is expected to implement new policies to recognize transnational higher education both domestically and internationally. On March 29, 2004, the Ministry of Education published its study group's report on quality assurance of transnational higher education. The group, consisting of experts and stakeholders in higher education, recommended that the ministry radically change its regulatory framework for transnational provision.

The current framework is said to be based on the "territorial principle." Foreign institutions' branch campuses on Japanese soil, including those accredited in their countries of origin, are not recognized as higher education institutions in Japan unless authorized by the minister as universities or colleges under Japanese law. Similarly, Japanese institutions' offshore programs in other countries are not recognized as part of Japanese higher education, and the ministry's view has been

that it is up to a host country's authorities whether or not to recognize the programs.

The current regimen may have been a reasonable part of the national education system in the modern world where sovereign nation states control domestic affairs including education. However, current postmodern trends—including globalization and marketization—are pressuring the Japanese system to change itself.

Foreign Branch Campuses

Although no official statistics exist on foreign branch campuses in Japan, there were probably around 40 American branches in the early 1990s. Most of them have shut down, and only a handful have survived. The largest one is Temple University Japan (TUJ) that started to operate in 1982—earlier than any other branch. In addition, quite a few institutions in China, Australia, and other countries have branch campuses in Japan.

Quite a few institutions in China, Australia, and other countries have branch campuses in Japan.

The branch campuses of foreign institutions are free to provide educational services without having official recognition of the Japanese authorities as part of the country's higher education system. To be recognized under the current system, those branch campuses need to reestablish themselves as universities or colleges under Japanese law in accordance with the standards and criteria set for local universities and colleges. None of the branches have pursued that course. Therefore, for example, credits acquired at Temple University Japan are not transferable to Japanese institutions, while those acquired at Temple University's home campus (TU) are.

Once the policy recommendations in the study group's report are implemented, the above distinction between Temple University and its branch campus in Japan will be eliminated. Under the new regime, foreign institutions' branch campuses in Japan that satisfy certain conditions will be recognized in the same way as their programs in their countries of origin. These conditions will not require matching Japanese quality standards but rather proving the programs are recognized as bona fide higher education in their countries of origin. In short, this new policy will recognize higher education services provided in Japan by established foreign institutions.

Apparently the World Trade Organization General Agreement on Trade in Services negotiations have revitalized the issue of American branch campuses, and

the U.S. government has been raising this issue not only in the World Trade Organization negotiations but also in other bilateral talks. However, the proposed policy change will affect not only American but also other foreign institutions, including Chinese, Australian, and British institutions, and the consequences can significantly impact higher education in Japan.

Japanese Offshore Programs

On the global transnational higher education market, Japanese institutions have been virtually absent. Although quite a few Japanese private institutions operate overseas, mainly in the United States, most of the overseas programs are for Japanese nationals to study abroad. However, it has been reported that some prestigious institutions (both private and public), including Waseda University and Tokyo Institute of Technology, are now starting to embark on new overseas activities. At this stage, these activities tend to involve nondegree programs and academic collaboration with local institutions. Furthermore, Japanese institutions have received government or nongovernment invitations from some East Asian countries—including Malaysia, Thailand, and China.

Offshore programs of Japanese institutions are not recognized as part of Japanese higher education.

Under the current system, offshore programs of Japanese institutions are not recognized as part of Japanese higher education. Host-country authorities may recognize those programs. In that case, the programs are recognized not as Japanese but as “foreign” higher education from the Japanese legal point of view. As a result, Japanese institutions are not able to award their Japanese degrees to graduates of their offshore programs, while foreign degrees may be awarded by these programs if the host-country authorities recognize them. Quality assurance of the programs and degrees is not provided by the Japanese system. In short, Japanese law prohibits Japan’s brand of higher education from being exported. Until recently there has not been much demand for removing this seemingly crazy self-regulation either from Japanese institutions or foreign hosts—although this has changed to some extent, as stated above. The proposed policy on offshore provision is that the Japanese government will recognize offshore programs and degrees and integrate them into the national quality assurance framework.

Prospects in a Shrinking Market

In Japan, the population of 18-year-olds, the traditional undergraduate student age cohort, has been rapidly shrinking and will continue to do so. After reaching a peak of 2.05 million in 1992 that population is now down to 1.41 million in 2004. The participation rate is about 50 percent. It is expected that by 2007 the number of young people taking entrance higher education exams will be roughly equal to that of the potential freshman population as a whole, which means no selectivity for admissions. With the increasing deregulation of the chartering process or of ministerial authorization of new universities and colleges, as a part of neoliberal regulatory reforms, it is now much easier and cheaper than ever before to establish new institutions—while spending less on lands, buildings, and so on. Even two for-profit universities have now been allowed to exist in the “special zones for structural reform,” one of the Koizumi Cabinet’s flagship initiatives.

In Japan, the population of 18-year-olds, the traditional undergraduate student age cohort, has been rapidly shrinking and will continue to do so.

The policy changes for transnational provision should be judged against this background. Will the consequences of the changes be disastrous for Japanese institutions that already face the hardships of survival in a shrinking, fiercely competitive market. Or will the changes encourage Japanese higher education to adapt to globalization, expand its market transnationally, and stimulate innovations in the sector? The Japanese government seems to believe that the latter will be the case, while it is too early to say what will happen after the implementation of the new policies. There may simply be no choice but to change the system when not only the United States, Britain, Australia, and other Anglophone developed countries but also other East Asian countries, including China and Singapore, are aggressively embarking on transnational provision in the Asia-Pacific region, which is surely the most active part of global higher education market. Otherwise, the Japanese higher education system may be left behind regionally and globally.

Among the various factors that may affect the consequences, the issue of language and the possibility of partnership with industry will be, important ones. How popular will foreign institutions programs in English and other foreign languages be, or

how significant will the language barrier be for foreign institutions? How difficult will it be for Japanese institutions to offer programs in English or find demand for programs in Japanese overseas? How realistic will it be for Japanese institutions to expect cooperation and assistance from Japanese companies in overseas enterprises? These questions have yet to be answered. ■

Educating Women Worldwide

Louise W. Knight

Louise W. Knight is a historian and former university and women's college administrator who presently teaches at a coeducational university, Northwestern University, in Evanston, Illinois, USA. E-mail: lwnknight@aol.com.

In every country of the world women lag behind in their development as citizens and leaders. A strong consensus exists among international development organizations, although admittedly not among all national governments, that education is the essential means to correct this imbalance. The question then becomes how best to deliver it. In higher education, as in primary and secondary education, two models are available and both are effective. But while coeducational institutions worldwide have played a crucial role in advancing women, women's colleges and universities have always been and continue to be the beacons, the innovators, and the heart and soul of the international women's education movement. Both their enduring success and a renewed worldwide interest in the single-sex model deserve more attention.

What do women need educationally to fulfill their human potential? In societies that, consciously or unconsciously, treat women as inferior—that is to say, in virtually every society in the world to a varying degree—women need educational affirmation. Access issues aside, they need classrooms where their intellect is respected and their bodies are forgotten, they need a campus life that is not sexually charged, and they need older women as teachers, mentors, and models of what they may become. Coeducational institutions have the potential to provide these things but, to date, these needs are more commonly met at women's colleges and universities. The absence, or minimal presence, of men is part of it, but the institution's priorities are the other, more essential, part.

Women's Separate Higher Education on the Rise

Compared to men's separate higher education, women's separate higher education has a short history. It began in the early 19th century in the United States, and spread to

Europe and Canada, and then was exported around the world by Protestant and Catholic Christian European and American missionaries, many of them graduates of American women's colleges. Later, national governments adopted the model. After a period of relative quiescence in the post-World War II years, the less-than-200-year-old international women's separate higher education movement is vital and spreading. Impressionistic research has revealed that women's colleges and universities have been founded in countries where previously they have been extremely rare—in Africa, much of the Middle East, and China—and their numbers have surged forward in India.

The first woman's university in East Africa, Kiriri Women's University of Science and Technology, was founded just three years ago in Nairobi, Kenya, by a consortium of visionary Kenyan business executives to encourage women to pursue technological education. In the Middle East, the United Arab Emirates has Dubai Women's college, founded in 1989; Saudi Arabia has Effat College, founded in 1999. Both of these are government funded. The state-funded China Woman's College, China's first women's college in the communist era, is less than 10 years old. In India, women's colleges are on the increase. In 1987, there were 780 women's colleges. By 1997, there were 1,195. Finally, a new Asian University for Women, to be based in Bangladesh, is in the planning stage.

While it is difficult to know exactly what forces are contributing to the sudden renewed interest in women's higher education and the separate education model, a case can be made that international development organizations are having some influence.

International Interest

While it is difficult to know exactly what forces are contributing to the sudden renewed interest in women's higher education and the separate education model, a case can be made that international development organizations are having some influence. The decision to establish the China Women's College, for example, came in the wake of the 1994 United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing. More broadly, under UNESCO's guidance, a strong campaign worldwide to educate *all* people has been building in recent years, inspired in part by article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations in 1948, which reads, "[H]igher education shall be accessible to all on the basis of merit . . . Education shall be