

Scaffolding excellence: Content-language integration and the development of Japanese ‘global leaders’

MacLellan, Philip ✉

Hitotsubashi University, Japan (philipmaclellan@econ.hit-u.ac.jp)

Received: 27 April 2017

Available Online: 22 May 2017

Revised: 1 May 2017

DOI: 10.5861/ijrse.2017.1820

Accepted: 19 May 2017

ISSN: 2243-7703

Online ISSN: 2243-7711

OPEN ACCESS



Abstract

How does one develop advanced foreign language proficiency, specialized content knowledge, and a global intercultural perspective in the four short years of undergraduate study? This paper provides a descriptive case study of the Global Leaders Program, a broad-based curriculum renewal at a top-tier Japanese national university specializing in the social sciences. It focuses on content-language integration in the Faculty of Economics and the manner in which English language development is scaffolded for students through a progression from Content-based Instruction (CBI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in the early years to English-medium Instruction (EMI) at advanced levels. Classroom instruction is further interwoven with multiple opportunities to apply theoretical knowledge and benchmark English proficiency through short-term field study tours and subsequent full-year student exchange experiences abroad. Following a description of the program, the paper discusses initial challenges in accommodating the additional English language instruction required by GLP and draws conclusions about a more fundamental hurdle that remains if an international excellence initiative such as the global leader's program is to be successful in Japan. In addition, the paper offers insight about the contemporary educational practices of top-tier institutions in Japan and East Asia which may be instructive for receiving institutions that have a high intake of students from this region of the world on study abroad and longer-term student exchanges.

Keywords: Japan; higher education; internationalization; global human resource development; English medium instruction; curriculum reform

Scaffolding excellence: Content-language integration and the development of Japanese ‘global leaders’

1. Introduction

In April, 2013, Hitotsubashi University, the only Japanese national university specializing in the social sciences, introduced a new Global Leaders Program (GLP) in the Faculties of Economics and Commerce & Management.¹ Designed to foster the development of future leaders able to work on the forefront of global business, government and academia both at home and abroad, the program became available immediately to more than half of the university's 4400 undergraduate students on an opt-in basis. GLP is funded in part by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) through a competitive grant under its Global Human Resources Development (*guroubaru jinzai*) initiative designed to “foster human resources who can positively meet the challenges and succeed in the global field, as the basis for improving Japan’s global competitiveness and enhancing the ties between nations” (Japan Cabinet Office, 2012). In other words, the Global Human Resource Development (GHRD) program aims to turn around a perceived ‘inward looking’ Japanese youth by creating Japanese graduates who are capable of working confidently in English in international contexts both in Japan and abroad. As the seeds of this latest internationalization effort can be traced back at least three decades to the policies of Prime Minister Nakasone in the mid-1980s (Hood, 2001) and most directly to the ‘Big Bang’ reforms of higher education in the early 2000s (Eades, Goodman, & Hada, 2005), some have expressed skepticism about the potential success of the current GHRD initiative (Chapple, 2014). For Hitotsubashi University, however, which traces its origins to the first commercial school in modern Japan, borrowing knowledge from the West to move the country out of the feudal era by educating domestic “Captains of Industry” (Ikema, Inoue, Nishizawa, & Yamauchi, 2000), human resource development is in its DNA. GLP represents the most recent step in an ongoing process of institutional reform aimed at positioning Hitotsubashi as a world-renowned university in the social sciences.

This paper discusses the Global Leaders Program in the Faculty of Economics² at the end of its third year of implementation, focusing on the integrated development of content and language that is scaffolded for students through an English program that progresses from Content-based Instruction (CBI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in the early years to English-medium Instruction (EMI) at advanced levels. The paper is structured as follows: the next section describes the interpretive case study methodology employed in this study, and this is followed by an overview of the Global Leaders Program. The paper continues with a sequential, year-by-year look at the GLP curriculum that integrates language, content and study abroad experiences. Of note is a substantial increase in the number of courses exhibiting CLIL and EMI language pedagogies. Initial challenges that shaped the implementation of the English language component of GLP is followed by a discussion of a potentially greater challenge that remains for the development of high-level global human resources in Japan. The paper concludes with considerations for institutions planning similar programs and provides insight about contemporary trends in English language development for institutions that receive large numbers of international students.

2. Methodology

Drawing upon participant observation, document review and in-depth interviews with key stakeholders, this paper reports a *local knowledge* case study, whereby insider status allows the researcher to “soak and poke” (Fenno, 1986), assessing and reassessing evidence as it unfolds to initiate new areas of investigation and arrive at

¹ In April 2017, the Faculty of Law, the third of the four university undergraduate faculties, implemented GLP.

² The two participating Faculties of Economics and of Commerce & Management submitted a joint proposal for government funding and collaborated in program design but are implementing their programs independently. This paper focuses on the implementation of the Global Leaders Program in the Faculty of Economics.

reasoned lines of explanation from an in-depth knowledge of the setting and the interactions within it (Flyvbjerg, 2006). The author reviewed internal university documents, official submissions for funding, interim evaluations and other government reports; conducted semi-structured interviews with instructors, students, staff and faculty in charge of implementing GLP; and engaged in participant observation of classes, faculty meetings and campus interactions as a faculty member who teaches academic writing and presentation courses in the graduate school and second year undergraduate *Basic Seminar* courses that adopt a CLIL pedagogy. As a qualitative case study that “capitalizes on ordinary ways of making sense” (Stake, 1995, p. 72), validity evidence is obtained not through statistical procedures but through the extent to which the descriptive analysis herein resonates with veterans of that context. It therefore does not aim for statistical generalizability in the manner of quantitative research, but does allow for *naturalistic generalizations*, or “conclusions arrived at through personal engagement” (Stake, 1995, p. 85). While the paper thus does not presume to reflect the situation at all institutions of higher education in Japan or the world, the descriptive analysis that follows and the conclusions reached are likely to resonate with readers embedded within similar contexts such as other EFL contexts in Asia or institutions elsewhere that receive many international students. Additionally, with the Faculty of Economics ranked second in Japan in its specialty (QS Quacquarelli Symonds, 2017), the case reported here can be viewed as a “best case” study (Fenno, 1986), with challenges reported here likely to be the most difficult to overcome and applying in even greater numbers in universities across Japan. Most importantly, the paper elaborates a tangible curriculum and pedagogy that addresses general concerns such as those raised by Chapple (2014) about the possibility of managing the considerable English language and content knowledge development challenges required of GHRD in only four years of undergraduate study.

3. Global Leaders Program

The Global Leaders Program (GLP) is a four-year undergraduate curriculum that provides the possibility of obtaining a master’s degree in five years with an additional year of study. It is one university’s vision for implementing the Global Human Resource Development (GHRD) program of the Japanese government (MEXT, 2012), the most recent in a series of programs in the new millennium aimed at creating a Japanese system of higher education that is more competitive, world-class, and globally engaged. GLP aims to develop internationally-experienced and articulate graduates who can draw upon their theoretical knowledge, English communication skills and practical overseas experience to both internationalize decision-making in Japan and become “smart and tough global leaders” abroad, as it is expressed in the university’s “Plan 135” reform plan. At its core, the GLP curriculum aims to develop global human resources by enhancing student mobility within and beyond academic disciplines, between theory and practice, across international borders, and from undergraduate to graduate study and careers. It is designed to achieve this by infusing within the existing curriculum an international focus consisting of enhanced English language development and an increased emphasis on meaningful study abroad and long-term academic student exchange experiences that push students to arrive at new understandings of themselves in the world and the roles that English and their disciplinary knowledge will play in their lives and future careers (Yamada, 2015).

The Global Leaders Program grew out of institutional reform that draws upon the university's founding as Japan's first business school early in the country's modern era (Ikema et al., 2000), its long history of educating leaders of Japanese commerce and industry (“Captains of Industry” is the school motto), its appeal in Japan as a top destination for high-achieving students (it is known for having one of the most difficult entrance exams in the country) and its international ranking and reputation among specialists in Japan and abroad for its world-class economic research (QS Quacquarelli Symonds, 2017). In short, GLP aims to prepare undergraduate students to be more active internationally – to become *Global Captains of Industry*, as it is expressed in the Faculty of Commerce & Management. GLP thus represents not so much an elevation of educational programs to world-class standards of the type the Japanese government has been actively promoting since the early 2000s

(Eades, Goodman & Hada, 2005; Poole & Chen, 2009; Tsuruta, 2003) but, rather, a global pivot.³

Accomplishing such a feat in an undergraduate program entails a different set of challenges for the university, whose international activities have to date been focused at the graduate level. While its 11% international student population ranks second in Japan, the majority (71%) are graduate students (QS Quacquarelli Symonds, 2017). One of the challenges of GLP for Hitotsubashi, then, is to bring its successful graduate programming deeper into its undergraduate curriculum and earlier into a student's academic career. Doing so, however, has profound implications for English language instruction, for not only are entering undergraduate students generally less experienced with academic English than are graduate students who are more accustomed to reading academic texts and attending seminars and conferences in English, for example, but the target population itself is different. The graduate student population is more internationally diverse than is the undergraduate student population which consists mostly of domestic Japanese students. Thus, while English-medium Instruction (EMI) in Japan has increasingly served to attract and scaffold learning for newly-arrived international graduate students whose abilities in English may initially outstrip their proficiency in Japanese (Wallitsch, 2014), EMI within GLP instead represents the end state, the culmination of a program of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction that allows graduating domestic Japanese students to embark on international graduate studies or careers. In other words, within GLP, EMI is not a scaffold for inbound student mobility but a facilitator for outbound student mobility that itself must be scaffolded in order to avoid a situation similar to that reported by Kim (2011) in which 60% of Korean students at the beginner level understood less than 70% of the EMI course content. The GLP curriculum is designed to avoid this problem by delaying EMI initially, providing first-year specialty content instruction in Japanese while students develop their English language skills and then proceeding in second year to a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) pedagogy that has dual content and language goals before moving to full EMI in later years of the program. Most importantly, though, as GLP is an opt-in program, only those who are motivated will participate, and this is discussed next.

Before turning to a description of the four-year curriculum in the next section, it is important to note the two-pronged design that makes the Global Leaders Program (GLP) available to every student in the participating faculties on an opt-in basis but compulsory for only a select few highly-motivated students through the special Global Leaders Class (GLC). The GLC is comprised of about fifteen of the most high-achieving students (approximately five percent of the annual student cohort) who apply and are selected at the end of their first year of study based on a review of documents and interviews. From second year, the GLC student cohort is not streamed into a separate stand-alone class for instruction but continues to take courses with the rest of the student body, a decision intended to provide a model of excellence for all students while retaining for GLC students a flexibility in pursuing their specialized fields of interest. Departmental targets⁴ for English, study abroad and English-language coursework become individual requirements for GLC students, and those with a 95 TOEFL iBT score, study abroad experience of 9-12 months, and sixty percent of all required economics courses taken in English receive a Global Leaders Program certificate upon graduation. Students who are not selected into GLC, meanwhile, are free to take part in GLP to any extent they choose, ranging from completely shadowing GLC to completely avoiding English language instruction and study abroad opportunities. Content-language integration, and this two-pronged opt-in design allows GLP to avoid challenges noted by Kim (2014) in which Korean engineering professors expressed discomfort with EMI because of students' inadequate English language abilities but yet were not supportive of additional basic language instruction for students because of their belief

³ This supportive infrastructure and rich legacy was recognized by MEXT as a crucial element in its decision to award funding for GLP, as it made the acknowledged 'high target' more achievable (JSPS, 2012a). In addition to curriculum, which is the focus of this paper, GLP also incorporates institutional reforms such as more robust provision of study abroad and career guidance, further internationalization of faculty and staff, and reform of administrative structures to better coordinate with global standards, including such measures as adopting a standardized system for transferring student exchange credits and shifting to a four term academic year, which Hitotsubashi University implemented in April, 2017.

⁴ The goal expressed in the joint GLP proposal for MEXT funding is to quadruple (to 25%) the number of graduating students expected to meet departmental English proficiency targets, to double (to 31%) those expected to have studied abroad over the four initial years of GLP, and to provide a minimum of 60% of the specialized academic courses in each department in English (JSPS, 2012b).

that it would detract from their study of academic content. The Faculty of Economics hopes that the select Global Leaders Class will function as a beacon of light to guide all boats by providing a pathway of excellence to motivate the most high-achieving students who, in turn, serve as models to guide the entire student population, while recognizing that students need language support to get there.

4. Integrated content and English language development

Advanced English language proficiency is a key target of the Global Leaders Program and, to achieve this, English language development has been integrated throughout the four undergraduate years. Table 1 shows the GLP English language courses and economics content courses taught in English by academic year, the providing unit, and pedagogical approach or language of instruction. We can see that formal instruction in English begins with content-based instruction (CBI) and content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in the first two years and then moves to English-medium instruction (EMI) in years two through four, before cycling back to CBI to provide advanced skill support in academic writing and presentations for students accepted into the fifth-year master’s program who will submit a thesis in English. Throughout this paper, the pedagogical approach assigned to each course was determined by analyzing the official course syllabi and coding according to the framework described in Ohmori (2014): courses referencing only language goals were coded as CBI, courses with only specialty content goals were coded as EMI, and courses explicitly referencing a *dual focus* on both content and language goals were coded as CLIL (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010 & Marsh, 2012). It is important to note, however, that while this analytic framework has been adopted in this study to more precisely capture the GLP language development path, the Faculty of Economics uses a less fine-grained framework for understanding English-taught courses, describing them either as ‘skills’ (herein coded CBI) or ‘content’ (herein, CLIL and EMI) courses. The latter courses count towards the 60% that GLC students are required to take in English, while the former do not.

Table 1

GLP language and content sequence in Faculty of Economics

Year	Courses	Providing Unit	Approach/ Language
1	English I, II, III ^d	General Education	CBI
1	Introductory Economics	Economics	Japanese
1-2	Presentation Skills	CGE (HGP)	CBI
1-2	Academic Writing	CGE (HGP)	CBI
2	Economic English	Economics	CBI
2	Basic Seminar ^a	Economics	CLIL
2	Basic Core / Elective Courses	Economics	EMI ^a and Japanese
2	International Field Studies ^c	Economics, Alumni, Industry, Government	Short-term immersive
3-4	Intermediate Core / Electives	Economics	EMI ^b or Japanese
3-4	Business Electives	Commerce	EMI ^b or Japanese
3-4	Social Science Electives	Law, Social Sciences	EMI or Japanese
3-4	Long-term study abroad ^c	Partner universities	Long-term immersive
4	Advanced Core / Electives	Economics	EMI ^b or Japanese
5	One year Masters Degree ^c	Economics	English ^c Thesis
5	Academic Presentations	Economics	CBI
5	Research-based Writing	Economics	CBI

Notes. Data obtained from Hitotsubashi University Course Syllabi, 2007-2015. CBI indicates content-based instruction focusing on teaching English skills through social studies content; CLIL indicates content and language integrated learning that has dual language and academic content goals; and EMI indicates English-medium instruction without any overt language learning goals. CGE (HGP) refers to the Hitotsubashi University Global Education Program (HGP) coordinated by the Center for Global Education (CGE).

^a indicates newly introduced GLP courses; ^b courses with increased offerings under GLP; ^c experiences receiving increased emphasis under GLP; ^d courses provided by external units that are partially funded by GLP.

4.1 Year 1: Transitioning to university

Entering first year students begin their exploration of economics with introductory courses taught in Japanese while they develop their English skills through compulsory university-wide General Education (GE) courses. According to their levels of proficiency and interest, students may take one or more of English I, II and III, offered through a CBI pedagogy using standard textbooks and media, with topics drawn from a range of contemporary social issues. These courses are taken by all first-year Hitotsubashi students but, as economics students take them as well, a portion of GLP funding was allocated to support them.

In addition to the GE English courses, students may also take academic English writing and presentation courses through the Hitotsubashi Global Education Program (HGP), a repository of English courses offered by various units throughout the university but which is coordinated by the Center of Global Education (CGE), a hub for international activities on campus. CGE was formed in 2010 following a pilot study funded by a 2005 MEXT Strategic International Headquarters (SIH) grant (JSPS, 2010) and, in addition to coordinating HGP, also provides Japanese language courses for international students as well as study abroad and career guidance for all students. As domestic degree-seeking students are able to directly enroll in courses offered by other faculties, HGP is of most benefit to international exchange students, but some courses such as the undergraduate academic English skill courses mentioned above are available only through HGP.

In the fall of the first year, based on an application and interview process, approximately fifteen highly motivated students are selected for the Global Leaders Class (GLC), the centerpiece of GLP.⁵

4.2 Year 2: Foundations for future study and an international experience

Following the first year of compulsory English courses, economics students opting to take GLP continue in their second through fourth years what I have characterized as a progression from CBI to CLIL to EMI courses, interspersed with practical opportunities to apply their growing theoretical knowledge and English skills abroad. The pivotal second year curriculum includes all of these possibilities. In the Faculty of Economics, courses are assigned numbers according to the level of difficulty and approximate year of study: 100-400 for introductory, basic (i.e. foundational), intermediate, and advanced levels. For their second-year economics courses, students can choose the language of instruction, as two newly hired native English speaking economics specialists offer core EMI microeconomics and macroeconomics courses that are also offered in Japanese by Japanese faculty. GLP students are encouraged to take these foundational courses in both languages to solidify their theoretical understanding and develop bilingual academic literacy. Students who do not opt into GLP take required courses in Japanese.

Students wanting to develop their English abilities further may continue to take higher-level GE English courses in their second year and/or the Faculty's *Economic English*, a CBI sequence for beginning-level language learners targeting listening and speaking skills through authentic sources of economics content. More fluent and confident students may take *Basic Seminar* courses, new CLIL offerings introduced in 2013 with GLP and taught by newly hired contract faculty, all of whom are non-Japanese native- or native-like speakers of English with content specializations in economics (two of whom also teach the core courses mentioned above). Two of these faculty have additional specializations in second language acquisition and the author of this paper also has a MATESL degree. The small-group Basic Seminars aim to apply economics theory through a communicative approach incorporating reading, listening, discussion, debate and presentations. These seminars perhaps best demonstrate what I have described as the global pivot that GLP represents for the Faculty of Economics because, although the concept of CLIL understandably does not resonate widely within a faculty comprised almost exclusively of economics specialists with no language teaching background, the Basic Seminar course concept is drawn from the long-standing Japanese language *kiso zemi* ('basic', or foundational, 'seminars') with similar

⁵ In the Faculty of Commerce and Management, this special class is known as the Shibusawa Scholars Program.

aims of exploring practical applications of theory through active discussion. As the *kiso zemi* also educate students in how to adopt an academic style of discourse through active discussion, debate and presentations, economics faculty may have an experiential, if not a formal, understanding of a teaching approach similar to CLIL in that it, too, involves dual communication and academic content goals.

Finally, study abroad is a key feature of GLP, in keeping with the university's aim for research to be drawn from real-life experience and for ideas to be generated based on a broad-based world knowledge. Hitotsubashi students typically take their first study abroad in the summer of their second year, and the experience featured in GLP (though open to all economics students) is one or the other of two International Field Studies, 10-day faculty-led group study tours to Europe and Asia. The experience aims to increase student awareness of real-world economic and cultural differences globally through visits to local NGOs, government offices, and businesses abroad. In the spring term prior to the tour, participating students take a required seminar course in which they learn about the countries they will visit and local socio-economic concerns. They also prepare presentations and speaking notes for discussions in English with university students from these regions while abroad. In the seminar upon their return, students reflect on what they have learned and individually prepare reports in English addressing socioeconomic aspects of the countries visited that are then compiled into an edited volume and published.

International Field Studies, which began as tours of Asia in 2009 and thus preceded GLP, were expanded in 2013 to include Europe and have become an important component of GLP, funded in part by the Japan Student Services Organization (JASSO), the *Josukai* alumni association, industry partners, and MEXT "Cultivation of Analysts" grants. The Field Studies and the accompanying year-long required seminar provide students with exposure to the world outside Japan through their first real test of their developing theoretical knowledge and language abilities. Students also receive an immersive international academic experience in English with which they can benchmark their later EMI courses at home as well as an initial structured experience that will support their subsequent independent full-year academic exchange abroad.

4.3 Year 3: Exploring new academic worlds

In the third and fourth years, students take intermediate and advanced level economics courses, many of them EMI offerings and, in a distinguishing feature of the university's educational philosophy, many of these EMI courses are graduate (400 level) courses that are available to advanced undergraduates with the permission of the instructor. Students are also encouraged to take courses in other faculties to gain an interdisciplinary perspective, and some of these courses are available as EMI, particularly those in the Faculty of Commerce and Management that has also participated in GLP from the outset.

In many of these EMI courses throughout the university, domestic degree-seeking students have an opportunity to become further aware of international perspectives in English through their interactions with international exchange students who often populate these courses (and similar perspectives are also obtained from international degree-seeking classmates in courses conducted in Japanese). The Center for Global Education (CGE) mentioned above offers a broad range of services to support both inbound and outbound student mobility (Ota, 2014). These include study abroad and career counselling as well as Japanese language courses for visiting students whose language abilities are not sufficiently advanced to enroll directly in the university's regular courses offered in Japanese. At Hitotsubashi, visiting international exchange students are assigned to a faculty, so if their Japanese language proficiency is sufficiently advanced, they may enroll directly in courses throughout the university just as degree-seeking students do. However, if they are not sufficiently proficient in Japanese, CGE develops a program for them that includes Japanese language courses and EMI content courses offered by units throughout the university and coordinated through the Hitotsubashi Global English Program (HGP).

GLP is flexible in the timing of the requirements of the third and fourth years, but because of the

time-intensive Japanese job search process in fourth year, many students choose their third year to participate in a full-year international academic exchange, following the glimpse of the professional and academic worlds outside Japan they obtained during the short-term International Field Studies in the middle of their second year. In the fall of 2016, Hitotsubashi had reciprocal student exchange agreements with 98 universities in more than 33 countries through which students could study for up to a year abroad while paying domestic tuition to their home university. Most students receive scholarships for living expenses while abroad from the Hitotsubashi University alumni association (Josuikai, 2015), and the first GLC cohort was in its third year of study in the fall of 2015, studying at universities throughout Europe, North America, and Asia. Additionally, a separate Global Leaders Development Program established in 2013 allows up to one Hitotsubashi student annually to study for up to one year at each of the four cooperating universities of Harvard, Cambridge, Oxford and the London School of Economics and Political Science. As with the second year International Field Studies, these extended immersive academic exchange experiences abroad are facilitated by prior English language courses taken at the home campus, while also providing students with an international benchmark not only for the EMI courses they will take upon their return but also for their future academic and career plans.

Returning to the supportive role that the Center for Global Education (CGE) plays in facilitating student mobility, arguably the greatest benefit it provides to degree-seeking economics students is one received only indirectly. The Hitotsubashi Global Education Program (HGP) that coordinates EMI courses offered throughout the university is seldom used by degree-seeking students because they are able to enroll in most of those same EMI courses directly from the faculties offering them. However, HGP and the Japanese language classes provided by CGE to international exchange students are highly appreciated by the Faculty of Economics, but for a different reason. In the emerging global model (EGM) of top-tier universities (Morhman, Ma, & Baker, 2013), an institution's reputation is derived not only from the quality of its own educational programs but also from the company it keeps. Universities typically sign the Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) that govern international student exchange agreements on a reciprocal basis with institutions of a similar caliber. These agreements are typically reviewed every 3-5 years and are renewed only if deemed beneficial to both parties. As under these exchange agreements, tuition is paid by students to their home university, not the host university, reciprocity in the flow of students is crucial. For the international institution, this means an assurance that its Japanese counterpart can provide quality instruction (and transferable course credits) *in English* for those students who are not able to take content courses in Japanese. By allaying these concerns, HGP thus facilitates the signing of student exchange agreements. Therefore, while HGP may not benefit economics students directly, the exchange agreements it helps facilitate become valuable currency that allows Hitotsubashi students to study, for domestic national university tuition rates, at top institutions worldwide.

4.4 Year 4: Bringing it all together

Fourth year students are confronted with both an end and a new beginning: preparing a senior honors thesis, perhaps in English, and planning for the next step in their career or educational plans. As GLP does not distinguish between activities in the third and fourth years, students have the flexibility to plan which year to take their long-term student exchange abroad. One factor is English language proficiency, and students who do not meet TOEFL requirements for acceptance into regular academic study abroad in their third year may take additional EMI and TOEFL preparation courses in their third year to apply again in their fourth year. Others who do not opt into GLP may take a shorter study abroad experience, often at one of the language schools with which Hitotsubashi has long-standing arrangements worldwide. Most of the first GLC cohort completed their long-term academic exchange abroad experiences as third year students in 2015-2016, and then graduating in March 2017. In their senior year, most students engaged in the Japanese job search process (*shushoku katsudo*) even if they were planning international careers or further academic study, and many took EMI courses to maintain their English. Other students returned from their academic year abroad to take advanced EMI courses to transition to graduate study abroad or to enter the fifth-year master's program at Hitotsubashi. Still others who had received offers from highly reputable internationally-facing firms that would satisfy most graduates instead strategically chose to

continue as fifth-year undergraduate students in order to undergo the job search process a second time in the hope of receiving an offer from their ideal employer.

In order to receive a Global Leaders Class certificate, GLC students must ensure that they have accumulated the required number of EMI courses. To graduate, all students must take 140 *koma* (two-credit courses meeting one 90 minute period per week), with 68 of these specialty content courses taught within the Faculty of Economics. GLC students are expected to take a minimum of 60%, or more than 40, of these courses in English. This does not include English skills courses taught within the faculty or EMI courses taken in other faculties, although these count as general electives fulfilling graduation requirements. Upon graduation, students have come to the end of one journey, but another opportunity for advanced study is available.

4.5 Year 5: Exploring further

Motivated Hitotsubashi students have the option of an additional one-year master’s program through which accepted students receive a baccalaureate and a graduate degree in five years, with a master’s thesis written in English. Graduate (400-level) EMI courses taken during the senior undergraduate year facilitate the transition to graduate studies. Support is provided for writing the senior thesis in English by the advanced graduate-level English skills courses in research-based writing and academic presentations. Described in Table 1 as adopting a CBI approach because the explicit learning objectives expressed in the syllabi are language-focused, the content of these graduate level courses, which aim to prepare students to present at international conferences and publish in international refereed journals, deals deeply with the specialized content of student’s research projects in practice. Thus, the cycle of language development begins again, at a more advanced level.

5. Greater emphasis on advanced instruction in English

The Global Leaders Program has brought a six-fold increase in EMI courses offered by the Faculty of Economics, from six in 2012-13 prior to implementation of GLP to 36 three years later (Table 2). EMI is also offered now at more advanced levels. This has been partially facilitated by increasing the number of English courses offered earlier via other pedagogical approaches to help scaffold these advanced EMI courses for students, and also through the hiring of native- or near-native English speaking economics specialists who teach core second year EMI economics courses. The following section will elaborate how this was accomplished, but here we can at least say that GLP has brought with it a substantial increase in EMI courses at a more advanced level than was available previously.

Table 2

EMI courses offered in Faculty of Economics by level and instructor, 2012-16

Year	2012-13			2013-14			2014-15			2015-16		
Instructor	J	NJ	Total	J	NJ	Total	J	NJ	Total	J	NJ	Total
Course Level												
400	--	--	--	12	--	12	18	2	20	17	4	21
300	2	--	2	7	--	7	9	--	9	7	--	7
200	3	1	4	--	4	4	--	8	8	--	8	8
Total	5	1	6	19	4	23	27	10	37	24	12	36

Notes. Data obtained from Hitotsubashi University Course Syllabi and Faculty of Economics lists of ‘Courses Offered in English’, 2012-2016. J, NJ and T refer to Japanese, non-Japanese and total faculty, respectively. Courses in Japan typically meet once a week, so those courses that meet twice a week are counted as two courses. Courses are numbered from 100-400 according to level of difficulty: introductory, basic, intermediate, and advanced. Courses designated 400 level are early graduate (master’s level) courses that are available to undergraduate students with the permission of the instructor.

6. Discussion

6.1 Initial challenges

At its core, GLP aims to cultivate students who are globally aware, able to construct academic theory based on practical real-world observation, possess excellent English communication skills and have strong leadership abilities to innovate and reform Japanese and global systems while driving global agendas through logical reasoning and negotiation (JSPS, 2012b). When asked about the initial challenges in GLP planning and implementation, the faculty member who oversaw the program for the first two years replies without hesitation: “Manpower”. As described above, integrated English language development throughout the four undergraduate years is fundamental to GLP, and the Faculty of Economics had initially planned to hire native English speaking faculty to address these needs. In the implementation phase, however, the planning committee quickly became aware of grant restrictions that limited the expenditure of funds on hiring new faculty (which had been identified as the area of greatest need) and that prohibited any direct spending at all on students (such as scholarships for living expenses and educational materials during their International Field Studies or year-long student exchanges abroad). Meanwhile, there were few restrictions on spending for computers and technology, but this was not an area of great need, as the university had received funds for this from previous grants. Facing a long-standing trend in Japan of easier access to funding for hardware and software than human-ware (Bachnik, 2003), appropriately managing the grant budget to implement the GLP program as it had been designed thus became an early challenge.

One aspect of this was ensuring that a sufficient number of content courses were offered in English to meet promised departmental targets and the minimum GLC student requirement of taking 60% of subject-level credits in English (amounting to more than 40 credits, or twenty semester-long courses). The Faculty adjusted, going forward with a plan to hire two full-time native English speaking economists on a contract basis for the second year (200-level) core EMI theory courses and the new (CLIL) Basic Seminar courses. Their academic specialties also contributed new topics to graduate (400-level) EMI course offerings. Second year needs were further met by allocating to Basic Seminar a portion of the course load of the faculty member responsible for teaching graduate-level academic English skills courses. With second-year needs filled, Japanese faculty then shored up the remaining program gaps by teaching more of their advanced courses in English, from five in 2012 to 24 in 2015 (as seen in Table 2). This would not have been possible were it not for the extensive international experience of the Japanese faculty, 56% (33 of 59) of whom obtained their PhDs abroad and 68% (40) of whom have extensive international experience. Nonetheless, having had the experience of learning in English does not necessarily equip one to teach in English, which requires a combination of linguistic, academic, and pedagogical expertise (Shohamy, 2012). Upon closer inspection below, the manner in which this challenge was addressed reflects a workaround solution to two main challenges identified by Vu and Burns (2014) in their study of a new EMI undergraduate curriculum in Vietnam whereby the Vietnamese instructors were challenged by teaching EMI in their second language, and this was made worse by their undergraduate students' relatively low level of English proficiency.

In the Faculty of Economics, the solution to the challenge of providing sufficient courses in English has resulted in an uneven distribution of course offerings, as some GLC students have pointed out. Specifically, there are relatively few intermediate (300 level) courses offered in English. The Faculty of Economics compiles two in-house lists of English-language courses that it offers; namely, *Courses in English Communication* and *Courses offered in English* (Table 3). The former list for 2015-2016 contains 21 CBI ‘skills’ courses, basic level *Economic English* and graduate level academic writing and presentation courses. These do not count toward the GLC requirement of 60% of economics specialty courses taken in English. The latter list, though, includes courses that *do* count and, in 2015-2016, it contained 46 ‘content’ (i.e. CLIL and EMI) courses. Recalling that GLC students must take more than 40 courses to meet the 60% English requirement, this means that GLC students must take almost half of these from among the 21 graduate (400) level courses. Additionally, while students have many

choices at the basic (2nd year) level (10 CLIL and 8 EMI, for a total of 18 content courses, plus 11 CBI courses), only seven intermediate (3rd year) courses are offered in English.

Breaking this down further, of the 67 courses offered in English by Economics faculty in the 2015-2106 academic year, those taught by Japanese faculty were exclusively EMI courses, most of them at the graduate level. In other words, Japanese faculty were mostly teaching their specialties and advanced core courses to advanced-level undergraduate students who have a better understanding of theory and more extensive English language development. Non-Japanese economics faculty, meanwhile, all of whom have specializations in economics, were responsible for teaching core economics and English development courses at the basic level, as well as advanced elective courses in their fields of specialization. Under the circumstances, this seems to be a not unreasonable division of labor, given the challenges found by Vu and Burns (2014) noted above. Second year English-language core economics courses and English skills courses taught by native English-speaking faculty can provide scaffolding for students' subsequent experiences abroad, beginning with the International Field Studies at the midpoint of the second year. These experiences abroad, in turn, can further prepare students to take advanced EMI courses at home from Japanese faculty who can also provide the theoretical support to help students complete a senior honors thesis and transition into graduate school and careers. The relative lack of intermediate (300-level) courses that is the overt symptom of this division of labor may itself be less of a concern than it may first appear to students, as most third year GLC students embark on a full year of academic exchange abroad and so receive an immersive academic English experience abroad instead of EMI at home.

Table 3

'English communication courses' and 'courses offered in English', Faculty of Economics, 2015-16

Course Type and Level	Japanese Faculty	Non-Japanese Faculty	Total Faculty
<u>"Skills" (CBI)</u>			
400	--	10	10
200	--	11	11
Total Skills Courses	--	21	21
<u>CLIL</u>			
200	--	10	10
<u>EMI</u>			
400	17	4	21
300	7	--	7
200	--	8	8
Total EMI	24	12	36
Total CLIL	--	10	10
Total Content Courses	24	22	46
Total 400 level	17	14	31
Total 300 level	7	--	7
Total 200 level	--	29	29
Total English Courses	24	43	67

Notes. Data obtained from Hitotsubashi University Course Syllabi and Faculty of Economics lists of *English Communication Courses* and *Courses Offered in English*, 2015-2016. Courses in Japan typically meet once a week, so those courses that meet twice a week are counted as two courses. Courses are numbered from 100-400 according to level of difficulty: introductory, basic, intermediate, and advanced. Courses designated 400 level are early graduate (master's) courses available to undergraduate students with permission.

One reason why Hitotsubashi University has been able to manage the above challenges is that its institutional reform efforts are generally aligned with government policy. Chapple (2014) identifies four main themes underlying Japan's most recent policy efforts to internationalize higher education (increasing foreign students, increasing foreign faculty, sending more Japanese students abroad, and teaching more classes in English), and the latter three are fundamental to the goals and implementation of the Global Leaders Program (the first theme is the subject of other university initiatives). The government of Japan has been calling for universities to adopt a more strategic approach to internationalization, one that is more proactive and institutionally organized than the ad hoc individual faculty initiatives that have been favored in the past (Ota,

2014). Accomplishing this requires greater integration of research and teaching as well as an elevation in the importance of international initiatives so that they underlie all university operations rather than being applied piecemeal and tangentially. The 2005 “Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities” (hereafter, the SIH Project) provided competitive grants to twenty universities to conduct internationalization pilot projects in an effort to develop and assess ‘best practices’ in nine areas⁶ identified by funding agency Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) (Ota, 2014). SIH Project results indicate that participating universities were particularly strong in goal-setting, inter-university cooperation, staff development, faculty and student exchange, and establishing overseas offices (Ota, 2014). With Ota a faculty member of Hitotsubashi University, one of the recipient institutions of the SIH Project grants, it is not surprising that knowledge of best practices gained from this earlier project were incorporated into GLP implementation.

Additionally, the Global Leaders Program represents a movement towards making the university’s international operations more systematic and central to the university’s mission. Qiang (2003) notes that many institutions are challenged by how to transition international intentions into practical strategies, and articulates a four-quadrant model with two dimensions: ad hoc/ systematic and tangential/ central. The challenge for many institutions is to elevate international activities that are ad hoc and tangential into operations that are more systematic and central to the institution. From this perspective, Hitotsubashi University appears to be on solid footing. As a faculty member formerly overseeing GLP states:

GLP and the internationalization activities of [Hitotsubashi] should not be seen as a succession of attempts to secure funding but a natural progression based on institutional tradition. While some universities have planted an international program on very domestically oriented soil, Hitotsubashi has been planning this for a very long time. [GLP] is planted on very fertile soil.

6.2 A more fundamental hurdle

There remains a potentially more serious challenge to the long-term success of the Global Leaders Program and its goal of developing Japanese graduates who are able to actively create meaningful change on a global stage. When asked what he sees as the greatest challenge going forward, the Japanese faculty member currently overseeing GLP, who also teaches one of the intermediate-level EMI courses, pauses for a moment before offering the following:

Bringing more students to English language courses, showing them how to take that first step... They are not eager to take English, but they feel that they have to do it [even though] they are not very good at it. But they take my course. And then they think, ‘Well, I didn’t understand everything that he said, but I could understand more than I thought. I could do it.’ Then they decide to do a short-term study abroad and then a long-term study abroad and it builds from there. The challenge is how to take that first step.

Taking that first step. With its efforts to develop a world-class brand, world-wide recognition for the quality of its teaching and research, links with top-tier universities around the world, and strong competition with those institutions for students, Hitotsubashi University has embraced the new paradigm of the ‘entrepreneurial university’ (Clark, 2013). The university has performed well thus far in the new era of competition in Japan, having obtained a succession of competitive government grants in the last decade, but the Global Leaders Program represents a shift from preparing Japanese students for elite domestic careers to preparing more outward-facing *global* thought leaders capable of communicating and negotiating global agendas based on their deep knowledge of economic theory, interdisciplinary study, real-world experiences abroad, and advanced English language communicative abilities (JSPS, 2012b).

⁶ The nine areas are 1) organization and governance directed by the President, 2) goal-setting, action plans and evaluation systems, 3) external funding, 4) cross-border university partnerships and consortia, 5) expansion of international activities based on transnational projects, 6) training and recruitment of administrative staff, 7) improved support for international researchers, 8) expansion of overseas study and research opportunities for Japanese, and 9) establishment of overseas bases (Ota, 2014).

This requires extensive English language capabilities honed through opportunities for real-world practice discussing academic content in international contexts. Are the students up to the task? One early indicator is the faculty-led International Field Studies short-term study abroad experience in the second year, an experience that provides students with an early opportunity to benchmark to international standards their English communication skills and ability to practically apply their growing theoretical knowledge. According to the coordinator of GLP in Economics who also served as faculty leader of the European Field Study in 2014, the struggles that these students faced while communicating with their ESL counterparts from Bulgaria and Germany made it difficult for them to contribute equally to the discussions, let alone lead them. As one student reflected later about discussions with students in Bulgaria, "I realized that we Japanese were not good at expressing our own opinions", and another student in the same seminar following her trip to China notes that "I felt almost overwhelmed by their broad knowledge and logical argument" (Martchev, 2016, p. 67). A third student shares his experience as follows (Martchev, 2016):

I was in charge of the presentation about higher education with the Chinese students.... In that conference, what I was most surprised at was their ability itself. They speak English more fluently than us and their presentation was so logical that it was easy to understand. In fact, we have to say that it was greater than ours (p. 67).

Though challenging, such experiences need not be debilitating. The study abroad literature (Dehmel, Li, & Sloane, 2011; Engle & Engle, 2003; Montrose, 2002) argues that events such as these can become critical episodes that push students out of their comfort zones and raise their awareness of the relevant world standard they are aiming to achieve. These experiences thus can have long-lasting effects that motivate students to greater performance in the future, provided that there are indeed future opportunities. I have discussed elsewhere (MacLellan, 2009) a case study of a doctoral student who was initially reluctant to present her research in English at an international conference that, in retrospect, became a life-changing first step on her path to an international academic career. The student writings on their international experiences above reflect Cummins' (1979) distinction between Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) and, for Hitotsubashi students who have generally performed adequately on the former but are now becoming acutely aware of their struggles with the latter, the International Field Studies experience appears to be sufficiently early in their educational program to allow them to reset expectations, raise standards and aim to achieve a higher, revised benchmark.

Back at home, some students will return to campus after experiences such as these with renewed vigor to sign up for English language courses and to understand their theory courses to a degree of depth that allows them to create logical explanations with a high degree of clarity in their second language. If they do so, they may indeed become 'global leaders' in the future. However, foreign language proficiency, specialized content knowledge and a global intercultural perspective are not simply items on a checklist that can be developed independently and relatively passively by merely showing up for class. Opportunities for critical reflection such as the experience described above may allow students to realize that creating meaningful change on a world stage entails more than merely being a motivated and high-achieving student at home. Rather, it involves taking English seriously not as a topic of study in itself but as a tool through which serious communication can occur, knowledge can be gained, ideas can be debated and minds can be changed. This also involves an understanding of the world from the perspectives of the people one is trying to engage as well as an ability to apply understanding of theory to solving practical world problems. The GLP program, with its integrated language and content development and experiences abroad, has set up the framework through which this can potentially occur. The task remains, however, to encourage more students to overcome their apprehensions about English and take up the challenge.

7. Conclusion

This paper reports a case study of content-language integration in an undergraduate university program in

Japan designed to develop internationally-experienced graduates who are competent not only in engaging in discussions of global issues but also in leading them. In so doing, the paper also provides a general framework for universities in other EFL countries, particularly those in Asia, intending to develop similar undergraduate programs aimed at graduating students who are equipped with both specialty content knowledge and advanced English ability. Core features of such a content-language integrated program include a scaffolding of English language instruction through a transition from first year content-based instruction (CBI) focused on developing English skills to English medium instruction (EMI) in the later years during which students learn their academic specialties in English. In the intervening years, courses with dual content and language learning (CLIL) goals, together with study abroad experiences that provide real-world benchmarks of English language development and practical experiences related to academic specialties, can help to scaffold this process for students.

There are several concerns that can create barriers that institutions must overcome in successfully implementing an integrated content-language program such as GLP. Firstly, while most curriculum reforms entail surprises, the detailed implementation requirements (i.e. the ‘fine print’) of government policy is regularly provided to institutions only after funding has been awarded. Even institutions whose missions and resources are generally aligned with government policy may find the need for substantial adjustments during program implementation. In Japan, the faculty have historically played a large role in the administration of institutions of higher education (President and Vice President are elected from current faculty, for example, and remain as faculty when their administrative terms are completed), which arguably leads to a deeper and more practical understanding of university resources and constraints than systems in which top administrators are recruited from outside the university. The supportive environment no doubt played a part in facilitating the adjustments necessary in implementing GLP. Secondly, while government policy aims to shape the activities of institutions of higher education, institutions may be tempted to undertake initiatives that are only tangential to their mission. This may lead to short-term success, but initiatives that encourage institutions to tweak, refocus and combine existing strengths are likely to be more sustainable in the long term than those that push the institution in a completely new direction. For Hitotsubashi University, the Global Human Resource Development initiative of the Japanese government is based on an economic concept that draws upon a university strength as well as its educational philosophy and historical practice. Initiatives that are sustained, systematic and fundamental to university practices are most likely to be successful and sustainable in the long term.

Finally, in addition to providing a model to other universities in Asia, the paper also offers to those outside Asia a window onto contemporary English learning at a top-tier institution in Asia (the source of a large number of students who seek to study in North America). In particular, it can perhaps be instructive for North American programs that take in large numbers of international students, as it highlights the contemporary needs of non-native English speakers working toward success in English-dominant contexts. Regarding study abroad, for example, programs have traditionally focused on rudimentary language study and intercultural experiences. Universities in Asia, however, are increasingly providing opportunities for students to develop their English language abilities on the home campus, allowing them to participate in more focused and value-added experiences such as field studies, internships and extended academic exchanges during their time abroad. Further, some institutions such as Hitotsubashi are encouraging students to participate in more than one study abroad experience which may include a short-term internship or field study early in a student’s undergraduate program and a longer academic exchange later. This more varied array of experiences allows study abroad to become better integrated within the overall academic program by better addressing student needs at various stages while also motivating students and calibrating their expectations about future language, academic and career goals.

8. References

- Bachnik, J. (2003). *Roadblocks on the information highway: The IT revolution in Japanese education*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Chapple, J. (2014). Finally feasible or fresh façade? Analyzing the internationalization plans of Japanese universities. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 3(4), 15-28.

<https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2014.794>

- Clark, B. (2013). The entrepreneurial university: Demand and response. In R. King, S. Marginson, & R. Naidoo (Eds.), *The globalization of higher education* (pp. 64-75). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/ academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 19, 121-129.
- Dehmel, A., Li, Y., & Sloane, P. (2011). Intercultural competence development in higher education study abroad programs: A good practice example. *InterCulture Journal*, 15, 11-36.
- Eades, J. S., Goodman, R., & Hada, Y. (Eds.). (2005). *The 'big bang' in Japanese higher education: The 2004 reforms and the dynamics of change*. Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.
- Engle, L., & Engle, J. (2003). Study abroad levels: Toward a classification of program types. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 9, 1-20.
- Fenno, R. (1986). Observation, context, and sequence in the study of politics. *American Political Science Review*, 80(1), 3-15. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1957081>
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800405284363>
- Hood, C. (2001). *Japanese education reform: Nakasone's legacy*. London: Routledge.
- Ikema, M., Inoue, Y., Nishizawa, T., & Yamauchi, S. (Eds.) (2000). *Hitotsubashi University, 1875-2000: A hundred and twenty-five years of higher education in Japan*. London: MacMillan.
- Japan Cabinet Office (2012). Summary and conclusion of discussions on promoting the development of global human resources [In Japanese]. Retrieved from <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/singi/global/1206011matome.pdf>
- Japan Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) (2012). Project for promotion of global human resource development. Retrieved from <http://www.mext.go.jp/en/policy/education/highered/title02/detail02/sdetail02/1373895.htm>
- Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) (2010). Strategic fund for establishing international headquarters in universities (SIH) (2005-2010). Retrieved from https://www.jsps.go.jp/english/e-bilat/e-u-kokusen/program_org/outline.html
- Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) (2012a). Examination results, Hitotsubashi University, project for the promotion of global human resource development, type B. [In Japanese]. Retrieved from http://www.jsps.go.jp/j-gjinzai/data/shinsa/h24/gjinzai_kekka_b05.pdf
- Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) (2012b). Project summary, Hitotsubashi University, project for the promotion of global human resource development, type B. Retrieved from http://www.jsps.go.jp/j-gjinzai/data/shinsa/h24/gjinzai_gaiyou_b05_e.pdf
- Josuiikai Alumni Association of Hitotsubashi University (2015). Overseas Student Exchange Program. Retrieved from <http://www.josuiikai.net/en/university/overseas-exchange-universities/>
- Kim, E. G. (2014). Korean engineering professors' views on English language education in relation to English-medium instruction. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 11(2), 1-33.
- Kim, K. R. (2011). Korean professor and student perceptions of the efficacy of English-medium instruction. *Linguistic Research*, 28(3), 711-741. <https://doi.org/10.17250/khisli.28.3.201112.013>
- MacLellan, P. (2009). Retooling Japan for the 21st century: Higher education reforms and the production of 'international' scholars. In G. S. Poole & Y. Chen (Eds.), *Higher education in East Asia: Neoliberalism and the professoriate* (pp. 73-95). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Marsh, D. (2012). *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL): A developmental trajectory*. Cordoba: University of Cordoba Publications.
- Martchev, M. (2016). On several problems of English usage observed among a group of 'global leaders program' students at a Tokyo university. *Jissen Women's University CLEIP Journal*, 2, 49-69.
- Montrose, L. (2002). International study and experiential learning: The academic context. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 8, 1-15.

- Morhman, K., Ma, W., & Baker, D. (2013). The research university in transition: The emerging global model. In R. King, S. Marginson, & R. Naidoo (Eds.), *The globalization of higher education* (pp. 226-248). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Ohmori, A. (2014). Exploring the potential of CLIL in English language teaching in Japanese universities: An innovation for the development of effective teaching and global awareness. *Journal of Rikkyo University Language Center*, 32, 39-51.
- Ota, H. (2014). Japanese universities' strategic approach to internationalization: accomplishments and challenges. In A. Yonezawa, Y. Kitamura, A. Meerman, & K. Kuroda (Eds.), *Emerging international dimensions in East Asian higher education* (pp. 227-252). New York: Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8822-9_12
- Poole, G., & Chen, Y. (2009). *Higher education in East Asia: Neoliberalism and the professoriate*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education*, 1(2), 248-270. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2003.1.2.5>
- QS Quacquarelli Symonds (2017). *Top universities: Worldwide university rankings*. Retrieved from <https://www.topuniversities.com/universities/hitotsubashi-university>
- Shohamy, E. (2012). A critical perspective on the use of English as a medium of instruction at universities. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges* (pp. 196-212). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tsuruta, Y. (2003). Globalisation and the recent reforms in Japanese higher education. In R. Goodman & D. Phillips (Eds.) *Can the Japanese change their education system?* (pp. 119-150). Oxford: Symposium Books.
- Vu, N. T. T., & Burns, A. (2014). English as a medium of instruction: challenges for Vietnamese tertiary learners. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 11(3), 1-31.
- Wallitsch, K. N. (2014). *Internationalization, English medium programs, and the international graduate student experience in Japan: A case study* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation, Paper 15, University of Kentucky, USA. Retrieved from http://uknowledge.uky.edu/epe_etds/15
- Yamada, A. (2015). Generating synergy by building stronger links with the world's top universities. *Hitotsubashi Quarterly*, p. 9. Retrieved from http://www.hit-u.ac.jp/eng/hq/2015/enghq2015_04-11.pdf