Review

A Comparative Analysis of the Higher Education Internationalization Policies of Australia and Japan

Kristen Sullivan

＜Abstract＞

This paper looks at the higher education internationalization policies of Australia and Japan from the 1950s to the present day and considers how and why they have shifted over time. After briefly considering the situation of higher education internationalization prior to World War Two, it discusses the three phases which have been identified: 1950s-1970s, 1980s and 1990s, 2000s-present day. It shows that both countries started with aid or international cooperation centered policies in Phase One. In Phase Two, different issues and priorities in each country led to different approaches to policy. Australia shifted to its infamous trade approach, positioning international students as a source of income and international education as a new national industry, while Japan saw its dwindling international student numbers as another sign that it was failing to play its role on the international stage, and began university-level reforms to increase its international student intake under the 100,000 International Students Plan. Although they were following different policy paths, during this period both Australia and Japan started to realize the importance of internationalization at home and the complexities of migration within international education. These last two topics became key issues within Phase Three, with both countries experimenting with ways to secure and develop global human resources through links with the migration system and recruitment of former international students, as well as delving into government-led and funded outbound mobility programs.

Keywords: higher education, internationalization, international students, Australia, Japan

Introduction

This paper is part of a larger project investigating the interconnections between the higher education internationalization policies of Australia and Japan, and people to people contact within higher education between the two countries. To provide background for this, this paper aims to map the shifts in higher education internationalization policies for both countries, while considering background issues behind these policy shifts and noting relevant similarities and differences between the two countries. This is done through a review of the literature as well as analysis of policy-related documents and websites. This paper will briefly touch upon the situation of higher education internationalization in each country prior to World War Two, before looking at the three policy phases that have been identified: 1950s to 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, and 2000s to the present day. It is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a comprehensive account of all higher education internationalization policies, strategies and programs undertaken by Australia and Japan. Instead, it aims to provide a starting point for a more nuanced consideration of exchange and cooperation activities between the two countries within the area of higher education.

Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Seinan Jo Gakuin University

Why Australia and Japan?

Australia and Japan enjoy a strong and mutually complementary relationship based on shared values and goals as developed, democratic nations located within the Asia Pacific region (Australian Embassy Tokyo, n.d.). They are strong trade partners benefitting from free trade agreements including the Japan-Australia Economic Partnership Agreement (JAEPA) which was signed in 2014. Australia has also benefitted greatly from Japanese investment, with Japan being its second largest investor. In recent years cooperation in the area of security has become more prominent, with the signing of the Joint Declaration on Security Cooperation in 2007, and the relationship being elevated to a Special Strategic Partnership in 2014. Cooperation with the United States and India within the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (QUAD) has also received media attention in both Australia and Japan.

Although the trade, investment and security aspect of the relationship receives most attention and action by the governments of both countries, there are also strong people to people ties between Australia and Japan. This includes tourism, sister city exchanges, the JET program, the working holiday program, school visits and excursions, Japanese language education in Australia, partnership arrangements and research collaboration between universities, the activities of the Japan Foundation in Australia, and other forms of cultural diplomacy. In higher education, there is a comparatively small but significant number of students from Australia and Japan studying abroad at each other's countries. However, the potential significance of this often flies under the radar. Pokarier (2006, p. 569-570) has stated that "[i]t is perhaps a mark of the mutual confidence in the resilience of the bilateral relationship though, that substantial bilateral educational initiatives rarely figured in the official relationship." That said, the author agrees with Pokarier's (p. 570) call that "[m]ore study is needed of the implications for the bilateral Australia-Japan relationship of the now significant mutual student mobility between the two nations" and indeed of other forms of cooperation within higher education. This paper aims to take a first step toward this through considering the general approach to higher education internationalization both countries have taken, and reasons for this, from the 1950s to the present day.

Phase One: 1950s to 1970s

Australia

Before investigating Phase One, let's briefly confirm where Australia stood regarding higher education internationalization pre-World War Two. Prior to the 1950s there was inbound and outbound student mobility in Australia, however this was not associated with an internationalization policy (Adams et al., 2011). Outbound mobility was largely associated with higher-degree level students and scholars based in Australia seeking opportunities at institutions in Europe and North America due to a lack of opportunity in Australia connected to its remoteness. Many of these scholars later returned to Australian universities to take up teaching and research positions (Adams et al., 2011; Dobson & Holtta, 2001). Regarding inbound mobility, there were a small number of overseas students predominantly from Asian countries studying at universities in Australia from as early as 1904 (Gallagher, 2011; Meadows, 2011); this was despite the implementation of the White Australia Policy and Immigration Restriction Act from 1901. Entry was limited to students who had been accepted by a university, would be studying full time, and could financially support themselves (Dobson & Holtta, 2001; Gallagher, 2011).

The systematic provision of international education is said to have started with the commencement of the Colombo Plan which was decided at the 1950 Commonwealth Meeting on Foreign Affairs held in Colombo, Ceylon (present day Sri Lanka) (Auletta, 2000; Cuthbert et al., 2008). The Colombo Plan (The Colombo Plan for Cooperative Economic and Social Development in Asia and the Pacific) as a whole aimed to contribute to the economic and social advancement of the people of South and South-East Asia, and consisted of two sections: the Capital Development Program and Technical Cooperation. It was under the latter that the Australian government sponsored international students from developing countries to study at Australian universities through its foreign aid program (Dobson & Holtta, 2001). This sponsorship system itself was named the Colombo Plan. However, development assistance was not the only aim of this program. As Auletta (2000, p. 57) notes "[t]he establishment of the Colombo Plan had more to do with the containment of communism and the countering of criticism of racist policies in Australia, and the development of trade and future markets in the region, than any of its publicly avowed aims."

From the same time, privately-funded overseas students mostly from Asia and the South Pacific, a number of whom were sponsored by their home governments or other sponsors (Trestrail, 2005), were also studying at Australian universities "on the same fee conditions and entry requirements as Australian students" (Adams et al., 2011). This meant that when tuition fees were abolished for local students under the Whitlam government in 1973 overseas students could also study at Australian universities without needing to pay tuition fees, leading to "increasing numbers of foreign students taking advantage of this new regime" (Cuthbert et al., 2008); although the number of private international students was capped at 10,000 (Dobson & Holtta, 2001). Even prior to the full abolition of tuition fees, tuition was partly subsidized by the government, thus students, including overseas students, had not paid the full cost of their tertiary education.

It is important to remember that the post-war intake of both sponsored and privately-financed overseas students was happening while the Immigration Restriction Act or White Australia Policy was in place. The Immigration Restriction Act (1901) aimed to limit non-white (particularly Asian) immigration to Australia; thus, it would normally have been difficult for the overseas students in Australia, primarily from Asia and the Pacific, to migrate to Australia. However, it seems that some overseas students had stayed in Australia after completion of their studies, instead of returning to their home countries and contributing to their development using knowledge and skills gained through their studies in Australia. This led to questioning in some quarters about whether the aid objectives of the overseas student program were being met, and if the program was creating a method of "back door" migration (Goldring, 1984, p. 30-31). This led to the introduction of certain requirements and restrictions for overseas students in 1956 and 1966.

In 1979 the Overseas Student Charge (OSC) was introduced requiring privately-funded students to pay initially ten percent, and in later years up to 33 percent, of the cost of their tuition to the Overseas Student Office within the Australian government, at the time of the issuing or renewal of their student visa. This new policy also required that overseas students return to their home countries for two years after the completion of their studies before they could apply for permanent residence (Goldring, 1984, p. 33). However, at the same time the previous limit put on the number of students to be accepted was removed and "[u]niversities were free to enroll international students as long as they did not displace domestic students" (Ziguras, 2016, p. 209). In this way, even with the introduction of this fee, overseas students' tuition fees were still being partially subsidized by the government through the aid budget (Adams et al., 2011; Cuthbert et al., 2008; Dobson & Holtta, 2001). Moreover, exemptions from the OSC were given to students already studying in Australia, and the Australian government paid the OSC for privately-sponsored students from Papua New Guinea and the South Pacific from the aid budget (Goldring, 1984). In this respect, during this first phase of higher education internationalization, Australia's policies had a strong aid element.

Japan

Japan has a well-known history of sending its citizens abroad and accepting foreign teachers in order to gain knowledge and modernize. For example, during the 7th to 9th centuries representatives (called *kenzuishi* and *kentoushi*) were sent to China, and from the end of the Edo period through to the Meiji period a number of Japanese travelled secretly or were officially dispatched to study in countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom and Germany (Ota, 2018a; Monbusho, 1981). The Meiji period also saw large numbers of foreign teachers being hired to teach at institutions of higher education.

Regarding the inbound mobility of foreign students, as early as 1881, three students from Korea were accepted to study at *Keiou Gijuku* and *Doujinsha*, and in 1896, 13 students sent by the Qing dynasty studied at *Sansagakusha*, which were three private schools offering western-style education (MEXT, 2001). The first acceptance of foreign students to study at institutions under the authority of the Monbusho (Ministry of Education, Science and Culture) was in 1901, which included students from Qing China, India, the United States and the Philippines. This was followed by an intake of more than 7,000 students from Qing China after the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905), and an intake of 116 scholarship students (*nanpou tokubetsu ryuugakusei*) in 1943 from countries in South-East Asia then under the occupation of Japan (MEXT, 2001).

During the post-war period, Japan was both the (brief) recipient and provider of international education based on the philosophy of international assistance. Between 1949 and 1951, 1,000 Japanese people studied in the United States as part of the GARIOA (Government Aid and Relief in Occupied Areas) scheme which primarily aimed to prevent starvation and ensure social stability in occupied areas (Ota, 2018a). From 1952 the name of the program changed to the Fulbright program, and under it approximately 6,500 Japanese people studied abroad in the US between 1952 to 2017; although from 1979 the Japanese government also contributed to the costs of the program (Ota, 2018a).

Japan's shift to becoming the provider of developmental assistance oriented international education started from 1954 with the establishment of the *kokuhi gaikokujin ryuugakusei shouchi seido* (Japanese Government Scholarship, hereafter kokuhi scholarship program), a scholarship program financed by the Japanese government which continues to the present day. The commencement of such a program was recommended by the domestic UNESCO committee and Science Council of Japan (Kudo, 2001; Terakura, 2009). The initial aim of the program was to undertake cultural exchange while promoting friendship and goodwill. Through focusing on the intake of students from South-East Asia and the Near and Middle East, the program aimed to contribute to the economic development of these countries through cooperation with human resource development (Sato, 2010). In this sense, the program was also intended to be a form of reparation for Japan's wartime aggressions (Ashizawa, 2013) and a way "to promote a better understanding of Japan and to wipe out the image of prewar militaristic Japan" (Ninomiya et al., 2009). At the same time, it has been pointed out that behind the focus on South-East Asia and the Near and Middle East was also an understanding of the importance of maintaining friendly relations with these areas which were also important suppliers of raw materials and energy resources (Sato, 2010). From 1960 Japan also accepted so-called compensation study abroad students (*baishou ryuugakusei*) from Indonesia as part of the two governments' compensation agreement signed in 1958. The costs of hosting these students were covered through Japan's compensation payments to Indonesia (Okumura, 2019, p. 26).

It is worthwhile noting here that Japan's overseas development assistance (ODA) program also commenced in 1954 (Ninomiya et al., 2009), and that this was actually through its joining of the Colombo Plan (Oakman, 2010). Although Australia was originally against American calls to allow Japan to join the Plan, it eventually succumbed and even sponsored Japan's submission to become a member (Oakman, 2010). As discussed above, among other forms of assistance, Australia sponsored students to study in Australia through the Colombo Plan, and the associated costs for these scholarships were paid for out of the foreign aid budget. Japan also provided various forms of technical assistance through the Colombo Plan, which included the intake of technical interns, however this was separate to its kokuhi scholarship program, which was led by the Monbusho. However, Terao (1990) states that an ODA budget was first incorporated within the Monbusho budget in 1973, and that many of Japan's international education expenditures, including the kokuhi scholarships and honors scholarships and partial tuition exemptions for private students, were paid for through the Monbusho's ODA budget.

As in the case of Australia, alongside the intake of scholarship students, privately-financed international students were also studying at Japanese universities, and their acceptance started in 1953, a year before the start of the kokuhi scholarship program (Kudo, 2001; Kawakami, 2016). Their numbers continued to increase, and according to statistics released by the Monbusho, in 1978 privately-financed students made up more than 80% of the entire international student intake with 4,774 privately-financed students and 1,075 scholarship students (Ashizawa, 2013). This number compares interestingly to the number of private students and Colombo Plan students in Australia in 1977, which were 7,653 and 1,474 respectively (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1978). Coincidentally or not, in 1978 the honors scholarship program for privately-financed international students (*gakushuu shoureihi*) also commenced (MEXT, 2001).

However, there was never a great increase in the number of students during the 1960s and 1970s, despite these scholarship programs (Kudo, 2001; Terakura, 2009). Data from MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology) (2001) shows that the total number of international students was 3,003 in 1964 and that this increased at a very gradual pace to 5,671 by 1976; unfortunately, breakdowns of the numbers of kokuhi and private students for this time period could not be found. While it is not clear if there is a connection to the slow growth in international student numbers or not, various problems had been highlighted and discussed since the very outset of the post-war acceptance of overseas students (Kawakami, 2016). Focusing her investigation on the 1950s and 1960s, Kawakami explains that from the mid-1950s, various discussion papers and investigative reports were released in publications by the Monbusho, academics and universities, and international student support groups on the topic of problems concerning the education of international students. Kawakami points out that much attention was paid to this issue by the Monbusho because it was felt that if these issues were not dealt with, they would have a negative influence on exchange between Japan and other Asian countries which could negatively affect Japan's future (2016, p. 25, quoting from a report by Kokuritsu Kyouiku Kenkyuusho, 1961, p. 2). There were problems in many areas including complaints about the level of financial support provided to kokuhi scholarship students, accommodation issues, problems with students' Japanese language ability and Japanese language education, issues with the quality of Japan's degree programs, the closed nature of Japanese society, discrimination against students from South-East Asia, and problems arising due to a lack of a clear diplomatic policy toward students' home countries. In many cases, the Monbusho made efforts to deal with the issues as they were brought to light, for example by improving the amount and type of financial support provided to kokuhi students. However, as it was not officially in charge of private international students, it left their issues up to each individual university to deal with. Kawakami (2016) argues that the root of these problems can be broken down into two main areas: problems with policy (diplomatic policy and international student policy) and problems with Japanese society (the Japanese university system and the closed nature of Japanese society), and she goes on to suggest that these are issues which still affect the intake of international students today.

Terao (1990) suggests that the 1974 response from the Central Education Council (Chuuou Kyouiku Shingikai) regarding international exchange within education, academia and culture represents a juncture in Japan's internationalization policies regarding education. In 1972 the then Monbusho Minister requested the Council to consider fundamental approaches to international exchange in education, academia and culture and measures that could be taken to promote and expand future international exchange from four perspectives: matters to be taken into consideration in school and social education, issues concerning the promotion and expansion of international exchange activities, issues concerning the expansion and promotion of Japanese language education targeting foreigners, and issues concerning the preparation of a framework to conduct international exchange. The reasoning given by the Minister for this request was that given

Japan's remarkable post-war economic growth and improved international position, Japan was being expected to play a greater role in international society. However, although Japan had made various efforts to date, internationally, and also in other areas, Japan's efforts in the field of international exchange in education, academia and culture had been insufficient. The Council's response concurred with this statement, noting that due to a lack of effort being made to truly understand foreign countries and have them understand Japan, there had been misunderstanding and distrust regarding Japan's activities abroad. The cultivation of internationally-oriented Japanese citizens and the improvement and expansion of international exchange activities in education, academia and culture were called for (Chuuou Kyouiku Shingikai, 1974).

The quite extensive response made suggestions for increasing the number of kokuhi scholarship students and to also give consideration to private students when reforming the university acceptance system. It also mentioned the need to improve accommodation options for both kokuhi and private students (Chuuou Kyouiku Shingikai, 1974). However, it is the wide-ranging number of recommendations made over a number of categories focusing on a broader sense of internationalization, going beyond that of just accepting international students, which is of interest. Terao (1990) suggests that the report was greatly influenced by two other reports published by external organizations: the OECD Education Survey Team's 1971 report "Reviews of National Policies for Education: Japan" and the UNESCO "1974 Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms"; note that Terao suggests that the Monbusho would have had early access to the UNESCO report. Indeed, Yonezawa and Yonezawa (2016, p. 194) suggest that "international concern prompted the Japanese higher education system to provide greater support for international students at their campuses" with this "international concern" referring to the 1971 OECD report. However, it was not until 1983 that the government introduced its first major policy (and target goal) regarding international student intake.

Summary

As we have seen, while there are various differences in the details between Australia's and Japan's post-World War Two higher education internationalization policies, there are also similarities. Both took an international cooperative assistance approach to the idea of accepting foreign students through the establishment of scholarship programs; Australia specifically through its aid program and Japan through the Monbusho, but from 1973 with financial contributions from the ODA budget. Both countries had both altruistic and self-serving motives for their programs, wanting to contribute to the advancement of developing countries in Asia through the training and provision of education, but also wanting to improve the image of their own countries in Asia and to secure trade routes and market access. Australia and Japan also accepted privately-sponsored international students. Students studying in Australia were able to benefit from the free tuition system between 1973 and 1979, and continued subsidized fees from 1979 until the mid-1980s. Japan introduced an honor scholarship program for privately-sponsored international students from 1978, which suggests that at this time both countries perceived some benefit in financially supporting international students in general. It also seems that from the early 1970s the Japanese government had started to become conscious of the importance of the internationalization of the Japanese public in order to be accepted on the world stage.

Phase Two: 1980s and 1990s

Australia

The 1980s in Australia marked what has been termed as its shift from an aid to a trade or commercial or market-based approach to international education, with a particular focus on increasing full-cost inbound student mobility for export purposes. As we saw above, in 1979 the Overseas Student Charge was introduced. One of the main reasons behind its introduction was potential budget deficits in the latter half of the 1970s which led to efforts to find ways to reduce government expenditure (Trestrail, 2005). Despite the introduction of the OSC, the number of private overseas students continued to increase, partly due to an overall increase in the number of people (particularly from developing countries) seeking tertiary education outside of their home countries, and partly due to the UK's introduction of full-cost student fees for overseas students in 1979, which saw Australia become a comparatively affordable place to study (Goldring, 1984; Indelicato, 2017; Ziguras, 2016).

However, the aid approach to the delivery of higher education was continuing to grow out of favor within some prominent circles. Rizvi (2011) points out that one reason for this was that the colonial ideologies underlying the program were becoming unpopular. In addition, with the Cold War coming to an end, the need for aid-based overseas student programs was also being questioned. This was particularly so given that some former overseas students did not return to their home countries, as discussed above, and that some overseas students supposedly came from elite families who could afford the cost of tuition (Rizvi, 2011; Ziguras, 2016). With these ideas, as well as an increase in the number of overseas students and growing domestic demand for tertiary education in the background, allegations were being raised in the media and politics that overseas students were taking the places (with the help of Australian government subsidies) of Australian students at Australian universities (Goldring, 1984; Ziguras, 2016).

There were at least three additional interconnected factors which contributed to the shift in thinking about international education at this time: Australia's trade deficit, the dire financial situation of Australian universities, and a shift to neoliberalism and economic rationalism. Faced with a deficit in the balance of trade and the national budget in the early 1980s, the Hawke government shifted from traditional Labor social equity policies to a neoliberal approach which emphasized deregulation, privatization, and user-pays strategies (Trestrail, 2005). Here, it was considered that incorporating service industries, including education, into the export mix would help to improve Australia's international competitiveness and address the balance of trade problem (Trestrail, 2005). Indeed, John Dawkins, who at the time was the Minister for Trade, but would later introduce major structural reforms to the university sector as Minister for Employment, Education and Training, stated that "the Government has made clear its determination that our education and training system should play a central role in responding to the major economic challenges which still confront us" (1987 quoted in Trestrail, 2005, p. 57) and predicted that the export of education services would soon surpass that of the manufacturing industry (1985 cited in Trestrail, 2005, p. 56). At the same time, with increasing student demand but decreasing government funding, the university sector was put under pressure to find its own profit sources (Trestrail, 2005).

Against this background, two separate reports were commissioned by the Fraser government and reported in 1984 to the Hawke government on Australia's overseas student program (Goldring, 1984) and overseas aid program (Jackson, 1984). The former, while recognizing the potential of international education as an export, recommended that international education continue to be considered a form of aid. The latter recommended that the aid program should focus on genuine humanitarian objectives rather than the promotion of Australia's political and economic interests, and that international education be shifted into an export industry, although while continuing to provide scholarships on a merit or need basis (Trestrail, 2005). The trade argument in the Jackson report suited the intentions of the federal government, and in 1986 it introduced a new overseas student policy that called for universities to charge international students full-fees (including a capital component). Under this new policy, the universities themselves were to be the recipients of these fees, and they were allowed to accept an unlimited number of international students as long as they met the entry requirements and did not displace an Australian student (Adams et al., 2011). Universities were encouraged to be entrepreneurial, which led to large increases in the number of international students and the fees from these students becoming a key income source for not only universities, but also for the nation, with international education becoming one of Australia's top export industries.

The shift to this new model of course did not happen overnight. There were incremental changes with the phasing out of old programs and phasing in of new ones, as well as much work being undertaken to create this new industry and all of the new systems needed to support it. However, the relatively sudden move to a trade-based approach to international education led to several problems. For example, many countries in Asia were critical of the policy change perceiving it to be too commercial (Smart & Ang, 1993). In addition, in 1988-1989, a "fiasco" occurred concerning Chinese international students. A loosening of visa requirements led to reports of visa exploitation particularly among Chinese students. When visa regulations were tightened leading to many Chinese students not being able to get a visa, private providers mainly providing English language education and reliant on Chinese students were affected, resulting in several of them closing down and large numbers of Chinese students losing their fees. The Australian government quickly made efforts to deal with this situation by reimbursing students and supporting providers, but this affected Australia's reputation as an education provider (Smart & Ang, 1993).

To deal with this growing criticism and the skewed reality of the export-oriented international education policy of the time, then Minister for Employment, Education and Training Kim Beazley released a report in 1992 entitled "International Education in Australia Through the 1990s." This report stated that the government was "refocussing" its policy on international education so that it would involve "a move away from a concentration on 'exporting' of student places to a recognition of the wider activities integrally involved in international education and the wider, sometimes indirect, benefits which flow from seeking to internationalise our education systems" (Beazley, 1992, p. ii). Specifically, it touched on many issues such as quality assurance, mobility for Australian students and student exchange, the study of Asia and Asian languages, internationalization of the curriculum, international partnerships, research collaboration, industry links, and the potentials of off-shore and distance delivery. Thus, it called for a wider view of international education that incorporates internationalization for domestic students, while also recognizing that "[f]ocusing on internationalisation does not require neglecting education as an export industry" (p. 5).

Thus, one could say that by the 1990s Australia's international education sector had well and truly shifted from a focus on aid to trade, but had also started to realize the importance of internationalization at home.

Japan

In the 1974 Central Education Council Report into international exchange in education, academia and culture, we saw that Japan was already starting to become conscious of a need to develop globally-oriented citizens and a better understanding of Japan around the world in order to fulfill its role as a major developed country. However, it took until 1983 for the government to introduce its first major policy regarding international student intake. In June 1983, then Prime Minister Nakasone instructed a council of experts to consider and make recommendations regarding international student policies moving toward the 21st century. Terakura (2009) shares a well-known episode regarding Nakasone's immediate motivation for calling this Council: when meeting with former international students to Japan during a historic visit to South-East Asia, Nakasone felt a sense of crisis when they said they would not want to send their own children to study abroad in Japan. However, Terakura states that there were other background issues many of which were touched upon in the 1974 Report: Japan's realization of its place and role in international society, the growing demand for international education in Asia and potential interest in Japan, and a realization within the business world of the need for people to people exchange in order to deal with growing economic frictions.

The first Council produced a report in August 1983 titled "Recommendations for International Student Policy Moving into the 21st Century" (hereafter Report 1) and a second group presented a summary of long-term guidelines for international student policy moving toward the 21st century ("Regarding the Development of International Student Policy Moving into the 21st Century", hereafter Report 2) based on the basic ideas laid out in Report 1. The objectives laid out in these two reports became known as "the 100,000 International Students Plan." An overview of the Plan (Chuuou Kyouiku Shingikai Daigaku Bunkakai, 2002) states that exchange with international students contributes to the advancement of mutual understanding between Japan and other countries and improvement in education and research standards, as well as human resource development in developing countries, and as such, from the perspective of education and diplomatic policies, it is an important national policy. It also points out that many former international students go on to make contributions to their own countries, as well as playing important roles in maintaining relations between their countries and Japan.

Report 1 pointed out Japan's comparatively small intake of international students, compared to other developed countries (8,110 students in 1982 compared to 311,882 in the US in 1980, for example), and recommended that Japan aim to accept 100,000 international students by the start of the 21st century; a number roughly on par with France's international student numbers in 1982, which was 119,336. Report 2, referring to the fact that Japan's 18-year-old population, i.e. the segment of the population that traditionally enters university, was forecast to grow between 1983 and 1992, and fall from 1993, recommended that 1983 to 1992 be used to prepare the acceptance system and infrastructure, in order to be ready to accept a large increase in student numbers from 1993 onwards, and it proposed several mid-term numerical targets (Terakura, 2009). However, despite these plans, the number of students increased dramatically (jumping from 10,428 to 48,561 students) between 1983 and 1992 when Japan had still not prepared its system for such an increase, whereafter the level of increase started to die down, and even decrease between 1995 and 1998. This led to a series of different councils and reports seeking to identify the cause of the decrease, measures to deal with it, and even questioning whether the goal of 100,000 international students was achievable and worth keeping.

The 100,000 International Students Plan was finally achieved in 2003, mainly thanks to an increase in the number of Chinese students (Terakura, 2009). Their numbers increased from 25,907 in 1999 to 70,814 in 2003, making up 64.7% of the international student population in that year. However, in the years leading up to 2003 discourse shifts and key incidents occurred which started to shift Japan's approach to international education (Terakura, 2009). Reports concerning the Plan were published in 1992, 1997, 1999 and 2000; here we will briefly consider the 1999 report titled "Development of an Intellectual International Contribution and Aiming for the Development of a New International Student Policy – An International Student Policy for Post-2000" (Ryuugakusei Seisaku Kondankai, 1999). This Report is interesting as it unambiguously states that Japan is in competition with other, mainly western, countries for access to international students and that, in face of tight public finances, particularly given cuts to the ODA budget which many international student measures are reliant on, the structural reformation of the university sector and a shift in focus to improving the quality of Japan's international education offerings is needed. Positioning the international student policy in terms of Japan's "intellectual international contribution" it states that it is time to move beyond just accepting international students to thinking about what is necessary to attract excellent international students from various countries and regions around the world. Regarding this new concept of "intellectual international contribution" the Report states that the cultivation of excellent human resources is necessary to secure economic and social stability and development, and that Japan's international student policy is in a sense its "intellectual international contribution" to global stability and development. At the same time "intellectual international contribution" has benefits for Japan as it deepens mutual understanding and the promotion of friendship between Japan and other countries, strengthens Japan's intellectual influence on international society, and contributes to the internationalization of Japan's economy and society.

The Report goes on to discuss the various reforms necessary to make Japan an attractive choice for international students. Here the stronger emphasis on international competition for international students, the necessity of university reform and the internationalization of the university system, and the internationalization of Japanese society and the Japanese people are particularly interesting, and as we will see, tie in with the next major international student policy.

Immigration system reform was another issue during this period (Terakura, 2009). It contributed to the achievement of the 100,000 International Students Plan, but it also caused various problems as well as tensions between the foreign and Japanese communities. The first round of reforms occurred soon after the start of the Plan. As Terakura (2009) explains, many privately-financed students study at Japan-based Japanese language schools to improve their language proficiency before applying to Japanese universities; in other words they are future international students. However, when applying for their initial visa they face various barriers. To make it easier for such students to enter the country the application process was simplified in 1984. In addition, it also became easier to get a work permit. These changes led to a huge increase in the number of Japanese language school students, particularly among Chinese students, but it also led to abuse of the system with non-existent Japanese language schools providing acceptance letters, required for the visa application, to people looking for a way to work in Japan. When the government tightened the application process in response to this in October 1988 a number of applicants from China who had already paid fees to schools and brokers could not receive visas, leading to a massive protest at the Japanese Consulate in Shanghai in November of the same year (Terakura, 2009).

In 1996 the personal reference system, which had long been said to be one of the biggest hurdles for potential international students to apply for a visa, was abolished, and further simplification of the application procedure was introduced in 2000. These reforms, as well as growing demand for international education in Asia and growing interest in accepting international students in the face of the declining 18-year-old population among Japanese universities, led to an increase in international students and achievement of the 100,000 international students benchmark (Terakura, 2009). However, with the increase in students there was an increase in the engagement of illegal work, disappearances, visa overstaying, and crime by those who had entered on a student visa, which led to another tightening of immigration restrictions in 2003 and new concern about the quality of the international students that Japan accepts (Terakura, 2009).

Suhara (2010) argues that this period led to a change in the perception of international students in Japan, from being seen as the symbol of internationalization in the early 1980s, people struggling to make ends meet due to the strong yen and thus the target of public sympathy in the late 1980s, to potential criminals in the 1990s and first half of the 2000s. In this way, Suhara argues that the 100,000 International Students Plan has left a "bitter legacy" in the hearts of international students of the time.

Summary

As we have seen in this section, internationalization in both Australia and Japan gained momentum through government policies during this second phase, however the nature of these policies was quite different. In the case of Australia, it was a shift from considering the intake of overseas students as a form of aid to a form of income for both universities and the nation, spurred by a trade and budget deficit, a shift to neoliberalism policies, and massive university reforms, and based on the belief that Australia was already widely considered to be an attractive destination for international education. This led to the establishment of various reforms and institutions in order to build the foundations for this new national industry. In contrast, in the case of Japan the government set a numerical target for international student intake given the realization that it was lagging behind other developed countries not just in the field of international education but in its (self-)perceived ability to perform as a global leader. This target was used to spur university-level reform to make Japan ready to accept foreign students and also an attractive study abroad destination, however the pace of this reform was not always enough to keep up with demand, or to continue to maintain demand. In this period, both countries started to realize the importance of internationalization at home, particularly regarding the cultivation of a globally-competent workforce, but this was not placed as a top priority. Moreover, both countries also started to realize that immigration and immigration systems are intertwined with international education policies and also need to be carefully tended to. It is these last three points, internationalization at home (particularly outward mobility), the cultivation of a globally-competent workforce, and immigration which have become the core issues in both Australia's and Japan's international education policies from the 2000s to today.

Phase Three: 2000s to the Present Day

Australia

From the late 1980s to the present day, international education, specifically international student intake, has continued to be positioned as an industry in Australia, with various policies, systems, frameworks, and institutions being established, often in a responsive manner, to build, maintain, professionalize, and expand this industry. At the same time, there have consistently been calls to consider international education in a more comprehensive way which has seen the incorporation of other internationalization policies and strategies, although never overshadowing the industry element. In this period, two unrelated but equally significant policy shifts stand out: a changing relationship between the overseas student and skilled migration programs and increased government funding and promotion of outbound mobility.

As discussed above, since the 1950s there has always been concern about so-called "backdoor" migration to Australia through abuse of the overseas student program, and this has influenced various policy and strategy changes over time. During the aid phase of international education in Australia, overseas students were always expected to return home and contribute to the development of their countries. When the OSC was introduced in 1979, it was made compulsory for international students to return to their home countries for two years before being able to apply for permanent residency, and this policy continued until 1997 (Ziguras, 2012). However, with the birth of the Howard government in 1996, a more complex nexus between the international student program and the skilled migration program emerged (Gallagher, 2011; Spinks, 2016). International students were perceived as being "instrumental in contributing to Australia's economic growth in the face of challenges such as skills shortages and an ageing population" (Spinks, 2016, p. 4). Moreover, given increased global competition in the international student market, the Howard government considered that the possibilities of skilled migration and permanent residency would be attractive to potential international students (Spinks, 2016). In this way, "[f]rom 1999 onwards the Government expressed a commitment to retaining successful international students with skills that were in demand" (Gallagher, 2011, p. 133).

Wright and Clibborn (2020) provide a useful outline of Australia's migration program. Australia established a dedicated skilled immigration program, based on a point system, in 1973 with the end of the White Australia Policy. In 1979 a Numerical Assessment Scheme was introduced, creating two visa categories: skilled and family. In 1981 skilled migration was separated into two categories: occupations in demand and employment nominees. A 1989 government commissioned report suggested that the immigration program put too much emphasis on family migration, which led to the government putting greater emphasis on skilled migration (Wright & Clibborn, 2020).

In 1998 the Howard government, with its aim of attracting overseas students, modified the point system so that students with a qualification from an Australian education institution would receive five additional points when they applied for permanent residency. In 1999 it introduced a list of occupations in demand; permanent residency applicants with skills in demand could receive bonus points and prioritized visa processing. In 2001, the government removed the requirement for former international students to apply for permanent residency outside of Australia. In 2003, it increased the number of bonus points for people with masters and doctorate degrees, and introduced bonus points for students residing in regional areas. Moreover, in 2005 it added trades such as cooking and hairdressing to the list of occupations in demand (Gallagher, 2011; Ziguras, 2012). Ziguras (2012, p. 42) states that "[s]uch an explicit and systematic linking of international education and migration outcomes was unprecedented." Gallagher (2011, p. 137) suggests that during this period, "[m]igration through education was no back-door path. It was straight through a welcoming front door."

However, this explicit linking of international education and permanent migration pathways led to various problems. For example, with the addition of trades to the list of occupations in demand, many private vocational colleges began to offer programs targeting these skills, and the number of international students entering these programs exploded, jumping from 37,061 in 2005 to 178,011 in 2009. The majority of these students were from India. Some of these providers were of low quality "cater[ing] almost exclusively to international students seeking fast and easy qualifications to support migration applications" and other education providers expressed concerned about the damage they may cause to the industry as a whole (Ziguras, 2012, p. 43). It was also clear that the number of international students taking these courses was greater than the actual need for such skills in the labor force (Ziguras, 2012).

There was a change of government in December 2007, and with the global financial crisis of 2008, the new Rudd government conducted a review of the migration program which led to a "move to a 'demand driven' model for permanent skilled migration, with a focus on delivering the skills most needed in the economy" (Spinks, 2016, p. 6). Although a necessary correction, which was followed by other changes which aimed "to avoid giving international students 'perverse incentives' to study vocational courses" (Gallagher, 2011, p. 141), it threw a spanner in the plans of many current and potential international students, and coincided with the collapse of several vocational and English language providers, as well as a series of attacks against international students from India, which led to diplomatic tensions between the two countries, again damaging Australia's reputation as an international education provider (Gallagher, 2011; Ziguras, 2012).

These events led to a series of reforms in 2010, with the government aiming to break the strong tie between international education and a pathway to permanent residency that had been introduced under the Howard government. However, these reforms coincided with a drop in international student numbers, leading to further reforms including the introduction of a temporary graduate visa as a new post-study work right policy (Tran et al., 2020). While space limitations restrict a detailed discussion of this visa system, it should hopefully be clear that the international education and migration nexus has been a core, but controversial, feature of the Australian international education system.

While international student intake, as seen above, has dominated international education policy discussions in Australia, since Beazley's 1992 paper, interest in and recognition of the potential and importance of government-supported outward mobility has gradually emerged, culminating with the creation of the New Colombo Plan (NCP) in 2014. As discussed above, prior to the 1950s it was quite common for students and academics from Australia to undertake post-graduate study and further research in Europe and North America. However, during Australia's shift from an aid to trade approach to international education, rates of outward mobility were quite low, reaching only 3,375 in 1998 and 6,000 in 2005 (Dobson & Holtta, 2001; Tran & Rahimi, 2018). There was a lack of a "mobility culture" in Australian institutions, and costs were a barrier (Adams et al., 2011, p. 122). Looking at the student aid system for Australian students in 2001, Dobson and Holtta (p. 252) note that regarding financial support as a means for promoting international mobility, "it can be stated unequivocally that the Australian government does little." Full-degree student mobility is not a popular option for Australian students, and for semester-based mobility they have traditionally shown a preference for studying at other English-speaking countries (Tran & Rahimi, 2018).

In Japan, reports into the drop in the number of Japanese youth seeking degrees in the US in the late 2000s led to a wave of national outrage and concern at what was referred to as a generation of inward-looking students. While there has never been the same degree of concern about the low outward mobility numbers in Australia, from the mid-2000s onwards there has been more movement within universities themselves in the creation of outward mobility programs. From the government, since the 1990s there have been calls for youth to engage with the Asia-Pacific region, reflecting the Hawke and Keating governments' focus on the Asia-Pacific region and Australia's position within it. In his report, Beazley (1992, p. 11) stated "[t]he Government is committed to deepening Australia's understanding of Asia by promoting knowledge and understanding of Asian languages and culture" which included the incorporation of the teaching of several Asian languages in Australian schools and financial contributions to the University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (UMAP) program. In his report the idea of "directly training Australians for participation in the global economy" is linked to improved knowledge of Asia (p. 12).

Although the strong focus on the Asia-Pacific, as well as funding for related programs, took a dive during the Howard era (1996-2007), it was restored under the Rudd and Gillard governments, with the latter releasing the "Australia in the Asian Century White Paper" in 2012 reaffirming the government's assertion that Australia needs to become "a more Asia-literate and Asia-capable nation" (Australian Government, 2012, p. iii). In the same month as the release of the White Paper, the government announced the start of the AsiaBound program that would give grants to 10,000 Australian students, and improve access to student loans, to study in Asia "as part of the Gillard government's strategy to strengthen engagement with Asia" (Evans, 2012). The media release lists many aims of the grant system such as encouraging students to "enjoy the experience of living and studying in an Asian country" and "build lifelong professional networks and friendships" while also linking this to the development of "[t]he next generation of Australian leaders [who] will need to be increasingly Asian-literate and these are skills best learnt by experiencing Asia first-hand" (Evans, 2012).

After the Labor government lost power in September 2013, the Coalition government's new Minister of Foreign Affairs, Julia Bishop, launched the New Colombo Plan, which was in many ways built upon the AsiaBound strategy (Tran & Rahimi, 2018). Billed as "a signature initiative" of the government, and backed with a robust starting budget of $100 million, moving to a budget of around $51 million for each financial year from 2017-18 to 2021-22, it "aims to lift knowledge of the Indo-Pacific in Australia by supporting Australian undergraduates to study and undertake internships in the region" (DFAT, n.d.). It is interesting as it is run by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), and is positioned as a form of public diplomacy (Byrne, 2016; Tran & Vu, 2018). Here, the incorporation of an alumni program is unique, with the government hoping that alumni "will play an increasingly important role in Australia's relationships with its neighbours" (DFAT, n.d.). In addition to contributing to knowledge of the Asia-Pacific and the deepening of relationships at the individual, university and business levels, the NCP website (DFAT, n.d.) also states that one of its core aims "is to ensure Australia's undergraduates have the skills and work-based experiences to contribute to our domestic and the regional economy" which suggests that it is also aiming to develop global work-ready graduates (Scharoun, 2016). Tran and Rahimi (2018) report that the number of Australian students experiencing outward mobility increased from 6,000 in 2005 to 44,045 in 2016, and that the NCP played an important role in this growth.

In this way, policies related to international education in Australia from the 2000s onwards have focused on dealing with the tricky relationship between overseas students and their post-study work rights, and a greater commitment to funding outward mobility with a particular focus on the Asia-Pacific region. Both of these issues are also related to the acquisition of global human resources, the former through migration, and the latter through government-funded education of the domestic population. As we will see, these are also the key themes in Japan's international education strategy from the 2000s to today.

Japan

After the achievement of the 100,000 International Students Plan in 2003, and with the issues surrounding the series of immigration reforms in the background, in 2003 the Central Council for Education released a report titled "The Development of a New International Student Policy – Focusing on Student Exchange and Quality Improvement." The Report gave the following four main findings and recommendations (Chuuou Kyouiku Shingikai, 2003). Firstly, although it is important for Japanese youth to study abroad, there has been a dearth of specific policies to promote this due to the emphasis placed on promoting incoming mobility to date. In order to stay internationally competitive and to cultivate human resources who can compete in today's globalized society, the government also needs to encourage Japanese youth to study abroad. Second, there needs to be a shift from quantity to quality when accepting international students. Japanese universities were ill-prepared to deal with the increased intake of international students which led to the acceptance of unmotivated learners and issues with international students engaging in illegal work. Universities need to be more actively responsible in improving their acceptance systems, and the government also needs to work with universities and the appropriate departments to ensure quality control. Here, it is interesting that the Council suggests that the aim should not be to ensure a minimum level of quality, but that Japan should do more to attract excellent students from around the world. Third, universities need to be more proactive in internationalizing (in terms of not just incoming and outgoing student mobility, but also research and education) and strengthening their international competitiveness, and that the government should support universities making such efforts. Finally, current financial support offerings should be integrated and that the newly established Japan Student Services Organization (JASSO) should handle financial support for both international students and Japanese students who study abroad. The Council recommended that a new policy should be introduced within five years.

The government's 300,000 International Students Plan was announced in 2008 as a cooperative initiative between six government ministries including MEXT, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Justice, and the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry. We can see that the issues introduced in the 2003 Council Report were expanded on and incorporated into the 300,000 International Students Plan, as well as the myriad other programs which commenced from 2008 onwards, some of which will be touched upon below. However, the Plan introduces a new slant to the motivation for the intake of international students: the acquisition of global human resources. In the year before the Plan's announcement, a number of expert advisory meetings were held in which there were calls to set a larger intake target for Japan's new international student policy. Terakura (2009, p. 38 citing Ota & Shiraishi, 2008) states that behind this was a deepening recognition that against the backdrop of global competition for highly skilled human resources, it would be necessary for Japan to start recruiting international students currently studying at its own universities. It seems that this concern was incorporated into the Plan.

The outline of the 2008 Plan (MEXT, 2008) states that the government intends to accept 300,000 international students by 2020 as part of its "global strategy." Specifically, it plans to strategically acquire excellent international students, in coordination with its acceptance of highly skilled professionals, taking into consideration the country/region of origin and discipline of applicants. In addition, it also intends to continue making efforts to make an intellectual international contribution to other countries, including the region of Asia. However, we can see that the priority of the government's strategy has shifted from international cooperation to national interest, and that there is an emerging link between the international student and skilled migration intake. The outline goes on to introduce specific measures to attract international students, including measures to: promote Japan overseas, support a smoother and more accessible application process, internationalize Japanese universities, provide better services to international students, and support former international students to enter the Japanese workforce.

While the Plan touched on the idea of global human resources only in relation to overseas students, from 2009-10, discourses about the cultivation of globally-competent Japanese youth, and the failure of universities to do this thus far, started to appear from the business world amid concern about Japan's inability to compete globally (Breaden, 2015). This concept of *guroobaru jinzai* (global human resources or global human capital) emerged from the field of industry and business, but was quickly picked up by MEXT and incorporated into their own programs (Breaden, 2015). Thus, here we can see an intertwining of the need to internationalize universities to not only appropriately and effectively accept and educate international students, but also to cultivate globally-competent domestic students, which plays nicely into the deficiency discourse that has been encircling universities for decades and MEXT's desire to introduce comprehensive university reform that goes beyond internationalization, aiming to change university governance and management practices.

Myriads of programs have been implemented since 2008 to achieve the Plan's goals and more widely contribute to university internationalization. These include competitive-based funding initiatives targeting universities such as the 2009 Global 30 Project and the 2014 Top Global University Project, as well as programs to enhance and financially support outbound mobility (the 2013 Japan Revitalization Strategy) and two-way mobility (the Inter-University Exchange Project) (Ota, 2018b). In addition, the public-private Tobitate! initiative, launched in 2014 and made possible through financial contributions from the private sector, is intertwined with the global human capital deficiency debate (Breaden, 2015) discussed above. It includes various programs, but its self-declared highlight is the "Tobitate! Young Ambassador Program" which targets both high school and university students and aims for "the students and supporting companies to form a globalized human resources development community and for the students to develop into globally minded professionals needed by society, especially industry, and who can succeed in a global world" (MEXT, n.d). The use of phrases such as "ambassador" and future "global leader" in promotional materials share some similarities with language used to describe Australia's New Colombo Plan introduced above.

We can see that Japan has moved to a new phase of internationalization driven by the need to internationalize itself in order to stay competitive in the globalized economy, based on a deficit model of Japan that has been evident since the 100,000 International Students Plan. Here, Breaden (2015, p. 102) makes the important observation that those in charge of creating Japan's various internationalization strategies "must recognize that Japan in the twenty-first century is already a site of significant ethnic diversity." A similar point was made by Horie back in 2002 in her review of higher education internationalization in the 1990s, when she argued that the needs of ethnic minorities in Japan, "domestic diversity" (p. 77), had been ignored due to the government's narrow understanding of internationalization. When comparing the higher education internationalization policies of Australia and Japan, issues of openness to diversity and multicultural coexistence cannot be ignored.

Summary

It seems that global human resources is perhaps a unifying theme for both Australia's and Japan's higher education internationalization policies during this phase. Both countries have incorporated policies that focus on the attainment or cultivation of global human resources through both inbound and outbound mobility. Regarding the former, in the case of Australia, the link with its migration program is strong, perhaps too strong, and finding the right balance and approach has been the challenge of the last two decades. In the case of Japan, as it does not have an official migration policy the link seems to be a little weaker, however it will be interesting to see how this new development plays out. Regarding the latter, both countries' governments have finally started to invest in the outbound mobility of their domestic populations. In the case of Australia, its New Colombo Plan policy focuses on a specific geographical region, the Indo-Pacific, with the main focus on developing regional-literacy and friendship ties. In contrast, for Japan the cultivation of domestic global human resources is more personal and urgent, linked to discourses about its own deficiencies. Links between higher education internationalization and university reform are also interesting. As we saw in Phase Two, major reforms of the university system, including governance and management, were introduced in the mid-1980s in Australia and were connected to the shift to viewing the intake of international students as a commercial enterprise of universities. Although the exact reasons and methods are different, we are seeing today in Japan that university reform by MEXT is a hidden agenda in its internationalization policies.

Conclusion

As we have seen, Australia and Japan have moved through three main phases in their higher education internationalization policies from the post-war period to today. Although both countries started out with a developmental assistance approach focusing on the intake of students primarily from developing countries, their policies have gradually shifted to focus on issues of current national importance. Today, for both countries the intake of international students is generally connected to issues of population control and labor shortages, although discourses surrounding this and particular strategies being undertaken differ. For Australia, the intake of international students is still very much linked to university profits and trade, while in Japan it is used to promote educational and societal reform through the internationalization of the university system. Outbound mobility has also become more important for both countries with the commencement of government-led and financed initiatives starting in earnest from the 2010s. However, here again, the specific needs and situation of each country shapes their approach to this, with the cultivation of domestic global human resources through outward mobility programs treated almost as a matter of national urgency in Japan, whereas such high levels of concern are not seen in Australia. When investigating exchange and cooperation between Australia and Japan in the field of higher education, it will be useful to keep in mind the three phases outlined in this paper.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) (20K02973).

References

Adams, T., Banks, M. & Olsen, A. (2011). International education in Australia: From aid to trade to internationalization. In R. Bhandari & P. Blumenthal (Eds.), *International students and global mobility in higher education: National trends and new directions* (pp. 107-128). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230117143

Ashizawa, S. (2013). 日本の学生国際交流政策〜戦略的留学生リクルートとグローバル人材育成〜 [Japan's policies for student international exchange – Strategic recruiting of international students and the cultivation of global human resources]. In M. Yokota & A. Kobayashi（Eds.), 大学の国際化と日本人学生の国際志向性 [*Internationalization of Japanese universities and the international mindset of Japanese students*] (pp. 13-38). Gakubunsha.

Auletta, A. (2000). A retrospective view of the Colombo Plan: Government policy, departmental administration and overseas students. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 22*(1), 47-58. https://doi.org/10.1080/713678129

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (1978). *Year book Australia No. 62, 1977 and 1978*.

Australian Embassy Tokyo Japan. (n.d.) *Strategic partnership*. Retrieved 31 August, 2021, from https://japan.embassy.gov.au/tkyo/Strategic-partnership.html

Australian Government. (2012). *Australia in the Asian century: White paper.* Retrieved from https://www.defence.gov.au/whitepaper/2013/docs/australia_in_the_asian_century_white_paper.pdf

Beazley, K. (1992). *International education in Australia through the 1990s*. Australian Government Publishing Service.

Breaden, J. (2015). 'Global human capital': A Japanese dilemma. In R. Mouer (Ed.), *Globalizing Japan: Striving to engage the world* (pp. 93-111). Trans Pacific Press.

Byrne, C. (2016). Australia's New Colombo Plan: Enhancing regional soft power through student mobility. *International Journal*, *71*(1), 107-128. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020702015617786

Chuuou Kyouiku Shingikai [Central Education Council]. (1974). 教育・学術・文化における国際交流について（答申）[*Report into international exchange in education, academia and culture*]. Retrieved from https://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chuuou/toushin/740501

Chuuou Kyouiku Shingikai [Central Education Council]. (2003). 新たな留学生政策の展開について（答申）～留学生交流の拡大と質の向上を目指して～ [*The development of a new international student policy – Focusing on student exchange and quality improvement*]. Retrieved from https://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo0/toushin/03121801.htm

Chuuou Kyouiku Shingikai Daigaku Bunkakai [Central Education Council University Subcommittee]. (2002). 当初の「留学生受入れ10万人計画」の概要 [*An overview of the original 100,000 international students plan*]. Retrieved from https://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo4/007/gijiroku/030101/2-1.htm

Cuthbert, D., Smith, W. & Boey, J. (2008). What do we really know about the outcomes of Australian international education? A critical review and prospectus for future research. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *12*(3), 255-275. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307308134

DFAT. (n.d.). *About the New Colombo Plan*. Retrieved September 13, 2021, from https://www.dfat.gov.au/people-to-people/new-colombo-plan/about

Dobson, I. & Holtta, S. (2001). The internationalisation of university education: Australia and Finland compared. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *7*(3), 243-254. https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2001.9967056

Evans, C. (2012). *Media release: More than 10,000 Australian students AsiaBound*. Parliament of Australia. Retrieved from https://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=Id:%22media/pressrel/2014369%22

Gallagher, M. (2011). The role of government in international education: Helping or hindering? In D. Davis & B. Mackintosh (Eds.), *Making a difference: Australian international education* (pp. 114-145). UNSW Press.

Goldring, J. (1984). *Mutual advantage: Report of the committee of review of private overseas student policy.* Parliamentary Paper No. 306/1984. Australian Government Publishing Service.

Horie, M. (2002). The internationalization of higher education in Japan in the 1990s: A reconsideration. *Higher Education*, *43*, 65-84. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1012920215615

Indelicato, M. E. (2017). *Australia's new migrants: International students' history of affective encounters with the border.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315568362

Jackson, G. (1984). *Report of the committee to review the Australian overseas aid program*. Parliamentary Paper No. 206/1984. Australian Government Publishing Service.

Kawakami, N. (2016). 戦後の日本国内の外国人留学生－1950～1960年代の「留学生教育問題」を中心として [International students in postwar Japan: Focus on problems in the 1950s-60s]. 神戸大学留学生センター紀要 [*Kobe Daigaku Ryuugakusei Sentaa Kiyou*], *22*, 21-40.

Kudo, M. (2001). 歴史的に見た留学の変遷と「今日の留学」[A historical look at transitions in study abroad and "study abroad today"]. In SGRA Report No. 006. Retrieved from http://www.aisf.or.jp/sgra/wp-content/themes/sgra_japanese/uploads/member/students/report/SGRAreport6.pdf

Meadows, E. (2011). From aid to industry: A history of international education in Australia. In D. Davis & B. Mackintosh (Eds.), *Making a difference: Australian international education* (pp. 50-80). UNSW Press.

MEXT. (n.d.). *About Tobitate! (Leap for Tomorrow) Study abroad initiative*. Retrieved September 13, 2021, from https://tobitate.mext.go.jp/about/english.html

MEXT. (2001). 我が国の留学生受入れ制度100年の主なあゆみ [*Japan's system of accepting overseas students:*

The main events in the last 100 years]. Retrieved from https://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/koutou/ryugaku/011101/ayumi.pdf

MEXT. (2008). 「留学生30万人計画」骨子 [*Outline of "the 300,000 international students plan"*]. Retrieved from https://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/koutou/ryugaku/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2019/09/18/1420758_001.pdf

Monbusho. (1981). 学制百年史 [*A hundred year history of the education system*]. Retrieved from https://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/hakusho/html/others/detail/1317601.htm

Ninomiya, A., Knight, J., & Watanabe, A. (2009). The past, present, and future of internationalization in Japan. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *13*(2), 117-124. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315308331095

Oakman, D. (2010). *Facing Asia: A history of the Colombo Plan*. ANU E Press. Retrieved from https://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/p52161/pdf/book.pdf

Okumura, K. (2019). インドネシア賠償留学生制度の構想と実態ー賠償留学生の日本語学習が国際学友会に与えた影響を中心にしてー [Indonesian students on reparations agreement and Japanese language education at the International Students Institute in Japan]. アジア教育 [*The Japanese Journal of Studies on Asian Education*], *13*, 26-39.

Ota, H. (2018a). 日本の海外留学促進政策の変遷 [Transitions in Japan' policies for promoting study abroad]. In M. Yokota, H. Ota, & Y. Shimmi (Eds.), 海外留学がキャリアと人生に与えるインパクトー大規模調査による留学の効果測定 [*Impact of study abroad on career development and life*] (pp. 2-28). Gakubunsha.

Ota, H. (2018b). Internationalization of higher education: Global trends and Japan's challenges. *Educational Studies in Japan: International Yearbook*, *12*, 91-105.

Pokarier, C. (2006). Cross-border higher education in the Australia-Japan relationship. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, *60*(4), 552-573. https://doi.org/10.1080/10357710601007034

Rizvi, F. (2011). Theorizing student mobility in an era of globalization. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *17*(6), 693-701. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2011.625145

Ryuugakusei Seisaku Kondankai [Council for International Student Policy]. (1999). 知的国際貢献の発展と新たな留学生政策の展開を目指してーポスト2000年の留学生政策ー [*Development of an intellectual international contribution and aiming for the deployment of a new international student policy – An international student policy for post-2000*]. Retrieved from https://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/koutou/015/toushin/990301.htm#01

Sato, Y. (2010). 日本の留学生政策の評価－人材養成、友好促進、経済効果の視点から [*Evaluation of Japan's foreign student policy: From the perspective of human resource development, friendship promotion and economic effect*]. Toshindo.

Scharoun, L. (2016). Short-term study tours as a driver for increasing domestic student mobility in order to generate global work-ready students and cultural exchange in Asia Pacific. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, *20*(2-3), 83-89. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2015.1075917

Smart, D. & Ang, G. (1993). Exporting education: From aid to trade to internationalization? *IPA Review*, *45*(1), 31-33.

Spinks, H. (2016). *Overseas students: Immigration policy changes 1997-2015*. Parliamentary Library Information Analysis Advice Research Paper. Parliament of Australia, Department of Parliamentary Services. Retrieved from https://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/download/library/prspub/4390265/upload_binary/4390265.pdf;fileType=application/pdf

Suhara, S. (2010).「留学生30万人計画」の意味と課題 [The meaning and challenges of "the 300,000 international students plan"]. 移民政策研究 [*Migration Policy Review*], *2*, 7-19.

Terakura, K. (2009). 我が国における留学生受入れ政策－これまでの経緯と「留学生30万人計画」の策定－[Japan's international student acceptance policies – The situation until the present day and the establishment of the "300,000 students plan"]. レファレンス [*Reference*], *2*, 2-47.

Terao, A. (1990). 教育の国際化政策とODA事業の役割 [The policy for internationalization in education and the role of ODA]. 国際基督教大学学報. I-A, 教育研究 [*International Christian University Publications. I-A, Educational Studies*], *32*, 1-22.

Tran, L. T., & Rahimi, M. (2018). New Colombo Plan: A review of research and implications for practice. *IEAA Research Digest*, *14*, 1-17. Retrieved from https://www.ieaa.org.au/documents/item/1448

Tran, L. T., Rahimi, M., Tan, G., Dang, X. T., & Le, N. (2020). Post-study work for international graduates in Australia: Opportunity to enhance employability, get a return on investment or secure migration? *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *18*(5), 495-510. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2020.1789449

Tran, L. T., & Vu, T. T. P. (2018). Beyond the 'normal' to the 'new possibles': Australian students' experiences in Asia and their roles in making connections with the region via the New Colombo Plan. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *73*(3), 194-207. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12166

Trestrail, C. (2005). *Full-fee paying international students at Murdoch University 1985-1991: A policy case study.* [Unpublished dissertation]. Retrieved from https://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/id/eprint/370/2/02Whole.pdf

Wright, C. F., & Clibborn, S. (2020). A guest-worker state? The declining power and agency of migrant labour in Australia. *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, *31*(1), 34-58. https://doi.org/10.1177/1035304619897670

Yonezawa, Y., & Yonezawa, A. (2016). Internationalization of higher education as a response to globalization: Japan's policy challenges since the 1980s. In E. Healy, D. Arunachalam, & T. Mizukami (Eds.), *Creating social cohesion in an interdependent world: Experiences of Australia and Japan* (pp. 191-204). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137520227_11

Ziguras, C. (2012). Learning the hard way: Lessons from Australia's decade of innovation in student migration policy. In D. E. Neubauer & K. Kuroda (Eds.), *Mobility and migration in Asian Pacific higher education* (pp. 39-52). Palgrave Macmillan.

Ziguras, C. (2016). And fairness for all? Equity and the international student cohort. In A. Harvey, C. Burnheim, & M. Brett (Eds.), *Student equity in Australian higher education: Twenty-five years of a fair chance for all* (pp. 207-220). Springer Science+Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-0315-8_12

豪州と日本における高等教育の国際化政策の比較分析

クリステン・サリバン

＜要　旨＞

本稿は、1950 年代から現在までの豪州政府と日本政府の高等教育における国際化政策を対象として、政策の変遷とその背景・目的について考察した。戦前の状況を簡単に確認したのちに、特定された 3 つの段階・時期（1950 年代～ 1970 年代、1980 年代～ 1990 年代、2000 年代～現在）に分け整理・分析した。

第 1 段階では、両国は国際援助そのものを目的に政策を展開した。第 2 段階では、両国は異なる課題と優先事項にそって政策展開を行った。豪州では「貿易」アプローチが展開され、留学生は大学および国にとっての収入源で、国際教育が新しい産業と位置付けられた。一方、日本では、伸び悩む留学生数が日本の国際社会における活躍が十分でないことの表れとして捉えられ、留学生 10 万人計画のもとで、留学生の受入れを促進するために大学国際化といった改革がはじまった。この段階では、豪州と日本では異なる政策展開がなされたが、両国とも内なる国際化の重要性と国際教育における移民政策の複雑さに気付き始めた。そして、第 3 段階で、両国はともにグローバル人材の獲得と育成に向けて、移民・入国管理制度の改革と自国民の留学促進に取り組み、現在に至っていることを考察した。

キーワード：高等教育、国際化、留学生、豪州、日本

西南女学院大学人文学部英語学科