Patterns of variations in the 'internationalising education' discourse and practice

Kaori H. Okano[*]

This paper examines variations and shifts of emphasis in the 'internationalising education' discourse and practice, and attempts to identify patterns in these variations. By examining two sectors, compulsory education and universities, it identifies four main strands of discourse: (1) international (understanding) education (kokusai rikai kyôiku) in the form of engagement with other (often Western) countries; (2) domestic internationalisation (uchinaru kokusaika); (3) human rights education (jinken kyôiku) for zainichi Koreans; and (4) global human resources and competitiveness in the global arena. Each of the four strands has been taken up to differing degrees, in varying combinations over time, in discussing internationalisation. The paper shows how each of these strands has made a 'connection' to one of the other strands, depending on the sector, the level of educational administration and specific local circumstances; and in so doing over time how they have lead to varying discourses and practices. This advances our understanding of the discourse of 'internationalisation' in education as a historical product that is still a work in progress.

Keywords: Internationalisation; education; Japan; multiculturalism

The term *kokusaika*, translated into English as 'internationalisation', has been a catchall phrase widely used in the government, business, academic and public discourse in the last five decades. It has often been interpreted differently in specific localities, sectors of the society (e.g., business, social welfare, education), and levels of public administration (e.g., national, prefectural, municipal, township). In the field of education, the *kokusaika* discourse in primary and middle schools has centred on the domestic cultural and linguistic diversity brought about by migration. It was subsequently replaced by the term *tabunka kyôsei* ('multicultural symbiosis'). The higher education sector has continued to place emphasis on engage-

* PhD, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia
  e-mail: k.okano@latrobe.edu.au

ment with other nation states and the competitiveness of institutions and their graduates in the global arena that is primarily defined by the Anglophone-centric 'global standard'.

Since the end of the Second World War a range of terms related to internationalising education have emerged at different times (e.g. Okano & Tsuneyoshi 2011). They include: 'international understanding education' (*kokusai rikai kyôiku*) (engagement with foreign countries, often with the West), 'education for domestic internationalisation' (*uchinaru kokusaika*), 'intercultural education' (*ibunkakan kyôiku*), 'multicultural education' (*tabunka kyôiku*), 'education for multicultural symbiosis', 'global citizenship education', and 'global human resources' (*gurôbaru jinzai)*. In addition there exist the expressions 'international education' (*kokusai kyôiku*), English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education, education of foreign children residing in Japan (*zainichi gaikokujin kyôiku*), Japanese as a Second Language (JSL) education, heritage language education (*keishôgo kyôiku*), international students (inbound and outbound), and so forth.

This paper examines variations and shifts in emphasis in discourse and practice related to, and arising from, 'internationalisation', and attempts to identify patterns in these variations and changes. In so doing it advances our understanding of the discourse of 'internationalisation' in education as a historical product that is still a work in progress. I chose to examine two levels of schooling, compulsory education and universities, since the two sectors illuminate the diverse nature of the internationalisation discourse and practice most clearly.

The paper identifies four dominant strands of discourse, practice and understanding relating to internationalisation in education. These are: (1) international (understanding) education in the form of engagement with other countries; (2) domestic internationalisation; and (3) human rights education (*jinken kyôiku*) (Okano, 2014); and (4) global human resources and competitiveness in the global arena. These are not mutually exclusive and have co-existed, with varying combinations of emphasis; but there have been changes in the levels of support for each of them over the years, depending on local circumstances and, to a lesser degree, national policies.

International understanding education aims to foster understanding and appreciation of other cultures and peoples, and promote English language education and engagement with other nation states (Aspinall, 2012). Education to address domestic internationalisation is a response to accommodating the cultural diversity of new migrants. Human rights education had focused on minorities, including education of long-existing Korean nationals (descendants of former colonial subjects). These three strands gradually merged to be absorbed into the more inclusive term 'multicultural symbiosis', which addresses all forms of cultural diversity. The fourth strand, global human resources and competitiveness in the global arena, is quite separate, emphasising the instrumental value of English language education and intercultural skills and focusing on competition between universities and their graduates in the global market.

'Multicultural symbiosis' is a concept similar to the liberal multiculturalism pursued by Western liberal democracies, but is specific to Japan, reflecting its own history and immedi-

ate conditions. Multicultural symbiosis often means different things to different people, both as an idea and in terms of experiencing the existing conditions (Iwabuchi, 2010; Shioya 2010; Enoi, 2011). The term is said to have emerged from interactions amongst multi-ethnic groups in the aftermath of the Kobe earthquake in 1995 (Takezawa 2008), has gained popular currency in civil activism, and then began to be used by local governments, and by the national government in 2005.

The paper argues that each of the four strands presented above has been taken up to differing degrees, in varying combinations over time, in discussing internationalisation in education; and that the variations depend on the level of schooling (primary and middle schools, and universities), administration level (national and local) and specific local circumstances. The paper shows how each of these strands made a 'connection' to one of the other strands, and in so doing a varied discourse and practice has evolved. For compulsory schooling, the dominant connection at the national level has been 'international understanding education' (the first strand) and 'domestic internationalisation' (the second strand), while at local government level, the dominant connection has been 'human rights education'(the third strand) and education for newcomer foreigners (the second strand). At individual schools both of those links have been prevalent, although their relative dominance varies significantly depending on local circumstances and individual schools' missions. Reference to global human resources and competitiveness in the global arena has rarely been made at the individual school level. In contrast, at universities the dominant connections are between international understanding (the first strand) and education for global competitiveness (the fourth strand).

I first examine the development of internationalisation discourse for primary and middle schooling, explaining variations at the levels of individual schools, the national government and the local government. I will then discuss universities. My examination draws on government documents, my fieldwork (in Kobe, Osaka and Aichi in 2006-2015), and secondary sources.

At Primary and Middle Schools

The first call to primary and middle schools to 'internationalise' schooling emerged when increasing numbers of Japanese returnees started arriving in classrooms in the 1970s. They were children of Japanese expatriates who were dispatched overseas by their employers. These children, often without a level of literacy equivalent to that of local students, found themselves having to learn Japanese and the cultural mores embodied in behavioural patterns (e.g. Goodman, 1993). Affected schools soon set up pull-out classes in language and 'adaptation' for these children, with extra teachers (*kahai*) funded by education boards. In order to make the process more effective, local education boards designated particular schools to cater for these children. As the children moved up the school ladder, education boards created special entry systems and quotas for them in order to enable their entry into senior high schools (Nukaga & Tsuneyoshi, 2011).

The next trigger was the arrival of the grandchildren of wartime displaced orphans from

China, following the 1972 normalisation of Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations. The 1970s also saw the arrival of refugees from Indo-China. These developments challenged the existing practice of schooling, which had assumed that all students shared a Japanese language background and 'culture'. The third wave of arrival was foreign workers from Asia and South America to fill shortages in unskilled labour in the bubble economy of the 1980s. Their numbers suddenly increased with the 1990 amendment to the immigration act which granted work visas to South Americans of Japanese descent to work in manufacturing. The number of foreigners in Japan doubled between 1989 and 2004 (Japan-hômushô-nyûkokukanri-kyoku, 2009).

This occurred when the central government was advocating the 'internationalisation' of education, in promoting English language education for communication and interaction with foreign countries (principally first-world Western countries) (e.g. Kubota, 1998; McConnell, 2000). It focused on the opening up of an insular Japan to foreign countries through the learning of English as communicative tools, overseas travel, and invitations to foreign teachers and students. The term 'domestic internationalisation was coined to describe the increasing number of visible foreigners residing and working in Japan in the mid 1990s to distinguish this trend from outward 'internationalisation'.

Making connections at individual school level

When faced with new migrant children and with homeroom teachers struggling to cope with the situation, schools and education boards resorted to the existing infrastructure to manage these 'different' students within the schools. Firstly, schools experienced in accepting Japanese returnee children decided that their 'international classes' (*kokusai kyûshitsu*) designed for Japanese returnees would absorb these migrant children, on the grounds that both groups were 'different' from the majority of students and had difficulties with the Japanese language.

Secondly, schools which already had a designated human rights education teacher (*jinken kyôiku tantô*) in relation to children from *buraku* backgrounds (descendants of a former feudal outcaste population) and *zainichi* children enlisted their expertise. The human rights education teacher coordinated financial assistance for, and maintained contact with families of minority students to support and encourage them in their schooling. The result was that, at some schools, new migrant children were grouped together with Japanese returnees (who were often from an upper middle class background); while at other schools they were categorized with *zainichi* Koreans since both were foreign nationals.

Schools which had none of the above infrastructure had to hastily create one, by setting up withdrawal classes in JSL and 'cultural adaptation', and employed extra teacher(s) (*kahai*). Trusted veteran teachers were appointed as 'international class' coordinators, who oversaw the special classes, liaised with mainstream homeroom teachers, and mediated with the ethnic community members (Okano, 2012). Some education boards designated selected schools as specialist schools accepting Japanese returnees and newcomer children and gave the schools

extra funding. By the mid-2000s, 'international classes' were comprised of both Japanese returnees and a wide range of immigrant children.

Newcomer children continued to struggle to keep up with school work and to gain entry to senior high schools via entrance examinations (Okano, 2012; Castro-Vazquez, 2009; Shimizu & Shimizu, 2001). Those of Latin American background especially found Japanese school increasingly difficult as they progress to higher school grades, and some dropped out of the system altogether (Sakuma, 2006; Miyajima & Oota, 2005). They subsequently either enter the unskilled labour market or attend Latin American ethnic schools (Sekiguchi, 2003; Gekkan Io, 2006; Haino, 2010; Okano, 2013). Local education boards have designated particular senior high schools to offer special entry schemes to newcomers, in response to teachers' requests to assist these students. While these initiatives have had some positive impact on newcomer Chinese students (Shimizu, 2008), there have been few studies of how Latin American children have benefited from this initiative.

We see two processes whereby schooling for newcomer children became linked to education for descendants of *zainichi* Korean education in certain localities. First, they shared family disadvantage, discrimination and identity issues. Secondly, both groups were also disadvantaged by their foreign national legal status. Because of these links, grassroots human rights education movements for *zainichi* Koreans gradually started to include newcomer education issues in their concerns. The teachers' organisation, the National Association for Research on Zainichi Korean Education (*Zenkoku-Zainichi-Kankoku-Chôsenjin-Kyôiku-Kenkyû-Kyôgikai*) began studying Koreans in Japanese schools in the 1970s and held its first conference in 1979 (Nakajima, 2004). After heated debates (Matsunami, 2004, p.182), the association decided to renamed itself the National Association for Research into the Education of Resident Foreigners in Japan (*Zenkoku-Zainichi-Gaikokujin-Kyôiku-Kenkyûkyôgikai)* in 2002, thus replacing 'Koreans' with 'resident foreigners' (Nakajima, 2004, p.8). This change signalled the Association's intention to address both groups. Papers on newcomers were first presented at the 1992 annual meeting, and their number increased gradually to account for half the papers at the 2002 conference (Matsunami, 2004).

It is the term 'education for foreign children residing in Japan' (*zainichi gaikokujin kyôiku*) that linked 'domestic internationalisation' and human rights education. It is used in local government and education board secretariats, which had long maintained active human rights committees (e.g. for *zainichi* Koreans). These committees were asked to also take on responsibilities for newcomers (e.g., in Hyôgo-prefecture, Osaka-prefecture, Kawasaki-city, and Kanagawa-prefecture) and as a result, discussion on the education of newcomer children gradually became connected to *zainichi* Korean education. The term 'education for foreign children residing in Japan' gained currency and was adopted by other local education boards.

The term soon became obsolete in the eyes of educational practitioners at the school level, however, since an increasing number of children were Japanese nationals who possessed non-Japanese heritage solely, or additionally, in the case of those born to foreign parents. Increasing numbers of Japanese were marrying foreign nationals, both long-resident Koreans and newcomers. In 2007 approximately 6 percent of all marriages in Japan were

inter-ethnic in Japan, while the percentage was even higher in metropolitan Tokyo, nearly 10 per cent (Sugimoto, 2010, p.181). Children born to a Japanese parent are entitled to Japanese citizenship at birth, as a result of the 1986 revision of the Nationality Law which replaced the former patrilineal system of nationality inheritance. The revision also allowed children of *zainichi* Korean men and Japanese women to retrospectively apply for Japanese citizenship. Some schools and local education boards in the Kansai region coined more inclusive terms and started using them in the public area by the early 2000s: 'children with foreign roots' (*gaikokuni rûtsu no aru seito jidô*) or 'children with a special relation to foreign countries' (*gaikoku to tokubetsu na kankei ga aru jidô seito*). In 2011 the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Technology (the Ministry of Education, in short) s, Cutluratarted using the latter term and created a website for these children.

In contrast, when local governments and education board secretariats lacked departments or committees for human rights education, they placed newcomers within the international education department or committee (*kokusai kyôiku ka*) (e.g., Toyota-city and Toyohashi-city). In this case, education for domestic internationalisation became linked to 'international understanding education', rather than to human rights education as seen above.

Making connections at the national level

Japan's central government has not yet formulated a comprehensive national policy to address the cultural and ethnic diversity of the student population. It has issued a range of ad hoc 'notices' regarding the treatment of foreign nationals (both *zainichi* Koreans and newcomers); and maintained the basic position that all Japanese citizens are required to attend mainstream schools, and non-citizens are expected to do the same, although this is not compulsory.

The national government's interest in promoting English language continued as the language's de facto status of a global language became entrenched. For primary and middle school education, the Ministry continued to pursue international understanding education through the Japan Exchange and Teaching Program (JET) which began in 1987, whereby native speakers of English are recruited as assistant language teachers (ALTs) in schools. It also introduced English in primary schools, and instituted 'Super English Language High Schools' to enhance English language learning (153 schools in 2006) (Kubota, 2011). In this context, Japanese returnees came to be considered the spearheads of the model of an internationalized person, and began to be seen in a more positive way.

The Ministry of Education actively responded to the needs of Japanese returnees, which I suspect was due to the effective lobbying power of their upper middle class parents. In 1967 the Ministry began designating 'research cooperation schools' to accommodate returnee children (Sato, 2001). This was followed in the 1970s by legal and institutional rearrangements to ease their entry into the Japanese education system (Nukaga & Tsuneyoshi 2011). The Ministry also established the Japan Overseas Education Service (*Kaigaishijo Kyôiku Shinkô Zaidan*), in which the private sector was to provide correspondence courses for stu-

dents and guidance for affected parents.

The Ministry responded to the influx of newcomers by using the model of Japanese returnee education (Mabuchi, 2002). The emphasis was on Japanese language instruction and 'cultural adaptation'. In 1991, the Ministry started collecting data on the number of students who required Japanese as a Second Language (JSL), and created a detailed JSL curriculum for primary schools in 2003, and for middle schools for 2007 (Japan-Mobukagaku-shô, 2003a & 2007). A guidebook in several languages ('Guidebook for Starting School') was given to parents of foreign national children in 2005 (Japan-Monbukagaku-shô, 2005a). In March 2011 the Ministry produced a 68-page guidebook for schools and teachers about accepting 'foreign children' (Japan-Monbukagaku-shô, 2011), an addition to the large number of existing commercially produced professional books of this kind.

The name of the office in the Ministry's bureaucracy dealing with migrants changed from the 'Overseas Returnee Children Division' to the 'International Education Unit' in order to reflect their expanded focus on newcomer foreign children (Mabuchi, 2002, p.92). In 2001, the Ministry introduced policies which simultaneously targeted Japanese returnees and foreign newcomers. This was seen in a 2001–2005 project which designated 33 districts as promoters of the internationalisation of education with Japanese returnees and foreign students (*kikoku gaikokujin jidôseito to tomoni susumeru kyôiku no kokusaika suishin chiiki*).[1] In 2006, the Ministry launched a project to explore a model support system for Japanese returnee and foreign students (*Kikoku Gaikokujin jidô seito kyôiku shien taisei moderu jigyô*),[2] and a second project was launched in 2007, to promote the integration of returnees and foreign children. The Ministry now provides a website devoted to 'children living abroad and returnees' (CLARINET);[3] and later in 2011, set up another website which provides information for 'students with special connection to foreign countries' (CASTANET).[4]

We finally could begin to see a slight but significant departure from the simple equality principle in educating newcomer children in the subsequent national curriculum guidelines (*gakushidô yôryô*, 'course of study')(for primary school and middle school in 1998 , and for senior high school in 1999). The guidelines advocated for the need for special treatment of 'Japanese returnees and those in similar situations', and included a clause that 'schools should promote these students' cultural adaptation to the Japanese school environment, and provide education that would effectively build on their prior overseas experience' (Japan-Monbukagaku-shô, 1998a & 2003a; 1998b & 2003b). Furthermore, the 2011 national curriculum guidelines for the first time acknowledged that knowledge and experiences brought by foreign students could benefit Japanese students, and recommended that schools consider giving foreign students opportunities to continue to learn their particular language and culture (Japan-Monbukagaku-shô, 2008a; 2008b).

It is important to note that the Ministry has shown little awareness of the connection between the education of *zainichi* Koreans (human rights strand) and that of Japanese returnees (international understanding education strand). The national policy regarding the education of *zainichi* Koreans has a complex history and is relatively unknown to the public. It suffices to say here that the Ministry's 1953 notice established the basic post-war 'principle of simple

equality' or in other words treating all students in the same way (Okano, 2011). Some teachers however questioned this simple equality principle, and supported such activities as ethnic lessons and Korean cultural study clubs, which continue to this day.

This passive policy continued for the next 25 years. Later, in 1991, the Ministry advised local education boards that it retrospectively acknowledged the operation of ethnic classes for Koreans at government schools, at local government discretion, and approved their continuation. It also stipulated that local governments send the parents of Korean children of school starting age a letter informing them about local school entry, as was the practice for their Japanese counterparts; and that this approach should be extended to other foreign nationals. This was the first time that the Ministry made a connection between long-time minorities and newcomers.

Making connections at the local government level

Deliberations at local government level are more reflective of the situations in schools, since local education boards must work closely with individual schools. The connection is more prominent between human rights education (for long-existing minorities) and education for domestic internationalisation (for newcomer foreign children).

We can clearly see this connection in local multicultural education policies that are created independently of the central government. In 2007 approximately 80 local governments maintained 'policies for the education of foreign nationals in Japan' (*zainichi gaikokujin kyôiku hôshin or shishin*) (Zenkoku-Zainichi-Gaikokujin-Kyôiku-Kenkyû-Kyôgikai, 2007, pp.26-28). The earlier policies focused on Korean residents, and later became inclusive of new migrants with reference to the latter's specific needs. The names of the earlier policies tended to refer only to Korean nationals, but in the 1980s references appeared to 'foreign nationals (mainly Koreans)' and then in the 1990s only to 'foreign nationals' in general (Zenkoku-Zainichigaikokujin-Kyôiku-Kenkyû-Kyôgikai, 2007, pp.26-8). Nonetheless, many policies began with references to Korean nationals in their main texts (Okano, 2006b).

Commonly observed major elements in these policies (Okano, 2006b) are widely observed in similar policies elsewhere in the world (Banks, 2010; Grant & Chapman, 2008). In comparison to so called multicultural education policies in migrant societies, these Japanese local policies display two distinctive features. One is the adoption of human rights education as the framework, and the other is the use of the term 'foreign nationals' in the titles of such policies rather than simply 'cultural diversity'.

Given the vague terms that these national government policies have adopted, local education boards and individual schools exercise their discretion to interpret and implement them at the school level in order to suit their specific situations. One result is a significant degree of variation in how local government and individual schools accommodate new migrant children. Variations between localities can be seen as a positive sign of responsiveness to their unique conditions. On the other hand, a lack of enforced national standards can be unfair to

children who happen to live in localities indifferent to the needs of migrants (e.g. Sakuma, 2006).

Higher Education: Making universities competive in the global arena

The internationalisation discourse and practice at universities significantly differs from primay and middle schools, and more directly reflects national government policies. Postwar universities were genuinely interested in promoting engagement with the outside world, both as part of their students' education, and to enhance international research collaboration. The national government provided scholarships to send Japanese students overseas; and accepted international students, often from Asia, although the latter was implemented as a part of Official Developmental Assistance (ODA). More recently, in the last four decades, however, the emphasis has shifted to being Japan becoming more competitive in the global arenas.

Public discourse on university internationalisation takes many forms in the media, the business sector and in academia. They include: increasing international students on Japanese university campuses, providing more effective English language education, introducing English language medium courses, flexible entry requirements (e.g. International Baccalaureate), collaborative teaching with overseas institutions, equipping students with intercultural communication skills and understanding, and producing so- called 'global human resources'.

There are two distinctive aspects to the university discourse on internationalisation. Policies are presented from above, reflecting the desires of the government and business community. One is the directive that Japanese universities engage with the global academic community and be competitive in the global university hierarchy (Yonezawa, 2015; Yonezawa & Shimmi, 2015; Ishikawa, 2016). This involves giving incentives to academics to publish in global journals in English, and develop transnational research networks, preferably with world-leading institutions in the Anglophone world. The other is that universities provide more internationally-oriented learning and prepare graduates for the increasingly globalised workplace (e.g., Breaden, 2016). Both of these aspects seem to be instrumental in nature, in order to achieve business and political goals, rather than emphasing intrinsic human development and the pursuit of knowledge.

We can see these goals in the national government initiatives to promote 'internationalisation', as an enhancement of engagement with the outside world. In the 1980s, the then Prime Minster Nakasone launched an ambitious and well-funded project to increase inbound international students to 100,000 by the year 2000. This was followed in 2008 by a new target of 300,000 inbound international students by 2020, aided by the 'Global 30' Project (2009-2013) which offered a total of 3-4 billion yen annually to 13 selected universities, enabling them to establish programs to promote internationalisation, such as English-medium instruction and recruitment of students, and academic staff members from overseas(Japan-monbukagaku-shô, 2017). Currently the Top Global University Project (Sûpâ gurôbaru daigakukô jigyô) funds selected universities to develop research capacities over the period of 2014-2024 that achieve high global rankings (Japan-Monbukagaku-shô, 2017b). There was also the Pro-

ject for Promotion of Global Human Resource Develpment (*gurôbaru jinzai ikuseiyôsei jigyô*) to promote internationalisation of university education by increasing outbound student mobility and curricula (Japan-Monbukagaku-shô, 2012).

The university discourse and practice of internationalisation has been dominated by international understanding (the first strand) and education for global competitiveness (the fourth strand). But only elite universities endowed with sufficient resources can participate in such global competition. Second and third-tier universities mention 'internationalisation' discourse in order to appeal to potential students, by for example advocating it in their mission statements. Since the 1980s, many universities and faculties have included the term 'international' (kokusai) in their names; there are 24 such universities as of 2017.

Reference to domestic diversity (the second strand) and human rights education (the fourth strand) has been negligible in the national policy discourse and practice, but some individual universities have taken initiatives to respond to the increasing number of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students. These are often private universities in localities with realtively large numbers of CLD students, for example in Aichi prefecture (new migrants), Hokkaido (Ainu), and in the Kansai region (zainichi Koreans and new migrant Chinese). They provide special admission schemes for migrant students who have not completed 12 years of mainstream schooling in Japan, while others accept graduates from 'schools for foreigners' (*gaikokujin gakkô*), including North Korean ethnic schools. Some univiersities have embraced education for multicultural symbiosis (e.g. Hayashi, 2012; Maeda & Okano, 2013), whether this be through offering related courses or in actively recruiting CLD students. One private univesity in Hokkaido actively recruits indigenous Ainu students and organizes internships in local companies in order to ensure potential employment destinations (Maeda & Okano, 2013).

Patterns of Variations in the 'Internationalising Education' Discourse and Pactice

I have examined variations in the discourse and practice of internationalising education at primary and middle schools on one hand, and at universities on the other. There are differences between the two sectors; and even within one sector, significant variations exist.

In order to facilitate the discussion on variations and changes, I identified the four main strands and used them as an analytical instrument. They are: international (understanding) education in the form of engagement with external countries (often the West); (2) domestic internationalisation; (3) human rights education (*jinken kyôiku*) for long-standing minorities such as *zainichi* Koreans, and (4) global human resources and competitiveness in the global arena.

We can see various patterns in terms of variations in the discourse and practice of internationalising education.
I have shown how each of these strands has made different connections to other strands, depending on the sectors, the levels of educational administration (national, local and individ-

ual schools) and specific local circumstances; and in so doing over time how this has lead to varying discourse and practice.

Firstly, the dominant discourse and practice at primary and middle schools differs significantly from that at universities. Primary and middle school discourse initially emphasised the first strand of 'international understanding education', which promoted English language education and later facilitated integration of Japanese children returning from overseas, and later promoted the second strand of 'education for domestic internationalisation'. The dominant discourse at universities has been 'international understanding education' in the form of promoting English language education as well as 'competitiveness in the global arena. The latter consists of producing global human resources and attaining a high ranking in the global university hierarchy.

Secondly, within the internationalisation discourse for primary and secondary schools, we see finer variations. At the national level, the Ministry initially focused on promoting English and later the accommodation of Japanese returnee students. It subsequently used the model developed for Japanese returnees to manage migrant children's education. The other, much weaker connection was made when the Ministry required local education boards to send school enrolment notices to all foreign national parents, including both *zainichi* Koreans and newcomer children. At the local government level, the dominant connection has been 'human rights education' (of long-time ethnic Koreans) and education for domestic internationalisation, particularly in local governments with prior experience with Japan-born Koreans. We can now see this perspective in local government policies for the education of foreign nationals.

At the individual school level where real human interaction occurs, two links were established: (1) between upper middle class Japanese returnees and new migrants on one hand, and (2) between long-existing minorities (the target of human rights education) and new immigrants on the other. The relative dominance of these two types of connections varies significantly depending on local circumstances – the extent to which schools had maintained active human rights education, or whether schools had accepted children of Japanese expatriates. Here we see the first three strands of internationalising education discourse became connected, and gradually began to be discussed in the combined discourse of 'multicultural symbiosis' education. These connections enabled *zainichi* Koreans to discuss their issues more visibly in public, by linking their concerns to those of new immigrants. English language education in the 'international understanding education' strand continues to be visible, but the fourth strand, global human resources and international competitiveness, is rarely mentioned at the school level.

Thirdly, the university-level discourse and practice do not exhibit the variations typical of primary and middle schools, and the internationalisation discourse and practice more directly reflect the national government policies. However, only elite universities can typically participate in global competitiveness and human resources discourse and practice, leaving the second and third tier institutions focusing primarily on international understanding. Some universities in localities characterised by domestic diversity have responded to specific local

needs.

Internationalising education discourse and practice at universities seems to be more closely tied to achieving emerging political and business goals, i.e. competitiveness in global markets and 'international understanding', compared to what takes place at primary and middle schools. I suspect this is at least partially because public debate is based on readily available and publicised global rankings of universities and their graduates. Primary and middle schools on the other hand have no equivalent benchmarking instrument --- only the PISA if any, and they are more concerned with developing peaceful multicultural symbiosis to provide children with a conducive learning environment and ways of socialisation.

The internationalisation discourse and practice in education have evolved in varying directions. While the central government issues directives, local governments, education boards and individual schools have a significant level of autonomous space where they can exercise agency, within the institutional constraints. This paper has demonstrated that the 'internationalising education' discourse and practice have developed as a historical byproduct of varying combinations of policies at different levels, discussions, direct experiences, and local circumstances. This phenomenon is likely to continue in the near future.

Notes
1   Available from: http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/clarinet/003/001/1295641.htm, Accessed on 1st September 2017.
2   Available from: http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/clarinet/003/001/1295641.htm, accessed on 1st September 2017.
3   Available from: http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/clarinet/main7_a2.htm, accessed on 1st September 2017.
4   Available from: http://www.casta-net.jp/, accessed on 1st September 2017.

Reference
Aspinall, R. W. (2012). *International education policy in Japan in an age of globalisation and risk*. Leiden: Brill.
Banks, J. (2010). *The Routlege intenational companion on multicultural education*. New York: Routledge.
Breaden, J. (2016). Education and training for the intercultural competence of Japanese university graduates. In K. Okano (Ed.), *Nonformal education and civil society in Japan* (pp. 133-158). London: Routledge.
Castro-Vazquez, G. (2009). Immigrant children from Latin America at Japanese schools. *Journal of Research in International Education, 8*(1), 57-78.
Enoi, M. (Ed.) (2011). *Gaikokujin no seikatsu to kyôiku no ima, Kaihô Kyôiku No.527, special issue*. Tokyo: Meiji tosho.
Gekkan-Io. (2006). *Nihon no nakano gaikokujin gakkô*. Tokyo: Akashi shoten.
Goodman, R. (1990). *Japan's 'international youth'*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Grant, C. A., & Chapman, T. K. (Eds.). (2008). *History of multicultural education*. New York: Routledge.
Haino, S. (2010). *Burajirujin gakkô no kodomotachi*. Tokyo: Nakanishiya.
Hayashi, A. (2012). Tabunka kyōsei shakai no kōchiku to daigaku kyōiku [Building multicutural society and university education]. *Gendai Kyōikugaku Kenkyūkiyō, 5*, 31-41.
Ishikawa, M. (Ed.) (2016). *Sekai daigaku rankingu to chi no joretsuka [World university ranking and the hegemonic restrucuring of knowledge]*. Kyoto: Kyoto Univesity Press.

Iwabuchi, K. (Ed.) (2010). *Tabunkashakai no bunka o tou*. Tokyo: Seikyusha.

Japan-Hômushô-Nyûkokukanri-Kyoku. (2009). Heisei 20-nenmatsu genzi ni okeru gaikokujin tôrokus-ha tôkei ni tsuite.   Retrieved from http://www.moj.go.jp/PRESS/090710-1/090710-1.html

Japan-Monbukagaku-shô. (1998a). Shôgakkô gakushûshidô Yôryô.   Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/cs/index.htm

Japan-Monbukagaku-shô. (1998b). Chûgakkô gakushûshidô Yôryô.   Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/cs/index.htm

Japan-Monbukagaku-shô. (2003a). Shôgakkô gakushûshidô Yôryô.   Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/cs/index.htm

Japan-Monbukagaku-shô. (2003b). Chûgakkô gakushûshidô Yôryô.   Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/cs/index.htm

Japan-Monbukagaku-shô. (2003c). Gakkôkyôiku ni okeru JSL karikyuramu shôgakkô-hen.   Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menushotou/clarinet/003/001/008.htm

Japan-Monbukagaku-shô. (2005). Gaikojin jidôseito no tame no shûgaku gaidobukku.   Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/clarinet/003/1320860.htm

Japan-Monbukagaku-shô. (2007). Gakkôkyôiku ni okeru JSL karikyuramu chûgakkô-hen.   Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/clarinet/003/001/011.htm

Japan-Monbukagaku-shô. (2008a). Shôgakkô gakushûshidô yôryô.   Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/new-cs/youryou/index.htm

Japan-Monbukagaku-shô. (2008b). Chûgakkô gakushûshidô yôryô.   Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/new-cs/youryou/index.htm

Japan-Monbukagaku-shô. (2011). Gaikokujin jidôseito ukeiru no tebiki.   Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/clarinet/002/1304668.htm

Japan-Monbukagaku-shô. (2012). *Gurôbaru jinzai ikusei suishin jigyô [Project for promotioin of global human resource develpment]*.   Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/24/09/attach/1326084.htm.

Japan-Monbukagaku-shô. (2017b). Top Global University Japan.   Retrieved from https://tgu.mext.go.jp/

Japan-Monbukagaku-shō. (2017a). *Gurōbaru30 towa*. Japan-Monbukagaku-shō Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/detail/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2017/03/30/1383779_01.pdf.

Kubota, R. (1998). Ideologies of English in Japan. *World Englishes, 17*, 295-306.

Kubota, R. (2011). The politics of school curriculum and assessment in Japan. In Y. Zhao, J. Lei, G. Li, M. F. He, K. Okano, N. Megahed, D. Gamage, & H. Ramanathan (Eds.), *Handbook of Asian education* (pp. 214-230). New York: Routledge.

Mabuchi, H. (2002). *Ibunka rikai no disukôsu*. Kyoto: Kyoto Daigaku Shuppan.

Maeda, K., & Okano, k. (2013). Connecting indigenous Ainu, university and local industry through the Urespa Project. *The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspective, 12*(1), 45-60.

Matsunami, M. (2004.). Nyûkamâ jissen ni miru kyôshi no zainichi gaikokujin kyôiku kan [How teachers involved in immigrant education view the education of foreigners in Japan. In T. Nakajima (Ed.), *1970-nen ikô no zainichi kankoku chôsenjin kyôikukenkyû to jissen no taikeiteki kenkyû hôkokusho [Studies in education for ethnic Koreans in Japan since 1970]* (pp. 182-206). Osaka: Poole Gakuin University.

McConnell, D. (2000). *Importing diversity: Inside Japan's JET program*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Miyajima, K., & Oota, H. (Eds.). (2005). *Gaikokujin no kodomo to nihon no kyôiku*. Tokyo: Tokyo University Press.

Nakajima, T. (2004). Kenkyû no shiza to seika [Research perspectives and achievements]. In T. Nakajima (Ed.), *1970-nen ikô no zainichi kankoku chôsenjin kyôikukenkyû to jissen no taikeiteki kenkyû hôkokusho* (pp. 1-40). Osaka: Poole Gakuin University.

Nukaga, M., & Tsuneyoshi, R. (2011). The kikokushijo: negotiating boundaries within and without. In R. Tsuneyoshi, K. Okanno, & S. Boocock (Eds.), *Minorities and education in multicultural*

Japan(pp. 213-241). London: Routledge.

Okano, K. (2006a). The impact of immigrants on long-lasting ethnic minorities in Japanese schools: Globalisation from below. *Langauge and Education, 20*(4), 338-354.

Okano, K. (2006b). The global-local interface in multicultural education policies in Japan. *Comparative Education, 42*(2), 473-491.

Okano, K. (2011). Ethnic Koreans in Japanese schools: Shifing boundaries and collaboration with other groups. In R. Tsuneyoshi, K. Okano, & S. Boocock (Eds.), *Minorities and education in multicultural Japan* (pp. 100-125). London: Routledge.

Okano, K. (2012). Languages and citizenship in education: Migrant languages in government schools. In N. Gottlieb (Ed.), *Language and dictizenship in Japan* (pp. 58-78). New York: Routledge.

Okano, K. (2013). Ethnic Schools and Multiculturalism in Japan. In G. DeCoker & C. Bjork (Eds.), *Japanese education in the era of globalization* (pp. 85-95). New York: Teachers College Press.

Okano, K. (2014). From 'internationalization' to 'multicultural co-living' in Japanese Schools. In J. Breeden, S. Steele, & C. Stevens (Eds.), *Internationalising Japan* (pp. 53-67). New York: Routledge.

Okano, K., & Tsuneyoshi, R. (2011). Introduction: an interactive perspective for understanding minorities and education in Japan. In R. Tsuneyoshi, K. Okano, & S. Boocock (Eds.), *Minorities and education in multicultural Japan* (pp. 1-26). London: Routledge.

Sakuma, K. (2006). *Gaikokujin no kodomo no fushûgaku*. Tokyo: Keiso shobo.

Sato, G. (2001). Kaigai/ kikokushijo kyôiku [Education for foreign children and returnee children] In M. Amano & Y. Murata (Eds.), *Tabunka kyôseishakai no kyôiku*. Tokyo: Tamagawa daigaku shuppan.

Sekiguchi, T. (2003). *Zainichi nikkei burajirujin no kodomotachi*. Tokyo: Akashi shoten.

Shimizu, K. (Ed.) (2008). *Kôkô o ikiru nyûkamâ*. Tokyo: Akashi shoten.

Shimizu, K., & Shimizu, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Newcomer to kyôiku*. Tokyo: Akashi shoten.

Shioya, Y. (2010). *Henkakusuru tabunka shugi*. Tokyo: Hosei daigaku shuppan.

Sugimoto, Y. (2010). *Introduction to Japanese Societty* (3rd edition ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Takezawa, Y. (2008). The Great Hanshin-Awaji earthquake and town-making towards multiculturalism. In N. H. H. Graburn, J. Ertl, & R. K. Tierney (Eds.), *Multicultualism in new Japan* (pp. 32-42). New York: Berghahn Books.

Yonezawa, A. (2015). Connecting higher education research in Japan with the international academic community. *Higher Education Policy, 28*, 477-493.

Yonezawa, A., & Shimmi, Y. (2015). Transformation of university governance through internationalization. *Higher Education, 70*, 173-186.

Zenkoku-Zainichigaikokujin-Kyôiku-Kenkyûkyôgikai. (2007). *Dai 28-kai Zenkoku zainichi gaikokujin kyôiku kenkyukyôgikai Kyoto taikai shiryôshû*. Kyoto: Zenkoku-Zainichigaikokujin-Kyôiku-Kenkyûkyôgikai.