Japanese Professors’ Perception toward the Quality of International Students’ Study
A Case Study of Hiroshima University

BADAMSAMBUU Khishigbayar
Graduate Student, Graduate School for International Development and Cooperation, Hiroshima University
1-5-1 Kagamiyama, Higashi-Hiroshima, 739-8529, Japan
E-mail: hishig@hotmail.com

Abstract

As a part of Japan’s efforts to internationalize, an ambitious plan was developed in the 1980’s that set the goal of accepting 100,000 foreign students into Japanese universities by the end of the 20th century. This target number was reached in May 2003 due to great support from the Japanese government. Upon this accomplishment, the government reexamined the goals and implementation of the plan in order to introduce new programs for improving the quality of international students’ adjustment. However, most research used to develop these new programs focuses only on the students’ satisfaction and does not take into account the quality of their academic performance, nor of the professors’ perception of the students’ academic performance.

The analysis of a survey questionnaire (2001) completed by 131 Hiroshima University professors who have international students in their Master’s courses showed that when these professors teach international students at the Master’s level, they are motivated primarily by social rather than academic interests and place lesser importance on the students’ academic qualifications. It appears that these professors of Hiroshima University are primarily accepting international students with the goal of improving the Japanese people’s multicultural understanding as well as increasing cooperation between Japan and other countries. Allowing this to be the primary basis for acceptance into Hiroshima University, rather than academic qualifications, has led to the acceptance of some academically poor international students, professors’ dissatisfaction with these international students’ academic achievements, and a less internationally competitive higher education system.

1. Introduction

The world is continuously becoming a globally standardized system. The process of globalization in commerce and communication inevitably affects educational systems and their objectives since international experiences are seen as highly important both to the individuals and the nations (Bruch and Barty, 1998). The higher education sector has played a particularly important role in globalization as it fosters...
a massive flow of students between nations with the purpose of studying abroad. Many countries have deliberately adopted an open door policy to encourage the inflow of foreign students from across the globe. According to Knight and Wit (1999), the internationalization of higher education may be defined as a process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institutions.

Japan is among the countries that have ventured into programs to encourage the internationalization of higher education. In the late 1980’s, the government of Japan created an open-door policy for international students with the goal of accepting 100,000 international students by the end of the 20th century. The government intended to foster multicultural understanding and international cooperation. By May 2003, this goal was reached with international students numbering 109,508 (Japan Times, 2003). However, with the large focus on quantity, the issue of the quality of higher education for international students has been somewhat neglected. While studies have been conducted on improving the international students’ living and studying conditions in Japan, there have been no thorough studies on the quality of the international students’ academics and the views of Japanese professors on this.

One reason that studies on the standard of international students’ academics have been neglected is the divergent views on this issue. There are differing views even among professors on whether policies should continue to emphasize quantity rather than quality, or the two concurrently. According to Mituta (2000), Japanese higher education needs to accept more international students in order to be internationalized, supporting that there is still a crucial need for Japan’s higher education system to internationalize. Those who follow this philosophy believe that studies and improvements made to universities should focus on how to attract more foreign students. On the other hand, Hara (1987) concluded that “Japanese professors are less satisfied with the quality of international graduate students,” indicating that there is a need to reassess the policies pertaining to the recruitment of international students with a focus based on more strict criteria for admission and stronger academic expectations.

The objective of this paper is to investigate the issue arising from the two aforementioned studies reporting that there is “the need for more international students” and that there exists “professors’ dissatisfaction with the quality of international students’ academic performance.” This paper will attempt (1) to determine that dissatisfaction by professors with the academic performance of international students does exist and to specify specific areas of concern, (2) to determine what factors, besides academic achievement, motivate professors to continue to teach international students and what criteria, besides academic qualifications, are used to determine the admission of international students, (3) to prove that there is a correlation between the current Japanese policies to increase the quantity of international students studying in Japan and the substandard academic qualifications and expectations for international students, and (4) to advise Japanese universities of beneficial policy revisions pertaining to international students based on the Hiroshima University model.

Findings are based on a case study (2001) of 131 professors at Hiroshima University who teach international students at the Master’s level. Although this case study does not represent the situation of Japanese universities nationwide, nor the opinions and experiences of all Japanese professors, it can be assumed that the experiences and perceptions of the professors surveyed at Hiroshima University are somewhat indicative of the sentiments felt by professor’s nationwide. This case study is intended to show the existence of certain problems in the current policies towards the admission and education of international students, to suggest possible improvements, and to show a need for further and more expansive studies on the topic. It should be noted that when “Japanese professors” are mentioned in this
paper in relation to the case study, it is referring only to the professors surveyed in the 2001 Hiroshima University case study.

The perception of Japanese professors at Hiroshima University towards international students will be discussed with emphasis on (1) the level of professors’ satisfaction with the academic performance of international students, (2) the professors’ actual interests in having international students, and (3) important factors for determining their acceptance. More precisely, this paper further explores the reasons why Japanese professors continue to accept international students even if they are not satisfied with the quality of work produced by international students. The first two sections of this paper discuss the Japanese policies towards international students and provide a literature review of previous studies. The concluding section describes the findings of this case study and discusses the standards of admission and academics that universities should expect of international students based on these findings.

2. Japanese International Students’ Policy

In today’s world, higher education is shifting from a national to international model. The government of Japan is trying to be more open to the world and to participate in international cooperation. One way of doing this is through the internationalization of its higher education system, which is primarily attained by attracting foreign students to study at Japanese universities. In 1983, when the policy of accepting 100,000 international students by the end of the 20th century was created, there were only 10,428 international students in Japan. The target number of 100,000 international students was set as this would place Japan as the second largest host country in the world to foreign students after the United States. At that time France with 119,336 international students was the second largest host country (Horie, 2003).

The policy was very ambitious and important to Japan’s internationalization because it aimed to increase the number of students ten times within only two decades. Even though the Japanese government had been supporting the acceptance of international students prior to this, little was done to actively recruit these students. The great support that has been given to fostering international students in the last two decades has led to the achievement of their 100,000 student goal. There are three main purposes of this policy:

1. International students are expected to contribute academically to Japan’s higher education system.
2. International students can contribute to the improvement of the Japanese people’s cross-cultural understanding.
3. International students can contribute to the expansion of Japan’s cooperation with developing countries. (The Commission for International Students Policy Toward the 21st Century, 1983)

The government of Japan reexamined the policy implementation in 1999 and established various new programs to improve the living conditions of international students. The government has been encouraging universities to adopt these foreign student policies as a part of their new direction towards internationalization. For example, the government has created centers and campus housing in national universities and has expanded the scholarship available for international students (Kanisawa, 1999). However, the program has been silent on the issues of quality of higher education for international students and the professors’ perception towards students’ academic achievement. Improving the living conditions for
international students alone is not sufficient to improving students’ educational experience and to achieving the goals of the program. Part of the third policy objective (expanding cooperation with developing countries) is to assist the beneficiary countries in the development of their human resources by providing high quality education to students studying in Japan. Therefore, professors’ perception of the academic performance of international students is crucial if Japan’s internationalization program is to bear long lasting benefits not only to the Japanese society, but also to the foreign countries supplying the international students.

3. Literature on International Students Study

According to Altbach (2004), about 2 million students worldwide now study outside their home countries and that number is expected to grow to 8 million by 2025. The U.S. has been playing a leading role as the biggest host country of international students. The U.S. received 451,934 students in 1999, which was the biggest proportion (34%) of OECD international students (OECD, 2002). Thus, most studies on international students have been conducted in the U.S., which accounts for about 70% of all studies (Altbach, 2000). The world research trend in this field is moving from “micro” to “macro,” such as from “student oriented” to “faculty, university, and society oriented,” since the number of international students has reached such high levels (Altbach, 1985). This prompts researchers to move from “quantity” to “quality” issues of international education, such as the impacts of international students on institutions and societies.

As for Japan, this field of study is quite new since the country has less experience in receiving international students compared to other OECD countries. The 1983 announcement of the policy to admit 100,000 international students by 2000 motivated various social researchers to conduct studies on international students from several perspectives (Horie, 2003). The majority of these studies focus on international student services such as accommodation, scholarship, the admission system, and academic and personal advising (Iwao & Hagihara, 1988; Uehara & Yamazaki, 1989; Ogita, 1986; Somucho, 1993; etc.). These studies were motivated by the realization that the attainment of more international students requires improved assistance particularly during the students’ adjustment stage. According to the survey done by Uehara and Hicks (1989), the following are the top 10 difficulties that international students are facing in Japan:

1. Financial burden
2. a) Japanese indirect expression
   b) Irritation
3. Slow progress in their studies
4. Lack of guidance and help for their studies
5. a) No Japanese friends
   b) Impenetrable Japanese groups
6. No open discussion with their advisor
7. a) Insufficient knowledge about Japanese culture and society
   b) Insufficient advisors’ guidance and direction
8. a) Language problems
   b) Suffering from fatigue
9. Homesickness  
10. Uncomfortable when communicating with instructors in their department  

Financial problems and cultural adaptation are the top issues for international students since Japan is one of the most expensive countries and at the same time a very homogenous society. As mentioned earlier, the government of Japan has introduced new programs and assistance for solving these problems. However, there is a more serious issue relating to academic conditions. This is the quality of guidance provided by Japanese professors, as international students indicated they are not happy with the slow progress and guidance they receive with their studies.

In Hiroshima University, two case studies concerning international students were conducted in 1987 by Hicks and in 2001 by Tamaoka. Both case studies investigated international students’ opinions regarding their living and academic conditions in Hiroshima University (Table 1.).

Comparing these two case studies, one can see that there has been some improvement in the educational and living conditions of Hiroshima University even though the research questions were not exactly the same. Surveys on the “Satisfaction of International Students in Japan” (2001) conducted in Tokyo and Nagoya Universities gave results similar to those of the 2001 survey done at Hiroshima University (Tamaoka). More than 70% of international students were “relatively satisfied” and “satisfied” with their learning and living conditions in Japan. However, students claiming to be satisfied with their education do not necessarily indicate that they are receiving a high quality education and are performing at a high level of academic achievement. To determine this, one must also take into consideration the professors’ opinions towards the academic performance of international students. Hick (1987, 200) coined the term “Almighty Professors” and noted that “… whether the student or the professor… Japanese Professors’ Perception toward the Quality of International Students’ Study”

Table 1. Case studies on international students in Hiroshima University, 1987 and 2001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and name of case study</th>
<th>Case study 1 (Hicks, 1987)</th>
<th>Case study 2 (Tamaoka, 2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Hiroshima University, Research Center of Higher Education, 1987</td>
<td>Hiroshima University, International Student Center, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Joe Hicks</td>
<td>Tamaoka Katsuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To examine international students’ satisfaction with their professors’ helping and guidance</td>
<td>To examine international students’ satisfaction with their learning and living conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>25 international students</td>
<td>309 international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Questionnaire and Interview</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>40% of international students are not satisfied with their professors’ help and guidance, main reasons were “professors are too busy” and “mismatched research interest.”</td>
<td>82.44% of international students were generally satisfied with their learning and living, most significant predicting variables were suitable curriculum, progress of research, friends, cultural adjustment and part-time job.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hicks (1987); Tamaoka (2001)
themselves likes it or not, professors are totally responsible for the international students once the international students are placed with them .” Indeed, Japanese professors play an important role that needs to be acknowledged in the improvement of Japan’s higher educational system for international students. Unfortunately, overall there has been insufficient recognition and research of professors’ opinions of the quality of higher education provided to international students and the level of their academic achievement.

4. Case study of Hiroshima University

Hiroshima University is one of the Japanese universities in which international students are provided with government-financed assistance programs. It has a Graduate School for International Development and Cooperation (IDEC) whose courses are taught both in English and Japanese, as well as the International Student Center. However, Hiroshima University, like all other national universities, has been autonomous since April 2004. This means that Hiroshima University is required to make its own international student policy. A study looking at professors’ perspectives of international students, such as what this paper will present, will assist such a university in developing internationalization strategies.

Design of the study

Survey: The subjects of this survey were professors from 13 departments at Hiroshima University who had international students in their Master’s courses. Because of the lack of prior studies on professors’ satisfaction with international students’ learning, it was difficult to identify which factors were most influential to professors’ overall satisfaction with the international students. For that reason, a preliminary interview was conducted with ten professors who had experience in supervising international students in their Master’s courses. In addition, the findings of the studies by Uehara, Hicks (1987), and Tamaoka (2001) were used in selecting the most influential factors in this survey. The questionnaire was written in Japanese and delivered in September 2001 to 263 professors through the internal mail service of the university and by personally visiting offices, with 131 (50%) returned. The questionnaire consisted of 10 questions. A brief content description is provided in Table 2. The survey was conducted using the five point Likert scale shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>not very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5----------</td>
<td>4-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. A brief content of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1-5: Professors’ profile</td>
<td>Professors’ age, faculty, living experience abroad, number of students under his/her supervision, origin, language used in communication and financial status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6- Interest</td>
<td>Professor’s interest in having more international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7- Satisfaction</td>
<td>Professor’s overall satisfaction toward international Students’ study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8- Acceptance</td>
<td>9 factors, which professors think are important for accepting international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9- Satisfaction</td>
<td>10 factors, which influence professors’ overall satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10- Contribution</td>
<td>3 factors, which professors think are important to society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: A Survey, Hiroshima University, 2001
Sixty percent of 131 professors had lived abroad for less than a year, 30% of professors had been abroad from 1 to 3 years, and 10% of professors had more than 3 years experience of living abroad. The length of the professors’ residence abroad was designated as an influential factor to the professors’ perception of international students as it reflects their experience and interest in working in an international arena and with people of other cultures.

In order to have a clear picture of the professors’ perception toward international students in terms of their academic areas, faculties were divided into four groups based on their field of study. These groups are Science (which includes the faculties of Medicine, Science, Biological Science, Advanced Science, Dentistry and Radiation), Social Science and Humanities (SSH) (faculties of Letter, Education, Law, and Economics), Engineering (which has its own curriculum and programs separate from that of the Science faculties), and the Graduate School of International Development and Cooperation (IDEC) (selected as one group because it has special programs for international students given in English and Japanese).

Altogether, respondents had 300 international students (Table 3.) where 43% came from China, 7% from Korea, 4% from Taiwan, 31% from other Asian countries, and 14% from other continents excluding Asia. In terms of financial support, 41% of the students had scholarships, while 59% were private students. As for the language used for communication between the professor and student, 45% used Japanese, 39% used English and 16% used both Japanese and English. Moreover, the ratio of student to professor was 2 or 3 students per professor.

Descriptive analysis was used to show the level of professors’ satisfaction, interest and importance. ANOVA and t- tests were used to determine whether there are some differences among groups or between variables. Multi-regression was used to find the most influential variable to overall satisfaction.

5. Findings and Discussions

5.1 Professors’ overall satisfaction

The first goal of this study is to determine that dissatisfaction by professors with the academic performance of international students does exist. Usually the term “professors’ satisfaction” refers to profes-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Number of professors</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Professors’ experience of living abroad*</th>
<th>Financial status of students</th>
<th>Student-professor communicating language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*experience of living abroad is by month
Source: A Survey, Hiroshima University, 2001
sors’ contentment with school administration, their satisfaction with the working condition, salary, support in academic progress and so on. However, in this paper, “professors’ satisfaction” refers to the professors’ contentment with the academic performance of their international students. It is relevant to study the professors’ satisfaction as they have in depth knowledge of their students’ academic achievement.

As Fig. 1 indicates, almost half of the 131 respondents were satisfied, with the remaining half as either neutral or not satisfied with their international students. While 51% of the respondents indicated that they were either “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with their international students, 13% indicated either “not much satisfied” or “dissatisfied”. Moreover, professors were more satisfied with students on government scholarships than with private students (F=16, df=8, p=0.05). There was no significant correlation between language communication and professors’ satisfaction.

It is difficult to determine if a professor’s satisfaction, or lack of, is actually a valid indicator of an international student’s academic achievement as professors often have different expectations from one another. In addition, insufficiency in data limits any comparative analysis in the professors’ satisfaction between international and Japanese students’ studies. Therefore, careful consideration of these limitations must be made before the author comes to any conclusion about this study. As such, the author considered ten factors, which will be used to determine the professors’ level of satisfaction with their international students.

These factors (Fig. 2) were selected based on interviews with ten professors from Hiroshima University. According to these professors, the performance of a student depends not only on his/her academic qualifications, but also on non-academic factors such as his/her cultural adjustment and financial condition. It was observed that the surveyed professors of Hiroshima University were satisfied with the “motivation,” “relationship with professors,” and “cultural adjustment” of their international students. Professors were less satisfied with the academic achievement, i.e. “the quality of the Masters’ thesis,” “professional knowledge,” and “class achievement”. The T-test determined the following groups (Table 4.) depending on the level of satisfaction.

5.2 The quality of masters’ thesis

The stepwise method showed that three factors significantly influence the professors’ satisfaction (Table 5.). These are the quality of the Masters’ thesis, financial independence, and the relationship with the professors. The quality of the Masters’ thesis has the highest inter-causal relationship with the
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Figure 2. Percentage of the 131 professors’ satisfaction on 10 factors by the Likert scale
Note: 5-very much satisfied, 4-somewhat satisfied, 3-neutral, 2-not much satisfied, 1-dissatisfied

Table 4. Ten influential factors in the groups by T-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction level</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much satisfied</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>Relationship with professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>Cultural adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>Language ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>Financial independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>Basic knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>Contribution to class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less satisfied</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>Class achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>Professional knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-4.01</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>Master thesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
professors’ overall satisfaction \( (r=0.514^{**}, \ r=0.296^*) \) (Fig. 3). Professors who were satisfied with the quality of the Masters’ theses were generally satisfied with the quality of their students’ performance. The opposite holds true for those professors whose students produced low-quality theses. Due to the significant relationship between overall satisfaction and the professors’ interest in having international students \( (r=0.407 \ p<0.01) \), it appears that professors have an interest in teaching qualified students who can successfully produce high quality Masters’ theses and excel in other academic areas.

The second influencing factor to a student’s performance, and thereby the professor’s satisfaction, is the financial independence of the student. Financial stability is a major concern of every international student, especially those living in a country such as Japan that has a high cost of living. Based on the results of this study, professors of Hiroshima University were satisfied with the level of financial independence of their international students (Fig. 2). In this survey, 41% of international students were on government scholarships, 8% had private scholarships, and 51% were privately financed.

The third influencing factor was the student’s relationship with the professor. Professors were generally quite satisfied with their relationship with international students, making this factor one of the most successful (Fig. 2).

To sum up the current findings, of the three factors that most influence the professors’ satisfaction with their international students, the lack of quality of the Master’s theses along with a lack of class achievement and professional knowledge are the most significant causes of professors’ dissatisfaction. A challenging question now arises: If the professors are not satisfied with the quality of the Master’s theses and other areas of academic performance compared to other factors, what other interests make them continue to accept international students? In other words, why don’t professors raise the academic standards of admissions for international students if they are not satisfied with previous/current students’ academic performance? Professors appear to have a motivation for accepting international students at the current standards even though they are not satisfied with the students’ academic achievements. It would be beneficial to both students and professors to know and understand these motivations in order to better the relationship between student and professor and to encourage higher academic achievement from the student.

**Figure 3.** Inter-causal relationship with overall satisfaction. Note: **p<0.01 *p<0.05**
5.3 Professors’ motivations for teaching

The second goal of this study is to determine what factors, besides academic achievement, motivate professors to continue to teach international students and what criteria, besides academic qualifications, are used to determine the admission of international students.

Based on the results of the Hiroshima University survey, half of the professors were interested in having international students while the other half were either neutral or not interested. The results showed that of the 128 professors who answered this section of the survey, 19% were “very much interested”, 28% were “somewhat interested”, 36% were “neither interested nor disinterested”, 12% were “not much interested”, and 5% were “disinterested” (Fig. 4).

It is necessary to again mention the three aims of Japan’s current international student policy to determine which among them are relevant to professors’ interests in teaching international students. These aims are academic contribution, social contribution to Japan, and cooperation between Japan and the students’ home countries. This study found that there is a significant correlation between the professors’ interest in having more international students and the level of importance of social contribution to Japan (r=0.291, p<0.01) and also cooperation between Japan and the students’ home countries (r=0.217 p<0.05). The most surprising finding is that there was no correlation between professors’ interest and students’ academic contribution to Japan.

These professors give more importance to international students’ social contributions than to their academic contributions. Three types of social contributions were included in this survey, with the results revealing that they were all more important to professors than academic contributions (by T-test):

1. the cooperation between Japan and home countries (t=3.115, df=127)
2. the development of home countries (t=2.704, df=126) and
3. the improvement of Japanese people’s multicultural understanding (t=1.765, df=127)

Another interesting finding was that the longer the professors have lived abroad, the more interested they are now in having international students (r=0.251 p<0.01), and particularly English communicating students (F_{2,125}=3.54 p<0.01)

Surprisingly, the factors that determine the professors’ satisfaction with international students under their tutelage (academic achievement, financial independence, and the student/professor relationship) do not align with their motivations for teaching these students. Professors indicated that they are satisfied with international students who succeed academically. Yet, these same professors are more interested in the international students’ social contribution than their academic performance.

Figure 4. Professors’ interest by the 5 level-scale. Note: 5-very much interested,... 1-disinterested
The professors of Hiroshima University do not appear to be concerned about academic qualifications such as previous research achievements, scores of entrance exams, and the educational background of international students in the Master’s program. Almost all professors recognized that international students’ motivation and their ability to adjust in Japan are more important than their academic performance when they make the decision to accept international students (Table 6.). However, in normal circumstances, academic performance should be considered as the most important criteria for accepting international students. Professors, though, gave more importance to students’ eagerness to study and their ability to adjust to Japanese society than to their academic ability.

That professors accept international students with little concern for their academic qualifications supports the contradiction between satisfaction and interest (quality and quantity).

In summary,

1. Professors are not satisfied with the academic performance of international students, especially with the quality of the Masters’ theses.
2. Professors are interested in teaching international students due to the students’ contributions to the Japanese society, rather than their academic outputs.
3. Professors are accepting international students without much concern for their academic qualifications.

### 6. Conclusion

The third goal of this paper is to prove that there is a correlation between the current Japanese policies to increase the quantity of international students studying in Japan and the substandard academic qualifications and expectations for international students.

It appears from the results of the Hiroshima University case study that professors, although they would prefer to teach students with higher academic qualifications, do not raise their admission standards because they believe that it is more important to Japan’s society and efforts to internationalize to admit a large quantity of international students rather than to improve the quality of their educational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>num</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>% professors by Level of importance</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>eagerness</td>
<td>62 30 7 1</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>adjustment ability</td>
<td>44 35 19 1 1</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>previous contact</td>
<td>45 34 16 4 2</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>research plan</td>
<td>40 35 20 4 2</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>financial proving</td>
<td>36 43 17 2 2</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>educational background</td>
<td>13 40 38 8 1</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>score of entrance exam</td>
<td>12 44 33 9 3</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>previous research achievement</td>
<td>10 37 34 14 4</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>recommendation</td>
<td>7 25 44 18 6</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-10.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 5-very much important... 1-not very much important
system. They believe that the way to increase the number of international students studying in Japanese universities is by maintaining low academic requirements for admission and consequently lowering their expectations of some students’ academic performance. Although Japan achieved the targeted number of 100,000 international students, this quantitative expansion was made at the expense of quality.

The fourth and final goal of this study is to advise Japanese universities of beneficial policy revisions pertaining to international students based on the Hiroshima University model. The government may continue to reduce support to international students as it has done during previous years. This is alerting universities to develop their own effective policies on international students that take into consideration the balance between quantity and quality issues. The author’s recommendations are as follows:

1. Academic qualifications for admission to Japanese universities should be raised for international students. Low standards do not necessarily guarantee the highest number of admissions. Albatch (2004) noticed that the US, with the most successful academic system in the world, benefits from attracting the best and brightest of other countries. As a result of having the most academically renowned higher educational system in the world, the US also has the largest number of international students of any country. During the 1999-2000 academic year, 514,723 international students brought $12.3 billion into the U.S economy, making education its fifth largest service export sector in 1999 (NAFSA: Association of International Educators, 2001). Japanese universities could benefit from the US model by raising their academic qualifications and thereby improving their academic reputation, becoming more internationally competitive, and enticing greater numbers of intelligent and ambitious international students. This will also benefit Japanese Universities since Japanese higher education is moving towards privatization, which is putting pressure on the universities to increase their competitiveness and to turn a profit.

2. In addition to raising the qualifications for international student admissions to Japanese universities, Japanese professors should raise their expectations of the students’ academic performance and should also provide better guidance to the students. Ultimately, this will benefit international cooperation and internationalization of Japan more effectively than just admitting large numbers of international students. Producing well educated international students in the Japanese higher education system benefits the students by increasing their knowledge and skills, benefits the professor by increasing their satisfaction with their students, benefits Japan as a nation by contributing to an influx of more highly educated people into their nation and educational system, and benefits the home country of the international students by producing a well educated person to return to their homeland with knowledge and skills that will be a contribution.

Notes

(1) This study is a case study only of Hiroshima University (2001) surveying professors who are supervising only international students at the Master’s level. Thus, the results of this study should not be assumed to represent every professor’s perception in Japan.

(2) This survey was conducted of more than 300 international students who were studying in national universities in Japan and was chosen since it had similar findings to other surveys.

(3) 82.44% indicated “Yes” when the question was “Are you generally satisfied with your learning and living” (the question included both learning and living in one sentence and only asked about general feelings with “Yes, No” questions).
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