

Singapore Management University

Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University

Research Collection School of Social Sciences

School of Social Sciences

7-2020

The transnational frontiers of Japanese education: Multiculturalism, cosmopolitanism, and global isomorphism

Hiro SAITO

Singapore Management University, hirosaito@smu.edu.sg

Follow this and additional works at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/soss_research



Part of the [Asian Studies Commons](#), and the [Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons](#)

Citation

1

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Social Sciences at Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Collection School of Social Sciences by an authorized administrator of Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. For more information, please email cheryl@smu.edu.sg.

4 The transnational frontiers of Japanese education

Multiculturalism, cosmopolitanism, and global isomorphism

Hiro Saito 0000-0002-9065-7668

The Japanese education system today faces three transnationally created challenges. The first is multiculturalism. Given an increasing number of students whose parents are either migrants or naturalized citizens, the government needs to rethink the nature of public schools, which have traditionally catered to ethnic majority students, and explore how to make them culturally more inclusive. The second is cosmopolitanism. Although cosmopolitanism is regarded as a desirable disposition and competency in a globalizing world, the government has difficulty incorporating it into the education system that continues to function as a central vehicle of nation-building. The third is global isomorphism. While world university rankings have facilitated the internationalization of Japanese universities, they have also suppressed important debates on the public mission of higher education institutions at the local and national levels. How the Japanese education system will respond to these challenges is both path-dependent on its historical trajectory since the Meiji period and coterminous with how the government and citizens will redefine national identity vis-à-vis the complex reality of globalization.

Introduction

The Japanese education system today faces various challenges posed by globalization – namely, the growing transnational flows, interactions, and connections of people, economic activities, political institutions, and cultural practices. To name but a few of these challenges: how to integrate the increasing number of students whose parents are migrants (Sakuma 2011), how to internationalize school curricula to help younger generations thrive in a globalizing world (Tsuneyoshi 2016), and how to make Japanese universities internationally competitive in both research and teaching (Ishikawa 2016). These challenges are distinctly transnational in that they are created by flows, interactions, and connections that render the operations of the Japanese education system interdependent with what is happening in the rest of the world.

To be sure, the Japanese education system has long been familiar with transnationally created challenges. When the Meiji government began to institutionalize a modern education system in the late nineteenth century, it extensively borrowed curricula and organizational forms from more developed countries in Western Europe and North America (Amano 2009). As the Japanese empire expanded in the early twentieth century, policymakers and educators also confronted the problem of how to educate local populations in the overseas colonies (Tohoku Daigaku Koutō Kyōiku Kaihatsu Suishin Center 2013). Moreover, after World War II, the education system was significantly influenced by the U.S. occupation (Tsuchimochi 1993) as well as recommendations by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and other international organizations (Willis and Rappleye 2011).

Nevertheless, the magnitude of today's transnational challenges seems to be unprecedented, not only because internationalization of education continues despite the rise of nationalist movements against globalization, but also because the latest transnational challenges are compounded by the way in which the Japanese education system responded to historically earlier ones. Put another way, the current trajectory of the education system is fundamentally path-dependent on its historical evolution. In this chapter, then, I elaborate on three of the most important transnational challenges confronting contemporary Japanese education – multiculturalism, cosmopolitanism, and global isomorphism – by focusing on their historical trajectories.

The first challenge, multiculturalism, is driven by the increasing number of foreign residents in Japan. Because children of these foreign residents are often not fluent in the Japanese language, they have prompted both national and local governments to find ways to make public schools, which traditionally catered only to children of Japanese parents, more inclusive of ethnically diverse groups of students (Miyajima 2014). However, this effort is faced with many difficulties because the principle of educational monoculturalism remains dominant in Japan: this principle – the education system should serve as a vehicle of culturally homogenizing and hence nationalizing the population – was originally institutionalized in the Meiji period and continuously defended after World War II (Yamamoto 2014). Inclusion of ethnic minorities in the form of multiculturalism has thus been hindered by the persistent myth of Japan as an ethnically homogenous nation (Oguma 1998).

The second challenge is cosmopolitanism. While multiculturalism tends to operate within the nation-state, promoting mutual respect for different ethnic heritages of co-nationals, cosmopolitanism is often regarded as a set of dispositions and competencies that allow people to interact with foreign others and cultures across national borders (Beck 2006). In the context of contemporary Japanese education, the challenge of cosmopolitanism takes two forms: one is how to internationalize school curricula for the majority of Japanese students to adapt to globalization, and another is how to integrate international schools with the rest of the education system (Shimizu, Nakajima, and Kaji 2014). Although the government recognizes the strategic importance of this twofold challenge in terms of making Japan competitive in the global economy, its response has been slow because of the persistent dominance of nationalism: the government is reluctant to incorporate too much “foreign influence” into the education system because it is afraid of diminishing a sense of national identity among younger generations (Lincicome 1993).

The third challenge is global isomorphism. Needless to say, education is fundamentally a global institution, where the borrowing and circulation of practices, policies, and discourses routinely happen across national borders, albeit with local adaptations (Benavot and Braslavsky 2007). Today, this force of global isomorphism is increasingly coercive because world university rankings and other mechanisms of international benchmarking began to proliferate in the 2000s (Pusser and Marginson 2013). Especially in higher education, the government implemented various policies aimed at making Japanese universities internationally competitive, i.e. isomorphic with top-ranked universities in North America and Western Europe. Although these government policies made universities more transparent and accountable to stakeholders in some ways, they also magnified one of the most difficult challenges of education in a globalizing world: how schools and universities should respond to local, national, and global concerns, which are not always compatible with one another (Saito 2018).

Below, I elaborate on these transnational challenges in contemporary Japanese education in light of their historical trajectories. Ultimately, I argue that these educational challenges are part and parcel of the constitutive dilemma of the nation-state today – how to reinvent the centripetal force of nation-building in response to the centrifugal force of globalization. In short, how the Japanese education system will respond to the transnationally created challenges is fundamentally coterminous with how the government and citizens will redefine Japanese national identity in the face of growing flows, interactions, and connections of people, economies, political institutions, and cultures traversing their country.

Multiculturalism

Japan's economic success after World War II led to the emergence of the “theory of the Japanese people” (*Nihonjinron*) in both popular media and academic research. One of the most distinctive features of this theory was to highlight Japan's ethnic homogeneity and attribute Japan's economic success to the unique culture of the Japanese people (Befu 2001). Although this theory was in fact a myth disseminating “the illusion of homogeneity” (Weiner 2009), it dominated the popular discourse on Japanese identity, legitimating monoculturalism as a foundation of the Japanese nation.

In recent decades, however, the myth of monoculturalism came to be challenged by the reality of ethnic diversity and the need for multiculturalism. For example, while the total number of registered foreign residents in Japan was 1,053,041 in 1990, it increased to 2,561,848 in 2017.¹

¹ Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, “Gaikokujin rōdōsha wo meguru saikin no dōkō,” 27 June, 2017 and 28 February, 2019:

In the past, the majority of these foreign residents were Koreans who had remained in Japan after World War II, but the recent years witnessed the significant increase of foreign residents from China, Vietnam, the Philippines, and Brazil. In fact, the government, headed by the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) and its coalition partner Kōmeitō, has begun to deliberate on how to increase the number of foreign residents in Japan against the backdrop of various socioeconomic problems associated with the rapidly aging and shrinking population.²

Because long-term foreign residents include school-age children who came to Japan with their parents, they pose to the Japanese education system an important question – how to integrate children of foreign residents into public schools that have assumed students to have Japanese-speaking parents. According to the national survey by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), 80,119 foreign students were enrolled in public schools as of May 2016; while 34,335 of them needed special assistance in learning the Japanese language, only 26,410 actually took special language lessons because 2,491 out of 7,020 schools in which they were enrolled did not have teachers capable of teaching Japanese as second language.³ The government survey, however, significantly underestimates the educational challenge of children of foreign residents because it does not take into account a sizable number of foreign children who are not enrolled in schools because of their family situations (Kojima 2016; Miyajima 2014).

Inclusion of foreign students is a particularly challenging issue for the Japanese education system that has been centered on moral education of the Japanese people, “to be carried out through the whole of school activities”,⁴ as a vehicle of nation-building. At least in principle, the moral attitudes and behaviours promoted by MEXT are mostly universalistic and therefore inclusive of ethnic minorities in Japan; however, they also assume the legitimacy of ethnic nationalism, as the 2006 new Basic Act on Education advocates cultivation of “respect for the tradition and culture” created by the ethnic majority of the Japanese.⁵ By emphasizing empathy, cooperativeness, and other qualities to facilitate group-level activities through moral education

www.jetro.go.jp/ext_images/_Events/bdb/49facb9d51d120db/session_first_1.pdf and www.jetro.go.jp/ext_images/jetro/activities/support/ryugakusei/pdf/report_20190228/5.pdf

² Sankei shinbun, “Maitoshi 20 mannin no imin ukeire: seifu ga honkakukentō kaishi,” 13 March, 2014.

³ MEXT, “Nihongoshidō ga hitsuyōna jidōseito no ukeire jōkyōtō ni kansuru chōsa,” 13 June, 2016, www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/29/06/1386753.htm The number of students who need special assistance in learning the Japanese language is larger when Japanese students whose parents are naturalized citizens are also taken into account.

⁴ MOE, “Chapter 1: Overall Guidelines,” Course of the Study, 1 October 1958, www.nier.go.jp/guideline/s33e/chap3-1.htm

⁵ MEXT, Basic Act on Education, www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/kihon/about/index.htm

(Sato 2003), the education system essentially assumes cultural homogeneity of students. Put another way, by promoting moral education “through the whole of school activities”, the education system imposes “common principles of vision and division ... and thereby contributes to the construction of what is commonly designated as national identity (or, in a more traditional language, national character)” (Bourdieu 1999: 61).

Importantly, such monocultural education is deeply embedded in the historical trajectory of modern Japan. To consolidate its control of the education system, the Meiji government issued the Imperial Rescript on Education in 1890, championing moral cultivation of “imperial subjects [who] in a time of crisis shall bravely and loyally shoulder the divine imperial destiny” (reprinted in Monbushō 1972: 11). Accordingly, as Japan proceeded to colonize Taiwan and Korea and eventually occupy various parts of Southeast Asia and the Pacific during World War II, local populations were instructed with the Japanese language and curriculum aimed at turning them into Japanese imperial subjects (Ching 2001; Tani 2000). To be sure, monocultural education was temporarily disrupted under the U.S. occupation (1945–1951). The Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers banned the Imperial Rescript on Education and pressed the Ministry of Education (MOE) to draft a new school curriculum centered on social studies promoting civic education of “citizens”, in contrast with moral cultivation of “imperial subjects” (San’ichi Shobō 1983: 333–337). Nevertheless, once the U.S. occupation ended, the LDP began to reinstitute moral education of Japanese nationals, if not imperial subjects, as the central pillar of the education system (Eshima 2016). Most recently, under the LDP-Kōmeitō coalition government, MEXT tried to reinforce monocultural education by nationally distributing supplementary materials for moral education and turning moral education into a graded subject in 2018.⁶

In sum, the principle of monoculturalism has kept the Japanese education system from effectively responding to the growing number of foreign students, firstly because the education system assumes cultural homogeneity of students, secondly because it assumes cultural assimilation as the only legitimate outcome. The assumption of cultural homogeneity slows down the response from the education system by making foreign students and their struggles difficult to see, while that of cultural assimilation makes language lessons and other special assistance too demanding for both teachers and students by delegitimizing any degree of linguistic mastery that falls short of being native. Thus, how to move from monoculturalism to

⁶ MEXT, Moral Education, www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/doutoku/

multiculturalism remains one of the most formidable challenges for the Japanese education system today.

Cosmopolitanism

While multiculturalism concerns how to make the education system, as well as the ethnic majority, more inclusive toward ethnic minorities, cosmopolitanism concerns how to internationalize the education system to help both the ethnic majority and minorities adapt effectively to the reality of globalization. In this regard, multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism constitute two sides of the same coin (cf. Beck 2006) – how to make students more open to foreign others and cultures both inside and outside of the nation-state.

The Japanese education system began to emphasize cosmopolitanism in the aftermath of World War II. The first postwar minister of education Tamon Maeda, for example, wished to eliminate “extreme, narrow-minded nationalism” from the education system (reprinted in San’ichi Shobō 1982: 122–124). The preamble of the original 1947 Basic Act on Education also stated,

We have established the Constitution of Japan and declared our determination to create a democratic and cultured nation and contribute to world peace and welfare of humankind. Realization of this ideal depends fundamentally on the power of education. We shall educate human beings who revere the dignity of the individual as well as seek truth and peace ardently.⁷

This emphasis on cosmopolitanism – contribution to “world peace and welfare of humankind” and education of “human beings” – was meant as an antidote to nationalism that had dominated pre-war education.

In subsequent decades, however, the LDP government implemented a series of education policies to redefine the relationship between cosmopolitanism and nationalism as symbiotic rather than antithetical. In fact, the government has taken an increasingly strategic approach to cosmopolitanism by regarding it as a set of competencies that will make younger generations of the Japanese people “more competitive in international settings”.⁸ Among these “strategically cosmopolitan” competencies (cf. Mitchell 2003), the government has focused on English, a de facto lingua franca, to interact with people in other parts of the world. MEXT

⁷ MEXT, Basic Act on Education, www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/kihon/about/index.htm

⁸ MEXT, “Kyōiku no kokusaika ni kansuru kinnen no omona teigen,” www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/kokusai/004/gijiroku/attach/1247198.htm

made English a mandatory subject in the fifth and sixth grades in 2011 and decided to introduce English in the third grade from 2020 onward. This is because, according to MEXT,

as the world is rapidly globalizing ... it is increasingly important for each Japanese national to understand and communicate with foreign others and their cultures. In this regard, learning English, the international common language, is indispensable for the future of Japan.⁹

Here, the Japanese education system has been evolving into a vehicle of “cosmopolitan nation-building” (Saito 2010).

It is crucial to note, however, that cosmopolitanism is always confronted with the persistent force of imperialism as an economic, social, cultural, and political process that legitimates power relations between nation-states. English, for example, has become a *de facto* lingua franca because of the legacy of the British Empire and the dominance of the United States as a new imperial power (cf. Johnson 2000; Steinmetz 2005). Indeed, the Japanese education system has grappled with the tension between cosmopolitanism and imperialism since the turn of the twentieth century, wherein cosmopolitan and imperial strands of pan-Asianism competed with each other (Inoue 2016; Nakajima 2014; Saaler and Koschmann 2007). During this period, various Japanese activists and intellectuals pursued pan-Asianism as a cosmopolitan ideal, interacting with their counterparts in other parts of Asia in the spirit of equality and solidarity to support the latter’s activities for independence from “Western” imperial powers. These cosmopolitan pan-Asianists, however, were overwhelmed by advocates of the imperial strand of pan-Asianism and later silenced by the government-backed discourse on the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. Accordingly, the pre-war education system ended up promoting what Mark Lincicome (2009) called “imperial internationalism”, bestowing the Japanese people with the mission to civilize other Asian peoples and liberate them from Western imperialism.

Although Japan lost its colonies and occupied territories after World War II, the legacy of Japan’s imperialism survived in the education system. Because of the occupation policy of the Allied powers vis-à-vis the unstable economic and political situation on the Korean Peninsula, many Koreans, voluntarily or involuntarily, remained in postwar Japan (Mizuno and Mun 2015; Morris-Suzuki 2004). When Japan officially regained its independence in April 1952,

⁹ MEXT, “Kongo no eigo kyōiku no kaizen jujitsu housaku ni tsuite,” May 2014, www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/shotou/102/houkoku/attach/1352464.htm

however, the government declared that resident Koreans had lost Japanese citizenship and hence eliminated public funding for Korean schools (Tanaka 2013). Then, in December 1965, the MOE secretary-general issued a notice refusing to recognize Korean schools because “Korean schools whose purpose is to cultivate ethnic Koreanness lack positive significance for our nation and society”.¹⁰ To be sure, this MOE notice was later challenged by the governors of Tokyo and other prefectures and, by the mid-1970s, all Korean schools gained legal recognition as educational institutions at the prefectural level (Han 2015). Nevertheless, many Japanese citizens continue to lack the awareness that Japan’s past imperialism is responsible for various difficulties faced by resident Koreans and remain complicit in perpetuating discrimination against them (Taka 2015).

In a way, the problem of Korean schools represents that of all international schools in Japan (Motani 2002). Historically, the Japanese government did not recognize diplomas from Korean and other international schools, which were not legally as such according to the first article of the 1947 School Education Act. This means that students who graduated from international schools were not automatically qualified to advance to higher levels of the Japanese education system. Even though MEXT has recently recognized several international schools under the purview of the School Education Act, the majority of international schools still lack the same legal standing as their Japanese counterparts. Even though detailed statistics are unavailable, the number of international schools is on the rise (Tanaka 2011) because not only the number of foreign residents, but also that of Japanese parents who want their children to be educated in English, has increased. This means the greater number of Japanese and foreign students, enrolled in international schools, have difficulty advancing to higher levels of the education system.

In short, cosmopolitanism in the Japanese education system is constrained by the persistent forces of nationalism and imperialism. Specifically, nationalism narrowly defines cosmopolitanism as the competency to speak English as a means to strengthen the position of Japan in a worldwide hierarchy of nation-states that is still permeated with imperialism. Moreover, international schools – prime sites for educating cosmopolitans – have been marginalized within the education system because they invoke anxiety and even hostility for undesirable foreign intrusion, be it from the “civilized West” or the “uncivilized rest”, to the

¹⁰ Ministry of Education, “Notice of Secretary-General Regarding Educational Institutions that Enroll Only Koreans,” 28 February 1965.

H. Saito

Japanese nation. Thus, the education system remains ambivalent and, at best, strategic toward cosmopolitanism.

Global isomorphism

This challenge of cosmopolitanism will only grow along with the increasing degree of global isomorphism in education. For example, European universities – the oldest educational institutions in continuous operation – emerged through transregional flows of teachers and students in the Middle Ages (Ridder-Symoens 1992) and later influenced the formation of universities in European colonies around the world. Japan, too, eagerly imported European models of education during the Meiji period and recruited foreign professors to instruct future leaders at newly created Japanese universities. Importantly, such isomorphism in education became systematic after the end of World War II, as the United Nations, UNESCO, OECD, and other international organizations began to construct and legitimate certain models of education to be adopted by governments around the world (Spring 2009). The force of global isomorphism seems to have intensified in the last couple of decades since the mechanisms of international benchmarking, such as the Programme for International Student Assessment and world university rankings, proliferated (Altbach 2016).

These mechanisms of international benchmarking are useful to the extent that they help policymakers diagnose the weaknesses of their national education systems and, when appropriate, borrow education policies and curricula from “better performing” countries. Nonetheless, these mechanisms also risk pushing policymakers to focus on international standards and “best practices” rather than meeting the educational needs of their countries. This risk is the greatest in higher education, where a global field of competition for prestige and profit has begun to emerge (Marginson 2008). The emergence of such a global field of competition is mainly driven by world university rankings that create a feedback loop between prestige and profit as two forms of capital: prestige, accorded by the rankings, allows universities to make profit by attracting students, donors, and top researchers with the ability to obtain substantial research funding, whereas profit allows universities to invest in faculty and facilities to boost their prestige.

The world university rankings have so far produced mostly unhealthy isomorphic effects, forcing higher education institutions to emulate the unidimensionally defined world-class research university (Marope, Wells, and Hazelkorn 2013; Pusser and Marginson 2013). Such unidimensional isomorphism is harmful to unique systems of higher education that different countries developed given their unique socioeconomic, political, cultural, and historical

contexts. This is because, within each national system of higher education, different types of higher education institutions, ranging from nationally well-known research universities to locally embedded community colleges, serve different pools of students and other stakeholders whose needs vary according to their socioeconomic statuses and geographical locations, among other factors. If world university rankings continue to promote the unidimensional status competition at the global level, they will likely keep higher education institutions from serving their distinct stakeholders.

Specifically, global isomorphism of higher education risks undermining public contributions of higher education institutions at local and national levels. At their best, universities are producers of knowledge as a public good, and they are loci of public spheres (Burawoy 2005; Calhoun 2006; Marginson 2016). Universities freely share knowledges produced by their faculty with their publics – students, members of local communities, and other citizens – through teaching and outreach activities, whereas their commitment to free thinking enables universities to operate as crucial infrastructures of critical and democratic debates on public issues. To be sure, global isomorphism facilitates interactions and collaborations between universities across national borders to serve as loci of transnational public spheres and produce knowledge about global problems, such as climate change, financial crisis, and pandemic, as a transnational public good. At the same time, however, global isomorphism in the form of world university rankings can push policymakers, university leaders, and other stakeholders to pursue international prestige at the expense of their public contributions at the local and national levels. In this regard, higher education institutions in non-English-speaking countries like Japan face particularly difficult challenges. The dominance of English as a de facto lingua franca can undermine public engagement of Japanese universities at the local and national levels, where ongoing debates on public issues are conducted chiefly in the Japanese language. For example, more and more universities in Japan have been pushing their faculty members to publish in internationally recognized English-language journals and to teach in English, so that they can climb up in world university rankings (Ishikawa 2016). This effectively discourages faculty members from engaging with their Japanese-speaking publics.

In contemporary Japan, this challenge of global isomorphism vis-à-vis the publicness of higher education is compounded by the longstanding underdevelopment of the humanities and social sciences (Kusahara 2010). Because the Meiji government originally developed higher education institutions to train technocrats – mostly, experts in engineering and law regarded as essential to modern statecraft – it did not invest much in the humanities and social sciences that were perceived to lack relevance to nation-building (Nakayama 1978). This underdevelopment

of the humanities and social sciences did not significantly change after World War II: the postwar government focused on agriculture, engineering, medicine, and other more practical fields of research and education that were seen as directly relevant to economic development (Monbushō 1972: 896–900). Today, the already underdeveloped humanities and social sciences can be further undermined by the “Super Global University” program that MEXT launched in 2014, which designated thirteen universities, including Tokyo and other former national universities, as “top” and awarded largest-scale funding to help them “become among top 100 in world university rankings.”¹¹ Because research activities in natural sciences and engineering are the key to scoring high points in the rankings, the government has so far allocated more resources to these fields while advising universities across Japan to reorganize, as well as downsize, the humanities and social sciences.¹²

As a result, universities in Japan risk further losing their capacities to serve as producers of critical knowledge about Japanese society as a public good and as loci of critical debates in the public sphere (Yoshimi 2016). Although global isomorphism has the potential to make Japanese universities more transparent and accountable to students, parents, and other stakeholders through international benchmarking, it has also begun to incentivize and pressure Japanese researchers in the humanities and social sciences to engage with their foreign counterparts rather than their local and national publics. In essence, the challenge of global isomorphism for the Japanese education system, especially its higher-education sector, has foregrounded the fundamental question, “For what purpose and for whom the education system should serve in this globalizing world?”

Conclusion

How, then, will the Japanese education system cope with, if not solve, these transnationally created challenges of multiculturalism, cosmopolitanism, and global isomorphism? An answer to this question is inextricably tied with the question of how the Japanese government and citizens will redefine Japanese national identity in response to the reality of globalization, such as the growing population of foreign residents, the deepening interdependency of economies and governments across national borders, and the increasingly transnational circulation of cultural practices. This is because how the government and citizens envision the future of Japan

¹¹ MEXT, “Top Global University Japan,” <https://tgu.mext.go.jp/>

¹² MEXT, “Kokuritsu daigaku hōjin tou no soshiki oyobi gyōmu zenpan no minaoshi ni tsuite,” June 2015, www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/koutou/062/gijiroku/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2015/06/16/1358924_3_1.pdf

will be reflected in the structure of the education system, arguably the most important vehicle of nation-building available to any country. How much are the government and citizens willing to make a future Japan multicultural, cosmopolitan, and globally isomorphic? What kinds of policies and practices will they adopt in responding to the three transnational challenges, given the historical trajectories of the economy, government, and other institutions in Japan?

Answers for these questions remain to be seen, but ongoing debates in Japan point to a certain future direction for the education system. First, Japan is likely to allow the number of foreign residents to increase only in a limited and incremental manner.¹³ This means that, for the foreseeable future, multiculturalism in education will remain marginal; education policies and practices toward children of foreign residents and naturalized citizens will likely be remedial in trying to assimilate them into Japanese culture without changing the attitudes of the ethnic majority of the Japanese. Second, Japan is likely to maintain a predominantly strategic approach to cosmopolitanism as a desirable competency for Japanese citizens in a globalizing world. Accordingly, the education system will focus on English language education and concentrate on internationalizing mainstream Japanese schools through the incorporation of the International Baccalaureate program, rather than integrating international schools with the rest of the education system.¹⁴ Third, Japan is likely to be selective with global isomorphism, decoupling local practices from global standards in some domains or adapting global models to local conditions in others (cf. Baker and LeTendre 2005). This selective isomorphism will likely happen to the education system, too, which then calls for a careful analysis, disaggregating the education system into different components and examining how and why these different components adopt and adapt global standards differentially.

Importantly, these likely responses assume that the national government will continue to play a dominant role in education policymaking, consistent with the overall historical trajectory of the Japanese education system since the late nineteenth century. If the national government gives more power to local governments and individual schools in setting policies, however, the Japanese education system may well exhibit internally more varied responses to the transnational challenges of multiculturalism, cosmopolitanism, and global isomorphism than otherwise. While significant liberalization and decentralization of the education system appears

¹³ Cabinet Office, “Basic Policy on Economic and Fiscal Management and Reform 2018: Realizing Sustainable Economic Growth by Overcoming the Decreasing Birth Rate and Aging Population,” 15 June 2018, www5.cao.go.jp/keizai-shimon/kaigi/cabinet/2018/2018_basicpolicies_en.pdf

¹⁴ MEXT, “Kokusai bakarorea wo chūshin to shita gurōbaru jinzai ikusei wo kangaeru yūshikisha kaigi,” 26 May 2017, www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/29/05/1386207.htm

H. Saito

unlikely at the moment, it is nonetheless worthwhile for future research to keep a lookout for changes in the role of the national government in education policymaking and examine how they might reshape the education system's responses to transnationally created challenges.

References

- Altbach, Philip G. 2016. *Global Perspectives on Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Amano, Ikuo. 2009. *Daigaku no tanjō*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Sha.
- Baker, David, and Gerald K. LeTendre. 2005. *National Differences, Global Similarities: World Culture and the Future of Schooling*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Beck, Ulrich. 2006. *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Befu, Harumi. 2001. *Hegemony of Homogeneity: An Anthropological Analysis of Nihonjinron*. Trans Pacific Press: Melbourne.
- Benavot, Aaron and Cecilia Braslavsky (Eds). 2007. *School Knowledge in Comparative and Historical Perspective: Changing Curricula in Primary and Secondary Education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1999. "Rethinking the State: Genesis and Structure of the Bureaucratic Field". In *State/Culture: State Formation after the Cultural Turn*, edited by George Steinmetz (pp. 53–75). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Burawoy, Michael. 2005. "For Public Sociology". *American Sociological Review* 70 (1): 4–28.
- Calhoun, Craig. 2006. "The University and the Public Good". *Thesis Eleven* 84 (1): 7–43.
- Ching, Leo T. 2001. *Becoming "Japanese": Colonial Taiwan and the Politics of Identity Formation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Eshima, Ken'ichi. 2016. *Nihon doutoku kyōiku no rekishi: kindai kara gendai made*. Tokyo: Minerva Shobō.
- Han, Tong-Hyon. 2015. "'Exclusion/Assimilation' in the Treatment of the Korean School in Postwar Japan: An Essay on the Korean School as a Symbol for the Outcome of the 'Exclusive Society'". *Kyōiku Shakaigaku Kenkyū* 96: 109–129.
- Hazelkorn, Ellen. 2015. *Rankings and the Reshaping of Higher Education: The Battle for World-class Excellence*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Inoue, Toshikazu. 2016. *Zōho: Ajiashugi wo toinaosu*. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.
- Ishikawa, Mayumi (Ed.). 2016. *Sekai daigaku rankingu to chi no joretsuka: daigaku hyōka to kokusai kyōsō wo tou*. Kyoto: Kyoto Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Johnson, Chalmers. 2000. *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, LLC.

- Kojima, Yoshimi. 2016. *Gaikokuji no shūgaku to fushūgaku: shakai de “mienai” kodomotachi*. Suita: Osaka Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Kusahara, Katsuhide. 2010. *Daigaku no kiki: Nihon wa 21-seiki no jizai wo ikusei shiteiruka*. Tokyo: Koubundō.
- Lincicome, Mark. 1993. “Nationalism, Internationalization, and the Dilemma of Educational Reform in Japan”. *Comparative Education Review* 37 (2): 123–151.
- Lincicome, Mark. 2009. *Imperial Subjects as Global Citizens: Nationalism, Internationalism, and Education in Japan*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Marginson, Simon. 2008. “Global Field and Global Imagining: Bourdieu and Worldwide Higher Education”. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 29 (3): 303–315.
- Marginson, Simon. 2016. *Higher Education and the Common Good*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Publishing.
- Marope, Priscilla Toka Mmantsetsa, Peter J. Wells, and Ellen Hazelkorn (Eds). 2013. *Rankings and Accountability in Higher Education: Uses and Misuses*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Mitchell, Katharyne. 2003. “Educating the National Citizen in Neoliberal Times: From the Multicultural Self to the Strategic Cosmopolitan”. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28 (4): 387–403.
- Miura, Akiko. 2015. *Nyūkamā no kodomo to imin komyunitī: dai’ni sedai no esunikku aidentitī*. Tokyo: Keisō Shobō.
- Miyajima, Takashi. 2014. *Gaikokujin no kodomo no kyōiku: shūgaku no genjō to kyōiku wo ukeru kenri*. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Mizuno, Naoki and Gyongsu Mun. 2015. *Zainichi Chōsenjin: rekishi to genzai*. Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Monbushō. 1972. *Gakusei hyakunenshi*, Vol. 2. Tokyo: Teikoku Chihō Gyōsei Gakkai.
- Morris-Suzuki, Tessa. 2004. “An Act Prejudicial to the Occupation Forces: Migration Controls and Korean Residents in Post-surrender Japan”. *Japanese Studies* 24 (1): 5–28.
- Motani, Yoko. 2002. “Towards a More Just Educational Policy for Minorities in Japan: The Case of Korean Ethnic Schools”. *Comparative Education* 38 (2): 225–237.
- Nakajima, Takeshi. 2014. *Ajiashugi: sonosaki no kindai*. Tokyo: Ushio Shuppan.
- Nakayama Shigeru. 1978. *Teikoku daigaku no tanjō: kokusai hikaku no nakadeno Tōdai*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Sha.
- Oguma, Eiji. 1998. *“Nihonjin” no kyōkai: Okinawa ainu Taiwan Chōsen shokuminchi shihai kara fukkiundō made*. Tokyo: Shinyōsha.
- Pusser, Brian and Simon Marginson. 2013. “University Rankings in Critical Perspective”. *The Journal of Higher Education* 84 (4): 544–568.
- Ridder-Symoens, Hilde de (Ed.). 1992. *A History of the University in Europe*, Volume 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

H. Saito

Saaler, Sven and J. Victor Koschmann (Eds) 2007. *Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History: Colonialism, Regionalism and Borders*. London: Routledge.

Saito, Hiro. 2010. "Cosmopolitan Nation-Building: The Institutional Contradiction and Politics of Postwar Japanese Education". *Social Science Japan Journal* 14 (2): 125–144.

Saito, Hiro. 2018. "Rearticulating the Publicness of Higher Education in a Global World". In *The Future Agenda for Internationalization in Higher Education: Next Generation Insights into Research, Policy, and Practice*, edited by Douglas Proctor and Laura Rumbley. New York: Routledge.

Sakuma, Kōsei. 2011. *Gaikokujin no kodomo no kyōiku mondai: seifunai kondankai ni okeru teigen*. Tokyo: Keisō Shobō.

Sakuma, Kōsei. 2015. *Takokusekika suru Nihon no gakkō: kyōiku gurōbaru no shōgeki*. Tokyo: Keisō Shobō.

San'ichi Shobō (Ed.). 1982. *Sengo nihon kyōiku shiryō shūsei*, Vol. 1. Tokyo: San'ichi Shobō.

San'ichi Shobō (Ed.). 1983. *Sengo nihon kyōiku shiryō shūsei*, Vol. 2. Tokyo: San'ichi Shobō.

Sato, Nancy. 2003. *Inside Japanese Classrooms: The Heart of Education*. New York: Routledge.

Shimizu, Kōkichi, Tomoko Nakajima, and Itaru Kaji (Eds). 2014. *Nihon no gaikokujin gakkō: transunashonariitō wo meguru kyōiku seisaku no kadai*. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten.

Spring, Joel. 2009. *Globalization of Education: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge.

Steinmetz, George. 2005. "Return to Empire: The New US Imperialism in Comparative Historical Perspective". *Sociological Theory* 23 (4): 339–367.

Taka, Fumiaki. 2015. *Racism wo kaibōsuru: zainichi Korean eno henken to internet*. Tokyo: Keisō Shobō.

Tanaka, Hiroshi. 2011. "Gaikokujin no kyōiku eno kenri: gaikokujin gakkō no genjō wo chūshin ni". In *Gaikoku ni rītsu wo motsu kodomotachi: omoi, seido, tenbō*, edited by Zaidan hōjin Ajia-taiheiyō jinken jōhō sentā (pp. 77–84). Tokyo: Gendai Jinbunsha.

Tanaka, Hiroshi. 2013. "Chōsen gakkō no sengoshi to koukō mushōka". *Kyōiku to Shakai Kenkyū* 23: 55–68.

Tani, Yasuyo. 2000. *Daitōa kyōeiken to Nihongo*. Tokyo: Keisō Shobō.

Tohoku Daigaku Koutō Kyōiku Kaihatsu Suishin Center. 2013. *Shokuminchi jidai no bunka to kyōiku: Chōsen Taiwan to Nihon*. Sendai: Tohoku Daigaku Shuppankai.

Tsuchimochi, Gary H. 1993. *Education Reform in Postwar Japan: The 1946 U.S. Education Mission*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Tsuneyoshi, Ryoko. 2016. "Kyōikuni okeru 'gurōbaru jinzai' toiu toi". In *Iwanami kōza kyōiku henkaku eno tenbō 7: gurōbaru jidai no shimin keisei*, edited by Yūto Kitamura (pp. 23–44). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Weiner, Michael (Ed.). 2009. *Japan's Minorities: The Illusion of Homogeneity, Second Edition*. London: Routledge.

Willis, David Blake, and Jeremy Rappleve (Eds). 2011. *Reimagining Japanese Education: Borders, Transfers, Circulations, and the Comparative*. Oxford: Symposium Books Ltd.

Yamamoto, Masami. 2014. *Nihon kyōikushi: kyōiku no "ima" wo rekishi kara kangaeru*. Tokyo: Keio Gijuku Daigaku Shuppankai.

Yoshimi, Shunya. 2016. *"Bungakubu haishi" no shōgeki*. Tokyo: Shūeisha.