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Abstract
Recent years have seen policies to promote regional cooperation, creating new forms of multilateral cooperation among countries. While Japan, China and Korea continue to grow economically interdependent, some critical factors such as political and cultural differences remain as barriers to regional cooperation. A primary reason for this situation is lack of mutual understanding. The key question posed by this paper is: what can CAMPUS Asia do to cultivate mutual understanding between the three countries? Tackling this question, this paper will explore the expected effectiveness of, and issues surrounding CAMPUS Asia, with a focus on the cultivation of mutual understanding between Japan, China and Korea. The first section will examine the concept of mutual understanding in regional integration theory. The second section will examine the current state of trilateral mutual understanding, by providing quantitative data as revealed in Asian Barometer, an international comparative survey. The third section will look at CAMPUS Asia policy development, and examine both the expected effectiveness of the initiative and the issues it brings to the fore, with regard to cultivating mutual understanding. Finally, this paper will comment on the expected role of Japanese higher education in response to these issues.
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要旨
近年の国家間連携の新たな動きとして、地域連携が推進されている。日中韓3か国においては、経済的相互依存関係の高まりが進む一方で、この地域の政治的・文化的多様性が地域連携推進の阻害要因となっていることが指摘されている。その改善策の一つとして、3か国間における国際相互理解の進展が求められている。本論では、キャンパスアジアがもたらす国際相互理解の進展について、その期待される効果と課題について考察する。第一に、地域連携における国際相互理解の概念について地域統合理論を用いて整理する。第二に、日中韓3か国における国際相互理解の現状についてAsian Barometerの調査結果をもとに言及する。第三に、キャンパスアジアの具体的な政策展開および期待される効果と課題について考察する。最後に、日本の高等教育の国際相互理解へのこれまで取り組みと今後への期待について述べる。

[キーワード：国際相互理解、キャンパスアジア、高等教育交流、地域協力]

1. Introduction
Recent years have seen policies to promote regional cooperation, creating new forms of multilateral cooperation among countries. Due to the diverse array of cultures, languages and economic systems in Northeast Asia, the concept of regional cooperation, specifically between Japan, China and Korea, differs from the concept of regional integration in the European Union, in that it promotes functional processes that aim for progressive regional interdependence by forming multi-layered regional cooperation networks for specific fields and agendas (Fujiyama, 2010; Bono, 2005). Discussions have also been held on the importance of higher education as a possible area for the development of regional interdependence. The most significant trend in this direction is the formation of Collective Action for Mobility Program of University Students Asia (CAMPUS Asia), a collaborative higher education program between the three countries,
launched in April, 2010. CAMPUS Asia aims to promote cross-border higher education programs and coordinate Japanese, Chinese and Koreans quality assurance systems, in order to enhance intra-regional student mobility between the three countries (MEXT, 2010a).

In the case of Japan, the objective for implementing CAMPUS Asia is not exclusively to promote intra-regional student mobility. The Re-Inventing Japan Project indicated that CAMPUS Asia is a touchstone educational program for the future, to contribute to the promotion of the East Asian Community Initiative, a regional integration initiative among ASEAN+3 (JSPS, 2011). On the other hand, The Development of East Asian Community Initiative (Higashi aja kyoudoutai kousou ni kansuru kongo no torikumi ni tsuite), a Japanese governmental policy about the Initiative, also states that CAMPUS Asia is a cultural program to promote the Initiative (Cabinet Secretariat of Japan, 2010). To date, the formation of an East Asian Community has been explored mostly from an economic perspective. While economic interdependence within the region continues to grow, some critical factors such as political and cultural differences remain as barriers to regional interdependence.

In light of this, the Japanese government proposed CAMPUS Asia - under the long-term vision of the East Asian Community Initiative - as a single program of higher education exchange, designed to promote intra-regional student mobility between Japan, China and Korea, as a sub-region of East Asia (Cabinet Secretariat of Japan, 2010). For this reason, finding ways to contribute to the formation of an East Asian Community will be an important focal point in the implementation of CAMPUS Asia. Kuroda (2007) points out the need to cultivate mutual understanding and peacefulness among the countries of East Asia. Given the complex historical, political and cultural differences between Japan, China and Korea, it is highly significant that the three countries are working to cultivate mutual understanding.

The key question of this paper is: what can CAMPUS Asia do to cultivate mutual understanding between the three countries? Tackling this question, this paper will explore the expected effectiveness of, and issues surrounding CAMPUS Asia, with a focus on the cultivation of mutual understanding between Japan, China and Korea. The first section of this paper will examine the concept of mutual understanding in regional integration theory. The second section will examine the current state of trilateral mutual understanding, by providing quantitative data published by Asian Barometer, an international comparative survey project. The third section will look at CAMPUS Asia policy development, and examine both the expected effectiveness of the initiative and the issues it brings to the fore, with regard to cultivating mutual understanding. Finally, this paper will comment on the expected role of Japanese higher education in response to these issues.

2. Concept of Mutual Understanding in Regional Integration Theory

Mutual understanding has been conceptualized by various scholars in a number of disciplines. Nagao (2009) states that from an international security perspective, it is critical to develop peaceful relationships among countries. Nakakouji et al. (2004) defines a community development perspective as a shared understanding, gradually developed in cooperative efforts between different communities, by employing vocabulary and forms specific to each individual community with expressions that the communities can understand. From a cultural perspective, UNESCO (1974) saw it as an understanding and respect for all peoples, their cultures, civilizations, values and ways of life, including cultures of nations and domestic ethnic cultures. Numerous interpretations of mutual understanding allow the concept to be continually adapted, depending on the situation. Bono (2005) provides help in understanding the role of mutual understanding in regional integration theory, by making a clear distinction between regionalization and regionalism. He employs the definition of regionalization provided by Andrew Hurrell — that regionalization is the condition in which social and economic effects move toward regional integration, without the intent of any given nation or its people toward that regional integration (Bono, 2005). This describes circumstances in which increasing intraregional, socio-economic interdependence promotes regional integration, even if the countries retain strong national political wills. One example cited by Bono (2005) is the establishment of free trade zones, by expanding Free Trade Agreements and Economic Partnership Agreements, eventually leading to the advancement of regional integration. Regionalism, on the other hand, is defined by Michael Schulz as a condition in which the countries and peoples of a given region share regional goals for security, economic cooperation and the like, as well as a regional value system, for the purpose of maintaining regional order (Bono, 2005). In this definition, the countries and peoples of a region desire integration, and the region enjoys relative autonomy from other regional areas. One example of this is the European Union, where individual countries and people are working toward a shared
identity of European citizenship, and where the Union has already established itself as an independent entity in relation to other regions (Bologna Process, 2010).

This distinction between regionalization and regionalism raises important questions about why the condition of regionalism is more conducive to regional integration. Any observation on this subject must begin with a comparative examination between realism and constructivism, the two approaches used in regional integration theory. Realism treats international relations as anarchical, since they are formed by individual countries. This means that all countries act in their own interests. Countries will act within the confines of a cooperative framework only when cooperation with other countries is deemed beneficial to maximizing national interest. For this reason, if regional integration is deemed by a country to limit or thwart its national interest, then that country will either refuse to participate in cooperative systems, or will participate passively. In other words, regional integration pursued for the practical benefits to individual countries, leads countries to seek their own pragmatic aims, leaving insecurities about sustainability, stemming from the failure to create shared universal values within the region. Meanwhile, constructivism states that regionalism and other multilateral structures are formed through the relentless pursuit of universal value systems, including mutual understanding, multilateral rules and norms. Since countries act based on the shared value system of the region, they seek more than short-term practical gains, of benefit only to themselves. Increasing mutual understanding within the shared value system is required for countries to pursue the constructivism condition.

3. Current State of Mutual Understanding between the Three Countries

Based on the conceptual framework of mutual understanding, this section will examine what degree of mutual understanding exists between Japan, China and Korea. In 2003, the University of Tokyo Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia conducted the Asian Barometer, an international comparative survey program to examine the possibility of the formation of an East Asian Community. Questionnaires targeting ordinary people in various Asian countries sought to ascertain (1) respondents’ awareness of relationships between their home countries and other countries in the region, and (2) their supranational identity as Asians. To successfully survey ordinary people, sampling in the Asian Barometer accounted for age, gender, income, education, and other factors relating to the social background of the respondents. Survey results were released in 2005. The Asian Barometer still remains the largest international comparative survey on the question of the formation of an East Asian Community.

Survey results pertained to respondents’ awareness of the degree of other countries’ influence. In this survey, only 30% and 26% of Japanese respondents said that China and Korea, respectively, have a positive impact on Japan (Inoguchi et al., 2005). In response to the same query, only 24% and 35% of Chinese respondents’ replied that Japan and Korea, respectively, made a positive impact on China, while in Korea, the percentages for Japan and China were 29 % and 45%, respectively. This reveals that, overall, relationships of mutual trust between the peoples of the three countries cannot be considered sufficient. Additionally, when asked if they identified themselves as Asians, 71.0% of Koreans responded positively, as opposed to 41.8 % of Japanese and only 6.1 % of Chinese (Inoguchi et al., 2005). This indicates that the Chinese maintain a cultural worldview of “the Chinese and everyone else”, and hence only a small percentage considers themselves Asians (Inoguchi et al., 2005). As for Japan, it points out that many Japanese have been distinguished between Japan and the rest of Asia, since the country is an economic powerhouse. Meanwhile, in the countries of Southeast Asia, respondents indicated a higher sense of supranational identity as Asians when compared to East Asia: 92.1% in Myanmar, 83.6% in Vietnam, 79.8% in Sri Lanka, 69.7% in Thailand and 61.5% in Malaysia (Inoguchi et al., 2005).

In Japan, Korea and China, regional interdependence --- focusing primarily on economic activities--- is intensifying. However, as the Asian Barometer survey reveals, questions remain as to whether the economic approach is effective in cultivating mutual understanding among the people in the three countries. In the meantime, higher education has pursued international universality in the truest sense, ever since its origins in medieval Europe. Ever since Issac Kandel - who played a major role in establishing comparative education as its own discipline in the first half of the 20th century - the importance of education in the construction of world peace has been noted. (Hayhoe and Mundy, 2008). In light of this, it is natural to explore the role of higher education as a way of raising awareness of the need for mutual understanding, in order to bridge gaps between the three countries. At present, the leading exponent of higher education exchange between the three countries is CAMPUS Asia.
4. CAMPUS Asia as a Collaborative Program in Higher Education between Japan, China and Korea

CAMPUS Asia is a collaborative program to establish a quality assurance network between Japan, China and Korea, with the aim of promoting cross-border higher education programs in the region. A crucial agenda for the promotion of cross-border education is quality assurance of education programs. The UNESCO/OECD Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-border Higher Education establishes a basic policy to protect students from the risks of low-quality and bogus programs. To this purpose, the Guidelines indicate that qualifications should be readable and transparent, to guarantee their international validity (UNESCO and OECD, 2005). One issue is: who recognizes and assesses the quality of cross-border providers and their educational programs? The answer may require receiving countries to develop their own reliable quality standards, but there are still few countries that have such specific standards. The guidelines advocate, for higher education agents such as national governments, institutions, and quality assurance and accreditation agencies, a holistic standard of quality. This does not impose upon the authority of individual countries to regulate the quality assurance and accreditation processes of their own higher education system, but it does involve collaboration between sending and receiving countries.

Based on the guidelines, CAMPUS Asia explores credit transfers, exchange programs, and quality control in universities across the three countries. One detailed measure that was proposed was the creation of a committee to create a framework to promote mutual cooperation between the quality assurance agencies of the National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation of Japan, the Higher Education Evaluation Center of China, and the Korean Council for University Education (NIAD-UE, 2010). The aim of this committee is to promote mutual understanding between the quality assurance systems of the three countries and discuss possible cooperation, as well as to implement a joint project on quality assurance, in order to provide assistance to trilateral university exchange (MEXT, 2011). To conform to the Guidelines, all three countries will need to begin sharing information on each other’s quality assurance systems at the government and quality assurance agency levels. Then, each of them will need to request that domestic universities disclose information and systematize their degree programs, which includes course grading systems that allow for credit transfers and the disclosure of syllabi to secure a certain level of commonality and consistency among the universities in the partner countries. Finally, the three countries will need to coordinate common systems with each other.

The three countries also agreed on creating a model for student exchange programs in which three universities, one from each country, form a partnership to operate a trilateral university exchange. With the initial goal of launching ten of these partnerships as a pilot program, the three countries began recruiting universities in July 2011, to serve as hubs for student exchange. Finalists were chosen at the end of 2011. The discussions on actual university exchange programs are focusing on both the short-term - student exchange programs and international internships in the region - and on the long-term - dual degree and joint degree programs (MEXT, 2010b). These programs have comparatively low barriers to entry and are expected to effectively increase student mobility. Each of the three countries is not fully aware of its neighbor’s societies and cultures, not to mention education and research at universities. Therefore, it is highly imperative that people acquire mutual understanding by going abroad and gaining insight into another country’s language, culture and society.

5. CAMPUS Asia and the Cultivation of Mutual Understanding

5.1 Effectiveness

When viewed through the lens of mutual understanding, CAMPUS Asia is unique among university educational programs in the three countries. It requires that universities provide educational programs in their country’s language and culture for students from partner countries, and requires support systems for learning in those programs. The rationale is that an effective way to enhance mutual understanding is to send students to study abroad, so that they can experience the language and culture first-hand, and deepen their understanding of other countries. Given this, creating a two-way student mobility model between the three
countries, with the aim of increasing the number of students with friendly dispositions toward the other countries, is expected to be the most significant result of this endeavor (NIRA, 2011).

Currently, student mobility in the three countries is exemplified by a strong mutual relationship in terms of student intake and a weak one in terms of outbound mobility. Japan, for instance, in 2010, relied heavily on China and Korea for international student intake, with 106,375 of the 141,775 incoming students, or 74.9%, hailing from the two countries. (JASSO, 2010). Meanwhile, 19,973 of approximately 75,000 outgoing Japanese students, or 26.6% of the total, studied abroad in China and Korea in 2007 (MEXT, 2007). The intake of Chinese students in Korea is particularly high, with 57,783 Chinese students of 83,412 total international students in 2010 (Nagashima, 2011). This number reaches 61,659, or 73.5%, when combined with the 3,819 incoming Japanese students. On the other hand, 92,197 of 251,887 Korean students (36.6%) study in Japan and China. Of the 238,184 incoming international students in China, 79,641 or 33.4% came from Japan and Korea (Kuroda, 2011). There are 1,391,500 outgoing Chinese students and 6.19% of them, or 86,173 students, study in Japan, while 157,558 study in the United States (IIE, 2011; Kuroda, 2011; JASSO, 2010). The proportion of outbound mobility is relatively low, compared to inbound mobility.

Under CAMPUS Asia, Japan, China and Korea have all unveiled measures to promote and sustain mutual relationships for trilateral student intake and outgo. Universities from the three countries will form trilateral partnerships, and these will serve as model programs for student exchange. In one of these programs, for example, Japanese undergraduate students will spend two of their four years at their home university and the remaining two years in China and/or Korea. Since credits earned will be recognized by partner universities, dual degree programs can also be considered as a possibility (NIRA, 2011).

5.2 Issues

The first issue pertains to quality assurance in education. Under the CAMPUS Asia initiative, there is quality assurance at the individual university level, but there is no clear system at the individual program level. Quality assurance agencies in the three countries are required to develop standard indicators for subject content, learning outcomes, and evaluations at program level. At present, the Guidelines for Exchange and Cooperation among Universities in China, Japan and Korea with Quality Assurance do not present a policy for detailed cooperation on curriculum design or a shared educational philosophy on mutual understanding in the region. Monitoring by quality assurance agencies in the three countries is currently being considered, to provide accreditation of the minimum required frameworks at the university level, not in-depth assurance of curriculum contents, teaching methods, learning outcomes and other program-level elements. Even though universities are not involved in policy discussions under the centralized education system, educational ideals and curriculum designs are left to the discretion of each university in these countries. Therefore, a significant consideration facing the ten partnerships that comprise the pilot program is quality assurance; that is, whether or not the partnerships can ensure qualified program contents, learning outcomes and teaching methods. It is essential for quality assurance agencies in the three countries to create a set of shared indicators and conduct monitoring at the program level.

The second issue deals with the basic nature of the curriculum. Although this paper highlights policy discussions of the grand design, uncertainty remains as to whether the academic content that individual universities provide in their country’s language and culture will focus on promoting mutual understanding. This is due to the lack of common standards, so there is a risk that the primary goal of an individual university would be is to disseminate their own country’s language and culture, without necessarily focusing on the cultivation of a regional awareness of Northeast Asia. With respect to this, universities are expected not only to provide programs to teach their own country’s language and culture, but also to promote educational programs that foster that awareness. One proposal that would enhance mutual understanding in the three countries, is the establishment of curricula to deepen understanding in subjects that are essential to the development of the region; namely, economics, international relations, environmental studies, business administration and public health. If the three countries collaborate in these fields of research and study, the common benefit will be increased prosperity. In order to share the outcomes of these endeavors worldwide, universities in the three countries will be expected to use English - a language which is being increasingly deployed in university programs in the three countries - as the language of instruction.

6. Expectations for Japanese Higher Education

Since Japan launched the 100,000 International Student
Plan in 1983, to promote international exchange in higher education, Japan has focused consistently on fostering mutual understanding with the countries sending international students to Japan. This can be considered a strong point of Japanese higher education. In the Proposal on International Student Policy for the 21st Century (21 seiki eno ryuugakusei seisaku ni kansuru teigen), which was released in 1984, Japan presented the basic tenets of this international student policy (Ebuchi, 1997). It placed particular emphasis on making intellectual contributions to international relations through human resources development and technology transfer. (Ebuchi, 1997; Terakura, 2009). These basic tenets were maintained in the 300,000 International Student Plan starred in 2008. The 300,000 International Student Plan proposes securing international students to serve as Japan’s future workforce in an effort to address the decreasing birthrate and the declining workforce population. While this Plan places emphasis on economic policy elements, it also maintains the original ideals of mutual understanding with other countries - evidence of the emphasis that has been placed on the cultivation of these ideals in Japanese higher education.

In the 1980s and 1990s, Japan was the only country in Northeast Asia to host international students on a large scale. Japan was also the only country, in the last three decades, that took measures to cultivate mutual understanding in higher education exchange. The model promoted mutual understanding with countries that sent students to Japan. Taking advantage of this experience, Japan can be expected to exhibit leadership in fostering mutual understanding with China and Korea in CAMPUS Asia.
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