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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

One must learn by doing the thing, for though you think you know it—you have no certainty until you try. (Sophocles)

Background
Since the early nineteenth century American higher education has been exported to other countries around the world, first through missionaries and the military, and later through U.S. educational institutions. After World War II, study abroad programs were developed for American students to study overseas, and increasing numbers of students from many countries enrolled in U.S. institutions. Cooperative educational ventures between countries are not new, but, in the 1980s, new initiatives and partnerships developed between U.S. higher education institutions and Japanese business enterprises which led to the establishment of about 30 to 35 American branch campuses or programs in Japan.

In the past, U.S. institutions of higher education, usually affiliated with institutions of higher education in other countries, established satellite campuses in many European countries as well as in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, China, Korea, and Japan. Chambers and Cummings (1990) claim that, in those situations, the overseas institutions were sponsored by the U.S. institutions but were established as "autonomous entities subject to the accreditation and other requirements of their foreign setting" (p. 17). About a dozen Japanese universities were developed in that way. However, the joint ventures described and discussed in this study involve the establishment of new U.S. institutions in Japan not associated with Japanese educational institutions.

Introduction to the Study
American higher education in Japan is a phenomenon unlike any other in any country. The major difference in the recent joint ventures compared to those in the
past is that "in the case of every branch and language program, the financial base and, in most cases, administrative control (including such matters as recruitment and operations) are Japanese while the academic program is provided by the American institution" (Lenn, 1991, p. 17). Chambers and Cummings had noted that in previous satellite campuses which were affiliated with other schools, Americans began to study abroad together with foreign nationals. But, according to Lenn (1990), "the students studying in these [new] institutions are 99.9 percent Japanese" (p. 4).

How did this phenomenon happen? According to Kataoka (1991) and Chambers and Cummings, by the mid-1970s, Japan was enjoying an economic boom and the yen’s strength made foreign investments more attractive to the Japanese. Several Japanese business individuals or corporations began looking for new business possibilities in the U.S. Other Japanese businessmen and politicians looked for ways to stimulate enterprises in rural areas of Japan. In the meantime, some U.S. colleges and universities were looking for opportunities to initiate or expand overseas educational activities and to encourage more students from other countries to fill anticipated future empty classroom seats in American-based institutions.

For many years, Asians have had a preference for studying in American higher education institutions (Cummings & So, 1985). Asians from several countries have come in large numbers to the U.S. to study. Joint ventures with higher education institutions were established in Malaysia, China and Korea years before the new Japan-U.S. ventures. Chambers and Cummings point out that "overseas campuses most largely serve an Asian clientele who cannot find places in their own systems. This clientele tends to have reasonable educational preparation, the will to study hard without complaining, and parents who are prepared to pay a substantial fee. Thus the execution of these programs has proved to be good business" (p. 20).

In 1982, a large, public Eastern university took advantage of an offer to set up a campus in Tokyo with the backing of a Japanese business partner with the purpose of providing "a unique, quality, graduate-level program in English as a Foreign Language for the rapidly expanding occupation of English-language teaching" (Chambers &
Cummings, p. 1). Later, that program was expanded to offer undergraduate and graduate level courses and activities. By 1987, other colleges and universities followed and established programs or universities in several locations in Japan.

During the mid 1980s the Japanese National Land Agency was trying to promote "effective utilization of public holding land" and believed that developing an international education system would encourage "the opening of the Japanese educational market." The hope was that lagging rural communities could attract new industry through new educational linkages (Bachman, 1990). In 1986, with support from the National Land Agency, a new association, The U.S.A.-Japan Committee for Promoting Trade Expansion was formed. The Committee, initially directed by U.S. Representative Richard Gephardt and Japanese Diet member Susumu Nikaido, was organized with 10 Japanese Diet and 20 U.S. Congress members. The Committee's purpose was to help link Japanese municipalities with American higher education institutions with the intent of easing "trade friction" between the two countries (Kataoka, 1991). The municipalities offered free land and buildings as incentives. The Japanese component of the Committee believed that the establishment of American higher education institutions in rural areas of Japan could spur their economies and keep their youth from leaving for the big cities, and would offer an alternative to the Japanese style of education (Normile, 1988). The American component envisioned better mutual understanding between the two cultures, increased enrollment of international students, and more international experiences for faculty and American students (Kataoka & Smith, 1991). Data from three such educational linkages will be discussed in this study.

During the 1980s, "the Japanese demand for higher education outpaced supply by a large measure. As many as 400,000 high school graduates with an interest in continued academic work were unable to be accepted by Japanese universities. The number of students that a particular university department may accept is limited in Japan by government guidelines and regulations" (American Higher Education in Japan, 1992, p. 3). During this same time, the U.S. was experiencing a 12 percent
decline in graduates while Japan was experiencing an 18 percent increase (Palin, at NAFSA 1991 annual conference). With these statistics, increased interest from the Japanese, a strong yen, and a trade imbalance, it seemed reasonable to many American educators and administrators to pursue the new international educational opportunities in Japan.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the processes and issues that led to the organization and development of several U.S. college or university branch institutions or programs in Japan during the 1980s and early 1990s. This study also has explored reasons for the discontinuance of some of these programs.

One aim was to synthesize what is known about branch universities in Japan by reading and analyzing journal articles and newspaper accounts, and by interviewing key players in the events which took place. Another aim was to examine the processes used to create new institutions to determine whether the manner in which they were created and developed has any relationship to their present situation, or to the prospects for their future success or failure. A third aim was to offer recommendations from the key players for establishing overseas branch campuses. A final aim was to stimulate further research and additional analysis of the phenomenon described.

This study is a systematic, qualitative investigation of characteristics of seven U.S. branch campuses in Japan, whose U.S. home institutions are state supported. Characteristics of additional programs are addressed for comparison, but those programs are discussed minimally because the campuses or administrators were inaccessible to the researcher and, therefore, a lesser amount of data was obtained.

Scope

This investigation is not a series of individual case studies of individual institutions or programs, but rather a composite case study of characteristics of seven
institutions in Japan which offer programs primarily for Japanese students. The descriptions and analyses are of issues related to four major variables, or areas of concern, as indicated by informants: (1) planning, (2) partners/sponsors, (3) financial and academic control, and (4) the physical, cultural and political environment. Subcategories within those four major variables are

1) goals, objectives, mission
2) negotiations and decision making
3) administrative issues
4) limitations in the process of establishing or implementing a program

Most, if not all, of the particular categories for this study were chosen because these emerged as the key issues that informants, including administrators, planners, teachers and sponsors, indicated in interviews as problematic or that required serious consideration regardless of where an institution or program is or might be located in the world. Informants suggested that these issues can influence or affect the establishment and/or survival of overseas branch campuses or programs. Each of these issues will be described in detail in Chapter 4. In Chapter 5 these issues are analyzed for the influence they may have on the establishment of branch campuses.

Each selected institution and the process used by planners to create that unique organization was investigated through the variables previously mentioned. Individual persons or their interactive behavior within an organization was not investigated. Programs in this study should not be confused with study-abroad programs for American students, with formal faculty and student exchange programs between American and Japanese institutions, or with Japanese institutions in the U.S. This research does not focus on the political, economic or social implications of American Higher Education in Japan, although some political, economic, and social aspects are discussed as they relate to the events or process of establishing a branch program.
Limitations

This study is admittedly one-sided; that is, the perspective, with few exceptions, is from the American organizers' point of view. Although the researcher was able to talk to many key Japanese informants, much of the limited Japanese perspective presented in this study has come from Japanese newspaper articles. Because of time and money constraints, it was impractical, if not impossible, to hire an interpreter and to gain access to Japanese sponsors, at least for the purposes of this research project. A future study may be able to remedy the imbalance.

Statement of the Problem

The topic of American university branch campuses is still considered controversial in Japan (Regur, 1992). For some people in Japan, U.S. branch campuses offer a second chance at higher education, or an alternative to the Japanese educational system. For others, especially when such schools close, branch universities may represent unfulfilled promises and expectations, and cause confusion and misunderstandings. In one of the most extreme cases, "confusion and misunderstanding resulted in the program having a bad beginning and a quick ending" (American Higher Education in Japan, 1992, p. 7).

While some programs have been regarded by educators, administrators, and authors in both Japan and the U.S. as quality educational endeavors, other programs have been considered questionable and have been accused of lowering standards just to increase enrollment, or of not providing the services as advertised. (These and other related issues will be discussed in Chapter 4.) In 1991, Gagliano was concerned enough to write, "Alarms already have been sounded about deceptively promoted, shoddy American educational programs abroad. Confusion, disillusionment, anger and law suits are reportedly increasing among foreign educational consumers and overseas consumer-protection entities. They are symptomatic of heightened concerns about the quality of the U.S. educational products" (p. 11).
According to several authors and informants, there is a need to add to and clarify the present information regarding the development of U.S. higher education institutions in Japan because there have been many misunderstandings. Regur (1992), stated

... the mood here has shifted. Prospective Japanese partners are not as eager as they once were to work with U.S. institutions, and students and parents seem much more cautious in considering such programs. To a large degree, the problems of some programs and the well-publicized closings of others have caused an erosion of confidence in the American campuses among many Japanese. Stability and commitment are considered by Japanese to be the most important characteristics of an educational institution, and the failure of several U.S. branch campuses here shocked many people. The U.S. programs are now fighting to overcome negative images. Many of the problems are unresolved, perceptions are still changing, and no conclusions have been reached on their future (p. A42).

Research Objectives

The research questions used in this study were developed from discussions with key informants; that is, international educators and administrators who had directly or indirectly participated in the creation and establishment of U.S. branch campuses. Many questions came from that group; others evolved from talking with other informants from a variety of related institutions including the U.S. Embassy, the U.S.A-Japan Committee for Promoting Trade Expansion, and the Association of American Colleges and Universities in Japan.

The overall research question addressed by this study was to discover how U.S. branch universities or programs in Japan were established and whether the manner in which U.S. institutions of higher education in Japan were created and developed has any relationship to their present situation, or to the prospects for their future success or failure.

This research was an attempt to explore and discover characteristics, trends, or practices that led to the creation and early development of U.S. higher education institutions in Japan in the 1980s and early 1990s. The study addresses the following general research questions:
(1) What are the organizational mechanisms or policies for setting up a branch university or program in Japan?

(2) What are some of the major constraints to establishing and operating a U.S. higher education institution or program in Japan?

(3) What are some of the major advantages and disadvantages of operating a U.S. higher education institution in Japan?

Significance of the Study

Because U.S. satellite institutions in Japan are a relatively new phenomenon, little detailed information is available on how they were established and organized, or on how they operate. This research is an attempt to add information to the body of knowledge on U.S. higher education in Japan. Information compiled in this study may also be helpful to future planners in other situations. In 1985, Wixson stated that it was important to examine successful programs and determine how different approaches might be utilized by other international operations.

This study looks at programs that have survived and that informants called "successful" in meeting the institutions' goals. However, this study also explores reasons for the discontinuance of several programs, even though they may have been judged as meeting the institution's goals. Rogers (1971), and many informants, believe that it is necessary to analyze not only the survivors, but also those schools which have closed. Rogers says "to understand why [programs fail], we need to take a closer look at the culture, the local environment, and the individuals" (p. 2).

The literature cites a dearth of research on "mature" organizations and many aspects of organizations once they are established but this researcher, like Kimberly (1979) found that very little data exist regarding the founding of new organizations, even though small businesses, special interest groups, as well as social, political, and educational organizations, are being created every day. Seymour (1988) said that, historically, research in higher education has been done to assess strengths and weaknesses of ongoing programs, or detailed analyses of existing programs have been
done for the purpose of deciding their future within organizations because scarce resources have forced colleges and universities to retrench. However, studies of new program development have not followed. Norris (1992), in regard to U.S.-Japanese branch campuses specifically, said

Accurate information about the institutions and programs . . . has been exceptionally difficult to obtain. Information . . . is frequently declared to be confidential and is not for release to the public. It is believed that the prime reason for this secretiveness is the competition for recruitment of students and the belief that information that is shared may be used to one school's advantage and another's disadvantage (p. 94).

The secrecy Norris mentions may be one of the elements that has fueled the negative and controversial Japanese newspaper articles. Lenn, writing in The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 27, 1991, stated

Most of the programs in Japan exemplify the general excellence of American higher education. However, U.S. colleges and universities need to pay attention to the problems that have developed with some programs, both to improve the education offered and to set the record straight with the Japanese and the American publics. If U.S. institutions are going to establish programs in Eastern Europe and other parts of the world, as many may be tempted to do, given the changes under way internationally, they can learn valuable lessons from the experience in Japan.

This researcher, like Scott (1981), believes that the study of organizations, and especially the development of new innovative institutions or programs "can contribute to basic sociological knowledge by increasing our understanding of how generic social processes operate within distinctive social structures" (p. 7).

Statement of Assumptions

(1) A basic assumption in this study is that the decisions to create and develop U.S. institutions or programs in Japan are made by dedicated and knowledgeable individuals after careful study of the language, cultural and educational differences,
the political, cultural and physical environment, and the relative cost-benefits of the range of alternatives known to them.

(2) All respondents answered questions honestly to the best of their ability and knowledge of a given situation.

(3) Linking educational programs between two very different societies is very complex.

Organization of the Study

This study is divided into five chapters, a bibliography, and twelve appendixes.

Following this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 reviews the literature on pertinent research related to organization theory and design; offers a summary of research describing characteristics of organizations in general and higher education institutions in particular; and includes a literature review of U.S. branch campuses or programs in Japan.

Chapter 3 discusses the rationale for using qualitative research methods and the composite case study method, and describes the procedures used to gather data.

Chapter 4 presents results of the investigation, gathered through personal and telephone interviews, on site campus visits, and a review of printed documents and materials collected from respondents. Also included are profiles of the institutions that were researched for this study.

Chapter 5 offers analysis and implications of the data, and recommendations for future studies. A list of all respondents can be found in Appendix A. A list of the institutions studied can be found in Appendix B.
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

One of the purposes of this study was to discover whether the manner in which U.S. branch campuses in Japan were created, organized, and developed has any relationship to their present situation, or to the prospects for their future success or failure. It is of interest then to explore what designs, structures or models, if any, were used when creating branch campuses. The question is what factors in the original design influence the prospects for survival.

The purpose of this chapter is to explore briefly, through the literature, issues related to the construct of organization theory and design, in order to determine whether there is a relationship between the theory and the practice of setting up programs in Japan. Organizational models can also be useful for future planners of new or innovative academic institutions or programs in the future for deciding how organizations should be structured in order to fulfill the purpose for which they were created.

It is important to note that in this investigation, a distinction is made between success and effectiveness of the programs studied, although that’s not always the case in the literature. This study takes a very limited view of success to mean survival of the institution or program, whereas effectiveness could mean whether an institution is fulfilling its stated mission, goals and objectives, and whether students are learning what they are supposed to be learning. To evaluate effectiveness in those terms is beyond the scope of this investigation.

This chapter includes 1) an explanation of organization theory and design and discusses how the major variables that constitute the central focus of this study relate to the theory, 2) a summary of research describing characteristics of organizations in general and higher education institutions in particular, and how those characteristics apply to U.S. branch campuses, and 3) a literature review of U.S. branch campuses or programs in Japan in order to give a clearer picture of some of their specific characteristics.
Organization Theory and Design

Organization theory is the discipline that studies the structure and design of organizations. It applies to new as well as already developed organizations and provides the theoretical base for the analysis of organizational problems (Robbins, 1987; Butler, 1991). The organization theory discipline has developed from the systematic scholarly study of organizations and deals with basic aspects of all organizations (Perrow, 1970). The theory implies principles of organization. Structure, or design, implies systems, patterns, and policies that guide or shape the organization to fit with its environment.

The literature on organization theory provides valuable insights into organizational designs. Butler said that organizational design is the establishment of appropriate structures within which decisions are made and executed. Structure refers to the set of decision rules, or what Hickson et al. (quoted in Butler, p. 16) call rules of the game, which "guide the behaviour of an organization's participants during decision making and provide both opportunities and constraints for action."

Organization design can include all aspects of all relationships, internally and externally.

Ideally, planners, decision makers, and managers should have a clear idea of all the organizational processes in order to devise strategies for coping with complexity and uncertainty (Scott & Mitchell, 1976). For example, how does one deal with the issues of authority and leadership, delegating tasks, the division of labor, chain of command, communication issues, and changes in the external environment? Because organizations are social systems as well as technical systems, it is advantageous to have a theoretical framework in order to help develop an understanding of the interactions between the social, technical, and environmental aspects (Butler, 1991).

In 1977, Child wrote, "Organizational design aims to devise appropriate structural arrangements. Organization structure is a means for allocating responsibilities, providing a framework for operations and performance assessment, and furnishing
mechanisms to process information and assist decision-making. Deficiencies in structure can give rise to serious problems" (p. 23).

Scholars of organizational theory have identified several models which can help to guide or influence organizational structures and activities. Four models are summarized here.

(1) Closed-system model. The closed system model has a bureaucratic structure with a strong hierarchy, set of rules, and procedures as the main coordinating method. A closed system is created to achieve goals efficiently (Robbins, 1987). This model focuses on the internal workings of an organization (Butler, 1991; Robbins, 1987; Weber, 1947). This model is also called the rational-planning perspective and the classic organization theory. Goals are clear and choices are made in a logical way. Robbins says it offers a simple and straightforward model for designing an organization. "Management's formal planning determines the organization's objectives. These objectives, then, in logical fashion, determine the development of structure, the flow of authority, and other relationships" (p. 478).

(2) Open-system model. The open system model assumes that an organization exists in an environment and is open to influences from that environment. The organization's survival depends on its ability to interact with environmental elements and to adapt to environmental changes (Katz & Kahn, 1966; Robbins, 1987). The open-systems model represents a cooperative approach incorporating internal and external factors and is often described as a contingency model. Robbins says that "No current discussion of organization theory would be complete without a thorough assessment of environment as a major contingency factor influencing the preferred form of structure" (p. 482).

(3) Political coalition model. The political coalition model embodies a political view of organization and the idea that participants may use power to further their own interests rather than the interests of the total system (Butler, 1991). Butler credits Cyert and March (1963) with the idea that for an organization to survive, "there has to be a sufficient agreement over goals among an organization's
participants, that is, there has to be a coalition of interests, and the organizational
design question is to create appropriate structures to resolve these disparities" (p. 7).
and developing this model which "encompasses power coalitions, inherent conflict
over goals, and organizational-design decisions that favor the self-interest of those in
power" (p. 483). Butler says that many authors have acknowledged the political
reality of managing an organization, but they "have not tackled the organizational
design implications of this politicking" (p. 7).

(4) Institutional model. The institutional model incorporates the main features of
the three previously described models but adds an important dimension of the
institutional environment (Butler, 1991). The institutional model, credited to
Thompson (1967), assumes that "the normative stream of action derives from the
institutional environment and appears as beliefs and values, or norms, outlining the
range of desired performances for an organization against which an organization’s
effectiveness is assessed" (Butler, p. 10). For example, the same values or norms,
including religious, social, economic, governmental, or political may apply to an
organization regardless of whether it is a non profit or a profit making organization.
However, Butler also said that "The reality for any but the simplest organization is
that there can be different and sometimes contradictory norms arriving from different
segments of the environment" (p. 11).

Daft (1989) contrasted the rational and political models. He said the rational
model of organization is "characterized by extensive, reliable information systems,
central power, a norm of optimization, uniform values across groups, little conflict,
and an efficiency orientation" (p. 417). Daft called the political model the opposite
view of the rational model of organizational process. He wrote

This model assumes that organizations are made up of coalitions that disagree
about goals and do not have good information about alternatives. The political
model defines the organization as made up of groups that have separate interests,
goals, and values. Disagreement and conflict are normal, so power and influence
are needed to reach decisions. Groups will engage in the push and pull of debate
to decide goals and to reach decisions. Decisions are disorderly. Information is ambiguous and incomplete. Bargaining and conflict are the norm (p. 417).

Daft also discussed what he called a "mixed model," which he defined as a combination of the rational and political models. He suggests that no one model applies to all organizational processes. He also stressed that the closed-system, or rational model, applies best to organizations in stable environments. However, the rational model may be inadequate when there is uncertainty and conflict.

It is probable that decisions to establish U.S. branch campuses in Japan were not made in a logical, rational manner according to the definition and characteristics of that model. The creation process of U.S. branch campuses in Japan was characterized by uncertainty and conflict of interests, goals, and values because two very different cultures, educational systems, and profit versus non profit enterprises were being linked—and because this was an entirely new phenomenon with no set guidelines to follow. It would appear that, knowingly or not, decision makers used some combination of all four models described in order to create U.S. branch campuses in Japan. It is not unusual, however, for decision makers to use intuition and experience to guide them through processes and problems without consciously referring to theoretical models. Daft said that, in reality,

most decisions do not begin with the careful analysis of a problem, followed by systematic analysis of alternatives, and finally implementation of a solution. On the contrary, decision processes are characterized by conflict, coalition building, trial and error, and mistakes. Intuition and hunch are often the criteria for choice. The decision process is disorderly, and may even seem random (p. 385).

Organizational theory and design is, however, a useful construct and can help planners and decision makers to 1) devise organizational structures that will be compatible with the goals, mission, and objectives of the proposed institution (the internal environment), and 2) manage conflict and uncertainties so that an organization or institution can fit into the external environment.
Characteristics of Organizations in General

Studies of organizations are often divided into three broad, arbitrary and sometimes ambiguous levels (Scott, 1981). At one level investigators attempt to explain individual behavior within an organization, sometimes called the internal environment (Scott, 1981; Pfeffer, 1982). At the second level, the major concern is to explain the "structural features and social processes that characterize organizations and their subdivisions" (Scott, 1981, p. 11). At the third level of analysis, "the focus is on the organization as a collective actor functioning in a larger system of relations" (Scott, 1981, p. 11; Pfeffer, 1982, p. 130). It is this third level, or approach, to analyzing U.S. institutions or programs in Japan that is used in this study.

This investigation takes a qualitative research approach and looks holistically at several overseas U.S. institutions or programs that were established in Japan between 1982 and 1992 under what some authors and observers call "unusual" circumstances in the way they were created and are now administered. The researcher looked at specific variables, common to all the institutions or programs studied including planning, which incorporates goals, objectives, and mission, as well as negotiations, decision making, and partnerships; power and control, which include sponsors, finances, academic and administrative issues; and the environment. The success or survival (or effectiveness) of an organization is usually determined by how well these variables are managed and coordinated. As Meyer and Rowan (1992) pointed out, "Organizational success depends on factors other than efficient coordination and control of productive activities" (p. 34). Success also depends in part on "environmental processes and on the capacity of given organizational leadership to mold these processes" (Hirsch 1975, as quoted in Meyer & Rowan, 1992, p. 34).

This study describes how the four major variables chosen for this study were managed and coordinated in some of the U.S. branch campuses, but it also includes what the researcher has deemed "critical information" from some of the other variables noted earlier in order to present a more complete picture of the phenomenon.
The Planning Variable

The results of a literature search on issues in the creation and early development of organizations and on new or innovative academic institutions showed that very little data exist even though new organizations are being planned and created constantly. One study, New Academic Institutions: A Survey, published by the American Council on Education in 1972, was the result of statistical research begun in 1967, the purpose of which was to "gather data about the numbers and kinds of new institutions [created after 1947], the circumstances of their founding, their common and distinctive characteristics, their special problems, their failures and successes" (p. v). The authors stated, "Individually as well as collectively, new institutions of higher education represent considerable investments of talent, time, money, and hope. There are lessons to be learned from failures as well as from successes, and the need for more knowledge about such ventures has long been manifest" (p. 2).

The 1972 investigation was, at least in part, "a response to the educational community's expressed need for statistical data on a significant historical development in American higher education" (p. v). The new institutions surveyed had all been planned and created in the U.S., not in other countries. The description of the study includes a step by step, point by point process borrowed from Eurich (1970) deemed necessary for successfully establishing new institutions (p. 43).

The results of the 1972 study suggested that the critical planning process included asking difficult questions such as "Why should this college or university be established? To what extent can its purposes be achieved? Will this institution be flexible enough to meet the demands of an uncertain future" (p. 42)? Respondents in the survey (presidents of both private and public higher education institutions) listed "assured financing, sound planning program, and a genuine demand and desire" as the three most important considerations for planners when attempting to create a new institution (p. 29). It was strongly suggested that a feasibility study be done to
answer the question, "Who needs what kinds of postsecondary education here" (p. 31)?

In 1979, Kimberly (who uses the terms success and effectiveness interchangeably) described a study he did of a new school of medical education that began in the early 1970s. He admitted that the investigation was difficult because he found that most organization research has been carried out in mature organizations that have "existing structures, domains, control systems, and normative codes and has been based on cross-sectional designs. This means that the perspective is usually static. Overlooked is the possible relevance of the organization's stage in its life cycle. . . . As a result, the implications that the conditions surrounding the organization's birth and early development may have for levels of success or effectiveness later on are not considered" (p. 438).

Kimberly's study analyzed the "question of effectiveness in the context of the birth and early development of an innovative organization." As the school grew, it faced what Kimberly called the "paradoxical nature of success" (p. 441). For example, he made the point that "organizations that are truly effective may put themselves out of business, in which case death [not survival] is the ultimate criterion for success." Survival, however, is often "one criterion that most researchers agree is a necessary, albeit not sufficient, condition for success" (p. 438). In Kimberly's example, the problem was that planners apparently did not consider the ultimate consequences of the "success" of the newly formed institution.

As the medical school grew the whole idea of success changed. The growth caused it to be "institutionalized" which no longer allowed it to be innovative (p. 447). Kimberly offered several reasons why the medical school's success as an innovation was incompatible with what was needed to be successful in the future and to ensure its continuance (p. 447). Apparently, during the planning process, decision makers were unable to foresee what effects the ultimate growth of the school would cause, and therefore, no contingency plans were made.
Kimberly cautioned that the establishment of the medical school he studied "cannot be considered to be typical or to embody the full range of patterns and possibilities that confront the creation of organizations" (p. 453). He supports this claim by listing specific conditions and situations.

Kimberly's study, however, suggests that the "birth" of an organization may have implications for its success, or effectiveness. "There is the possibility, at least, that, just as for a child, the conditions under which an organization is born and the course of its development in infancy have nontrivial consequences for its later life" (p. 438).

The researcher in this present study raised some of the same questions that Kimberly raised earlier; that is, what makes some organizations more successful (or effective) than others? And does an organization’s success or effectiveness have anything to do with the way it is initially set up? Blau and Scott (1962) point out that a degree of planning is implicit in all formal organizations, and that [the organization] doesn’t just happen by chance.

The goals to be achieved, the rules the members of the organization are expected to follow, and the status structure that defines the relations between them . . . have not spontaneously emerged in the course of social interaction but have been consciously designed a priori- to anticipate and guide interaction and activities (p. 5).

The a priori design—or planning process—is probably the most important and influential step in the overall process of establishing a new or innovative organization.

Sprunger and Bergquist (1978) suggest that one of the first steps in the planning process is for the key actors to define and evaluate an organization’s strengths and weaknesses. For any organization, effective planning can be difficult, yet it is critical because it "provides a logical framework for organizing, staffing, leading, evaluating, and developing the work of an organization" (p. 27). Unfortunately, as indicated earlier, there is no single planning model that is appropriate to every institution or situation. The authors also point out that effective and continuous planning requires
a high degree of commitment and skill. "Planning is difficult, time consuming, and expensive, and it does not guarantee survival; but failure to plan is an invitation to disaster" (p. 34).

Sprunger and Bergquist proposed that in order to make planning effective the key players in the process should provide answers to five marketing questions: (1) What is the mission or purpose of our institution? (2) What are the unique strengths of this institution? (3) What is the nature of the market we are serving? (4) How do we communicate honestly and without exaggeration what we hope to achieve with students who come to our institution? (5) How do we accomplish what we hope to achieve in the most effective, efficient, and humane manner? (p. 27). Once an organization has answers to those questions, it should be able to more clearly define what the organization can do best, then build on those strengths. With careful planning an organization can create a "propitious niche," that is, a special role for the institution. Identifying this propitious niche allows the institution to establish goals and to design programs and services around its strengths. "The institution most likely to survive is the one that has defined its distinctive character and knows its strengths and weaknesses in this context. It has found its special role and can plan the future around that role, while those institutions that have no specific identity may find survival more difficult" (p. 28).

The concept of "a special role for the institution" is valuable and important because it takes into account both the strengths of the institution and the needs of the environment the institution will serve. However, regardless of how well a new organization or institution is planned, other variables can and do affect the organization's eventual success or failure. One of those variables is who has power and control in the organization or institution.

The Power and Control Variable

Many theories and concepts of power abound in the literature. For the purposes of this study, the researcher will examine a very limited selection of social science
literature and, more particularly, will look at writers who have discussed power within the framework of how organizations begin or are planned. However, power and control issues usually continue in some form throughout a new organization's implementation and entire lifespan.

In the literature some confusion is apparent about the nature of power because of the additional concepts of control, influence and authority. In addition, authors tend to agree that politics is intertwined with most concepts of power, or that political potential exists in social systems (Etzioni, 1964; Clegg, 1979; Bacharach & Lawler, 1980; Mintzberg, 1983; Kakabadse & Parker, 1984; Daft, 1989).

In this study power and control are important variables in relation to how they influence decision making in both the planning and implementing stages of new U.S. institutions or programs in Japan. This researcher was primarily interested in who controls the financial and curriculum issues in the new institutions. The literature deals more with theories and concepts, rather than particulars, but the theories and concepts pertain nevertheless because they relate to some of the conflicts that have been evident in U.S. branch campuses and in many institutions.

Daft (1989) defines power as "the ability of one person or department in an organization to influence other people to bring about desired outcomes" (p. 400). A problem can arise when people in power with differing viewpoints desire or exert control over certain issues, or when those in power do not share the same desired outcomes. Another problem may occur when one part of the power relationship must depend on the other for valued resources. All of these problems have been evident in some form in U.S. branch campuses in Japan because of the unique arrangements of sponsors and partnerships.

Etzioni (1964) studied organizational control and its relation to leadership and came to the conclusion that, "Nowhere is the strain between the organization's needs and the participant's needs—between effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction—more evident than in the area of organizational control" (p. 58). Although Etzioni's views were derived from studies of various types of organizations, he gave few specific
examples of educational institutions. However, he said the general and basic concepts tend to fit educational institutions as well as businesses, churches, and even prisons. Ryan (1984) wrote about related issues to power and control, including values, authority, communication, negotiation, and dependency. Her research, carried out in an academic setting, studied decision-making processes in which financial resources were allocated to various groups and individuals. She then analyzed those groups' and individuals' interpretation or perceptions of the people with whom they interacted and the processes with which they were involved. She studied three broad categories: perceptions of structure, powerful people, and perceptions of culture. Ryan concluded that respondents perceived power to be unevenly distributed and that political influence was significant.

Gray (1984) discussed the politics of organizational values and credited Hodgkinson (1978) with the idea that "the concept of organizations as value systems is an important aspect of organization theory. Organizations function as value systems because values are the basis of consistency in decision-making. Though no two individuals will have exactly the same value system, congruence of values will lead to consistency while conflict may lead to friction" (p. 117). Gray illustrated the dysfunctional aspects of power and concluded that "there is a wide failure to accept and understand just how educational institutions are politically organized" (p. 124).

Gray included his views on the importance of the personality of individuals who have power in educational institutions. He wrote, "Every educational institution I have ever been in has had a character that derives entirely from the people who compose it. In every case, the personality of the top person—head, principal or whatever—has been pivotal" (p. 109). This view will be discussed in a later chapter because it also directly pertains to the U.S. branch campus phenomenon in Japan. Administrators at branch campuses must be able to interact effectively not only with the U.S. home-based campus but also with the indigenous environment where the branch campus is located.
The Environment Variable

Much of the literature examines perspectives on both internal and external environments. However, this study will focus on a discussion of external relationships to the institutions because those aspects appeared to influence the success or failure of U.S. branch campuses in Japan more than internal institutional relationships.

Many definitions are available in the literature, but this researcher will borrow from Daft (1989) and define an organizational environment as "all elements that exist outside the boundary of the organization and have the potential to affect all or part of the organization" (p. 45). Daft explained that external environments comprise many sectors or subdivisions including financial and human resources, raw materials, technology, market, and sociocultural characteristics. The problem, said Daft, is that there's great uncertainty in the environment, and that "decision makers do not have sufficient information about environmental factors" (p. 52). Thus they have a difficult time predicting external changes.

Daft's investigations were done with corporations, so he raised the question, how do managers know the environment? The same question, however, may be appropriate for other organizations. How do educational administrators know the environment? A thorough investigation of the environment and strategies for dealing with the environment are imperative. For businesses Daft suggests four techniques for controlling environmental domains, which may or may not be appropriate for educational institutions, especially in other countries. Yet, some consideration must be given to them. They are

1. seek new environmental relationships and drop old ones. Try to find a domain where there are affluent customers, no government regulation, and where there is little competition and barriers to keep competitors out;

2. encourage political activity, which includes techniques to influence government legislation and regulation and lobbyists;
(3) work with other organizations that have similar interests and pool resources; and

(4) resort to illegal activities which can include kickbacks and payoffs.

Daft suggests that U.S. businesses "sometimes use all of these techniques to control their environmental domain" (pp. 71-72). It's entirely possible that some educational institutions use similar techniques in order to survive.

In the literature most organization definitions and characteristics, whether of private or public entities, fit academic institutions as well as businesses and industrial companies because, according to Perrow (1970), "organizations are, after all, made up of people" (p. 2). However, Perrow also admitted that organizations differ in critical areas such as goals, objectives and tasks, and thus in the way they are run (p. 49). U.S. branch campuses in Japan have been controversial partly because of the way they are run; that is, business companies (for profit entities) are sponsoring educational institutions (non profit entities). Critics say that goals and objectives are not the same for profit and non profit entities and thus there are conflicts in certain elements of the environment. However, the external environment does and should play a major role in determining the way organizations are run because the environment provides the resources, in this case-money and students.

Baldridge (1983) raised the question, "Are schools and institutions of higher education really that much different from private corporations?" (p. 13). He reinforced the idea that, as similar as they may be in many characteristics, organizations still vary in a number of important ways.

. . . they have different kinds of clients; they employ workers with varying skills; they work with various types of technologies; they develop divergent styles of structure, coordination, and governance; and they have differing relationships to their external environments. To be sure, there are some common elements in the ways that colleges and universities, hospitals, prisons, business firms, and government bureaus are operated. No two organizations are really the same, however, and any adequate theory of decision making and governance must take their differences into account (p. 38).
Butler (1991) also stressed the importance of the relationships of organizations to their environments, regardless of how organizations are defined or classified. Butler credited Brunsson (1989), and Meyer and Scott (1983) with the idea that whether organizations are big or small, manufacturing or service type, public or private institutions, however they are described, "they need support from their environments and, most crucially, they must be concerned with gaining support in the future. In order to do this they have to demonstrate their worthiness for such support by adopting appropriate structures" (Butler, p. 1). As noted earlier, planners must design structures that will help the organization fit appropriately into its environment.

Pasmore (1988) took a sociotechnical systems approach to study organizational design and environments. He stated that the effectiveness of an organization depends on how well the social and technical systems are designed with respect to one another and with respect to the demands of the external environment. He suggested that organization planners often don't take enough time to learn about the environment or they ignore it because the environment is complex, uncertain, and turbulent. He credited Bartunek and Louis (1988) and Greiner (1972) with the idea that, "the creation of an organization is a complex undertaking, during which many decisions are made without complete information" (Pasmore, p. 3). Pasmore cited examples of organizations failing to acknowledge elements in the environment that impacted on their success including the American Buggy Whip Company which continued to manufacture buggy whips after the invention of automobiles. Pasmore wrote, "Failure to design the organization to fit with the environment is as dangerous as totally ignoring the environment; while the ultimate effects of a mismatch between the design and the environment are not always immediately obvious, they are usually severe" (p. 7). Pasmore recommended that "despite the difficulties involved in comprehending the environment, managers and designers must attempt to do so. The environment, regardless of its levels of complexity and turbulence, remains the final judge of organizational success" (p. 13).
Branch Campuses in Japan

As noted earlier, although institutions of higher learning have been operating in several parts of the world for many years, little consolidated information is available on how they were initiated. In addition, earlier U.S. overseas institutions were usually joint ventures with other educational institutions. However, the satellite campuses in Japan are examples of new types of partnerships. The "problem," or "conflict," as some observers see it is that these partnerships are usually between for-profit Japanese entities and non-profit American entities. This unusual set of arrangements has caused not only controversy but confusion and misunderstandings for Americans and Japanese because of conflicting goals and objectives and strategies used to run the branch campus.

Partnerships for branch campuses usually fall into three categories: 1) a Japanese business individual or corporation will sponsor a U.S.-based state supported college or university, 2) a Japanese business individual or corporation will sponsor a U.S.-based private college or university, or 3) the U.S.A.-Japan Committee for Promoting Trade Expansion will act as "matchmaker" between municipalities or prefectural governments and U.S. state-supported colleges or universities (Kataoka & Smith, 1991). (Readers are referred to Appendix C for the initial proposal and Appendix D for suggested guidelines from the U.S.A.-Japan Committee for Promoting Trade Expansion.) A negotiated written contract usually specifies the responsibilities of the two entities. Major constraints in setting up programs have included negotiating and writing the contracts, and language, cultural and educational differences as well as control over curriculum matters (Sharp, 1992; Davey & McNamara, 1991).

In 1990 an Institute of International Education (IIE) publication entitled Profiting from Education was published. The title strongly implies that there are conflicts between the profit and non profit enterprises. Authors Chambers and Cummings documented what they called the "cooperative ventures" or "a new wave of educational exchange" between Japanese business enterprises or municipalities and U.S. institutions of higher education, in an attempt to clarify the branch campus
phenomenon. With the exception of several newspaper and a few journal articles, Profiting from Education was the first publication that described characteristics of many of the U.S. institutions or programs which had been established in Japan since 1982. The authors argue, "The issues raised by the Japan-U.S. cooperative ventures are of particular importance at this juncture in world history because of the delicate nature of Japan-U.S. relationships" (p. 133). Spradley wrote something similar in 1979, and it may be even more true today: "In our complex society the need for understanding how other people see their experience has never been greater" (p. iv).

A later publication, American Higher Education in Japan (1992) and similar publications in Japan also attempted to clarify the situation with explanations and suggestions in order to help Japanese high school students make an informed choice for higher education. Palin says the publication is designed primarily for recent Japanese high school graduates, and those soon to graduate from high school. It is an attempt to gather in one easily accessible resource helpful and accurate information as to American Programs of higher education in Japan (p. vi).

A later statement points out that it is written "from an American perspective... and it is sympathetic to traditional American practice in governance, academic standards, and teaching. When this book is critical of U.S. branch schools in Japan, it aims at reform rather than discontinuation of current programs" (p. vi).

Branch campuses are created for diverse reasons including to fulfill an institution's mission, to increase global awareness in students and faculty, to increase enrollment and prestige, and to give faculty members and students experience abroad. Financial and political reasons have also been cited. According to Norris (1992, pp. 91-92), several major factors have contributed to the general development of American higher education in Japan:

1. A steadily appreciating Japanese yen as compared to foreign currencies encourages Japanese corporations to invest heavily in the United States. ... higher education is perceived to be a good investment... and thus we have seen numerous programs being developed as for-profit operations.
Some of the for-profit operations Norris mentions are Japanese owned schools in the U.S. including Teikyo universities in Iowa, Colorado, and Virginia, which are not classified as branch universities and which will not be dealt with in this study.

(2) There is a strong surge on the part of the Japanese citizenry toward internationalism. Statistics from Ringisho, February, 1992 (cited in Norris), show that in 1990-91, 36,610 Japanese students studied in the United States which is a doubling since 1986-87.

The Institute for International Education's (IIE) Open Doors annual survey shows that Japanese student enrollments in U.S. institutions increased 33 percent in the 1988-89 school year. Japan has continued to have the largest increase in the number of students studying in the United States since 1988 with increases of 33.0 percent in 1988-1989, 24.3 percent in 1989-1990, and 22.7 percent increase for 1990-1991. These were the highest increases among major sending countries (Educational Information Service, The Japan-United States Educational Commission, p. 1 [source: IIE Open Doors 1990-1991]).

(3) Many Japanese rural communities are concerned about the flight of the young people to the big city [Tokyo] and they think that if higher education was available, then many of these youth would stay in the area. Most of these communities would prefer a good Japanese university, but would settle for a good American program.

Many respondents and authors have said that it is far more costly to establish a Japanese institution of higher education than it is to establish a U.S. branch university in Japan. This issue is discussed further in Chapter 4.

(4) Because of the huge trade imbalance, a political movement to use higher education has been seen as one way to begin to offset this imbalance. The U.S.A-Japan Committee for Promoting Trade Expansion, led by Representative Richard Gephardt of Missouri and former Diet member Susumu Nikaido of Japan was established in 1986 to act as "matchmaker" between cities or municipalities and U.S. institutions of higher education. To date, three such matches have been made. Others are being negotiated (Norris, 1992; Kataoka, 1991).

(5) American higher education saw a window of opportunity in Japan to open up an area for students and faculty to have an international experience, to
increase the number of Japanese students on U.S. campuses, to convey a true, altruistic desire to assist the Japanese people, and an opportunity to recruit students with the ability to pay the necessary tuition and thus make a profit, or in the case of some institutions, provide a funding base to assist the home campus operations (pp. 91-92).

Hiatt (1989) claims that U.S. universities have various motives, not the least of which is the recruitment of students who can pay full tuition, as the college-age pool dwindles at home. An administrator at one of the branch campuses in Japan believes that U.S. schools and programs in Japan provide a valuable service for Japanese who wish to study in the U.S. In a 1990 article, Dorn stated that the "comparatively difficult academic and social adjustment of Japanese students going directly to undergraduate studies in the United States convinced some that branch campuses in Japan could serve as a bridge or stepping stone to an American bachelor's degree" (p. 191).

Branch campuses fall into three general types (Regur, 1992, p. 12): "intensive English programs which prepare Japanese for American academic programs; programs which offer a limited number of academic content courses and the opportunity to eventually transfer to a U.S. institution; and full degree programs taught in English. All of them incorporate aspects of American educational philosophy but none are recognized by the Japanese government as university programs." In fact, the Japanese government classifies "all American educational bodies as 'foreign corporations' and does not recognize a U.S. degree granted in Japan as valid" (Rutledge, 1992, p. 12). Curiously, The Ministry of Education (Monbusho), "recognizes degrees earned abroad" (Shishin, 1989, p. 5).

The difference between the two countries is in the basic strategies for accreditation and standards. In Japan, the Ministry of Education sets guidelines before an institution is established and exerts national control over educational institutions. In the U.S., accreditation organizations evaluate the quality of an educational institution after it is established and operating. Each state may also impose standards, but there is no national control. Because U.S. educational
institutions do not conform to Japanese standards, the U.S. schools cannot be recognized or governed by the Japanese Ministry of Education as official universities or colleges. However, the U.S. branch campuses can be classified as Special Training Schools or Miscellaneous Schools by being given authorization from local authorities (Background Report for CULCON, 1991, p. 11-12).

The Japanese Ministry of Education's stance on U.S. branch campuses is that "sufficient information and explanation should be given to the potential students so that they may not have any impossible expectation or perspective" because of the differences in the educational systems (Background Report for CULCON, 1991, p. 13). A respondent from Monbusho said that the Ministry of Education is not concerned about the branch campuses because U.S. institutions in Japan serve a relatively small number of Japanese students overall. While nearly six million students are enrolled in Japanese institutions of higher education in Japan, U.S. branch campuses in Japan together "at most teach a student population of from 9,000 to 10,000" (Palin, quoted in Regur 1992, p. A44).

Advantages and Disadvantages

From a U.S. perspective, American institutions participating in these efforts seem to believe that they will gain in a variety of ways. Geer (1988) stated that an increase in revenues is one assumed outcome. Numerous opportunities for faculty development are also perceived and encouraged on the American home campus. Study abroad opportunities for American students expand and diversify. Internships in business, government, and in instructional programs may become available. For all Americans participating, these programs may offer excellent opportunities to learn much about the foreign culture and the history, customs, language and people of the country. Some may wish to concentrate on learning how a particular country conducts business. Finally, an American institution may believe that its image abroad can be enhanced through these programs, its name made more prominent (p. 35).

Guyon and Klasek (1991) think that branch campuses offer several advantages including raising home campus morale by offering new and exciting educational and
Many Japanese at least perceive that there are some advantages of American higher education over Japanese higher education because of some of its more flexible characteristics. Regur (1992) wrote, "U.S. universities have a worldwide reputation for high academic standards and accessibility which has and will continue to attract Japanese students" (p. 8). Often, students who are not able to enter the Japanese University of their choice opt to attend a U.S. branch campus before transferring to a university in the United States. Some Japanese students choose an American school as an alternative to the Japanese educational system. Japanese students studying at branch campuses say they are getting an education they could never receive at a Japanese university (Japan Report, 1989). An administrator, quoted in Japan Report, pointed out that "The interest [on the part of Japanese students] is in the American educational experience. There's more creativity and freedom of choice for the individual" (p. 4).

While foreign universities offer many potential benefits including new educational opportunities for Japanese students who fail to gain entry to Japan's universities, promotion of internationalization, and better U.S.-Japan relations, "they're also expected to boost local economies" (Oshima, 1988, p. 32). From a developer's perspective, also cited in Japan Report, the most enthusiastic reception for the branch campuses seems to be coming from small cities and towns throughout Japan, which are vying for their presence. For these locations, a branch campus can provide "a valuable boost both for business and prestige" (p. 5). The increased interest in U.S.-style higher education in Japan has been generated principally by "the growth in the number of Japanese students who want to study in English and local governments eager to attract U.S. institutions to their areas" (Japan Report 1989, p. 4).
However, not all Japanese are supportive of U.S. branch schools. For example, according to Suzuki (1990), a town of 30,000 spent 1 billion yen ($6.9 million) on land and school facilities to establish a branch university. Students did not do as well as expected learning English and after the first-year English course "only 156 (out of 316) were allowed to take college courses" (p. 6). Students and parents complained they did not expect to "fail." Many respondents cited "educational differences" as a reason for some of the delay in learning at a slower pace than expected.

It's a well known fact that it is extremely difficult to enter a Japanese university, but once students are accepted, they often do not work very hard or attend classes regularly. Students have no fear of failing despite lower attendance or grades. In contrast, it is often relatively easy to enter many American higher education institutions, but once enrolled, students must prove themselves by earning acceptable grades. If students do not meet the appropriate U.S. academic standards, they are failed. Lenn (1991) said

Cultural differences, and particularly Japanese expectations of institutions of higher education, vary sharply with the nature of American higher education. Generally speaking, if admitted into an institution (even for a language program, much less the degree granting program), a Japanese student (and parents) often make the incorrect assumption that the student will be successful academically—or at least graduate (as is the case with Japanese higher education). The American notions of individual responsibility in scholarship and education without guarantees of outcome are foreign to the Japanese. Recruiters [usually Japanese partners], for example, do not broadcast a basic fact known to the educational community that the Japanese passing rate for English as a second language means that there will be many, and probably most, who will not progress to a degree level program (p. 17).

In another situation cited in the Japan Times (Oct. 6, 1989), a local civic group filed suit "demanding that the . . . municipal government be barred from using public money for inviting a U.S. university to open a local branch. The group said high tuition fees—amounting to about $10,000 a year—would prevent most residents from using the facility" (p. 4). According to several informants, in that particular case, many of the local residents were unhappy with the "manner and the speed" in which
the "deal" was made. Some said the lawsuit was "politically motivated," rather than a complaint about the American school being there. Ironically, one of the reasons some municipalities have cited for inviting U.S. branch universities into their locale was to encourage young people to stay in the area rather than to migrate to Tokyo. It was reported that it is not uncommon for Japanese parents to spend $10,000 or more a year for their children's education through private preparatory schools.

Summary

Education is very important to the Japanese people, but access to higher education in Japan is limited. As many as 400,000 Japanese high school graduates who want post secondary education will not be able to attend Japanese universities because of government guidelines and regulations. American higher education is known for being more accessible and for offering more diverse educational components than Japanese higher education. Therefore, it is believed that U.S. branch campuses offer an alternative for those who are unable to attend Japanese universities. In addition, U.S. branch campuses in Japan provide opportunities for non-traditional Japanese students who for various reasons do not wish to attend Japanese institutions (American Higher Education in Japan, 1992).

The construct of organization theory and design offers valuable guidelines for structuring an organization or institution to meet its desired goals and objectives. Guidelines, or models, can also help planners design an organization to fit into the external environment in which it must operate. The external environment may be a critical factor that determines the success or failure of an organization. Four theoretical models are described in this chapter: (1) closed-system, (2) open-system, (3) political coalition, and (4) institutional. The researcher suggests that planners of U.S. branch campuses in Japan used a combination of all four models, perhaps unknowingly, because of the unique circumstances of linking profit and non profit enterprises, and because there were no guidelines available to fit their specific situations. However, it is not unusual for administrators to use experience and
intuition to guide them through new processes and problems without referring to theoretical models.

Although data on initiation of organizations are limited, literature describing general characteristics of organizations indicates that educational institutions and businesses are similar in many ways. That is, successful organizations must plan carefully, reconcile power and control issues, and understand the environment. However, Baldridge (1983) stated that no two organizations are the same and any adequate decision making and governance must reflect the differences.

U.S. branch campuses in Japan are sponsored by Japanese corporations or business individuals, or by the U.S.A-Japan Committee for Promoting Trade Expansion. Confusion and misunderstandings have occurred because profit and non profit entities have been linked, and because of language, cultural and educational differences between the two countries. Confusion and misunderstanding may have caused the discontinuance of some programs.

As in any organization, advantages and disadvantages have been cited. For Americans, advantages include opportunities for faculty and students to gain international experience by living and working in another culture. It is also assumed that there will be an increase in tuition revenue for the U.S. home based campus. Disadvantages may be a lack of understanding of the political and culture environment, and disputes over control of financial and academic matters. For Japanese, advantages include increased access to higher education, an alternative to the Japanese educational system, and a boost to local economies. Disadvantages cited are that students take longer to learn English because they are in their indigenous environment, and cultural and educational misunderstandings.
CHAPTER 3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

In an effort to expand the knowledge base of how U.S. branch universities or programs were established and implemented in Japan during the 1980s and early 1990s, a qualitative, descriptive case study was designed that would enable the researcher to examine, describe, and analyze the situations and events systematically. A qualitative case study is "an ideal design for understanding and interpreting observations of educational phenomena" (Merriam, 1988, p. 2).

Case study is a method of investigation which allows researchers to collect and analyze various types of data in fields of study where relatively little is known about a particular subject. The case study is a basic design "that can accommodate a variety of disciplinary perspectives, as well as philosophical perspectives" (Merriam, p. 2). Merriam believes that "research focused on discovery, insight, and understanding from the perspectives of those being studied offers the greatest promise of making significant contributions to the knowledge base and practice of education" (p. 3).

The case study method has been used successfully by clinical psychologists and social scientists for many years to explore behavioral patterns and to ascertain motives and incentives for an individual's or group's actions. Through close systematic observations and interviews over extended periods of time, investigators have discovered how and why individuals think, feel, and act in specific situations. According to Merriam,

*a descriptive case study in education is one that presents a detailed account of the phenomenon under study . . . Innovative programs and practices are often the focus of descriptive case studies in education. Such studies often form a data base for future comparison and theory building* (p. 27).

Rationale for the Research Design

The case study method was chosen for this investigation because the unique set of circumstances under study could best be researched by observing campuses, interviewing respondents who had been directly or indirectly involved in the process,
and by reviewing both published and unpublished accounts of the events and situations that have taken place since this phenomenon began. A description of the issues and areas of concern, or variables (as noted in Chapter 1) are written as a composite case study of seven institutions because, although each institution may be different, many aspects of the processes to establish branch campuses in Japan are similar, and it was judged that the processes, not the individual institutions, were the important factors that could be helpful to those who may be considering similar ventures in Japan or elsewhere. However, the data have come directly from visits to Japan campuses, from interviews with Japanese and American administrators, sponsors, organizers, and teachers, and from printed sources. Many informants, along with Yucas and Holzner (1988), believe it is important to have documentation of this phenomenon "so that the academic community and international education administrators can conduct informed discussions and arrive at well-grounded choices" (p. 41).

Because this study focuses on innovative models for establishing U.S. universities or programs in Japan, discovery, insight, and interpretation were deemed by the researcher to be more appropriate than hypothesis testing. The qualitative, descriptive case study method enabled the researcher to explore a subject of interest and controversy, to discover and interpret multiple variables, to relate practice to a theory, and to describe the end product with a holistic view, realizing that the data collected may or may not be representative of the entire group of 30 to 35 U.S. institutions of higher education presently operating in Japan.

A decision was made by the researcher to investigate as many U.S. universities or programs in Japan as possible, but to treat the characteristics of those campuses as a composite; in other words, to describe trends and patterns observed at several sites. To investigate only one school in a single case study would have given a distorted picture of the overall branch campus situation. Although there are similarities and differences in the way branch campuses were created, it would not be relevant to compare specific schools or programs because the schools opened in Japan at different
times in different locations with different sponsors and, in some cases, with different purposes and missions. In addition, some schools or programs closed unexpectedly between 1991 and 1993, and the researcher decided it was necessary to look at some that "failed" and reasons why they failed as well as the "successes" (or, at least, survivors). Miles and Huberman (1984) suggest "Multiple-site studies are especially appealing because they can purposively sample, and thereby make claims about, a larger universe of people, settings, events, or processes than can single-site studies" (p. 37). The events and processes which led to the creation and implementation of, as well as the disengagement of, some branch programs were judged the important factors that could be helpful to those who may be considering similar ventures in Japan or elsewhere. Therefore, this investigation is presented as a composite case study of several characteristics of U.S. institutions in Japan, which offer programs primarily for Japanese students.

The descriptions and analyses presented are of specific variables, described earlier, which are related to the planning and implementation of the selected institutions or programs. Most, if not all, of the particular categories, or variables, for this study were chosen because these emerged as key issues that administrators, planners, teachers and sponsors indicated as problematic or that needed to be taken into account regardless of where an institution or program is or might be located in the world.

Data for the study were collected from 1990 to 1993. The process included conducting personal and telephone interviews, visiting branch campuses in Japan, participating in conferences and workshops on this topic, and reviewing printed documents. Documents included books, journal and newspaper articles, and university publications from the schools that were studied.

In accordance with the Human Subjects Review Committee guidelines at Iowa State University, pseudonyms or general terms are used throughout this study in an attempt to protect the confidentiality of the respondents and the programs that were investigated.
Selection of Institutions and Informants for Research

Data were gathered from seven separate programs. The seven schools in the study were selected because (1) they were public institutions rather than private institutions, (2) they were prominent and, in some cases, controversial; that is, they were mentioned repeatedly at conferences or in journal or newspaper articles, (3) administrators, teachers and/or sponsors at those schools were willing to discuss the establishment and implementation of the programs, and (4) the schools and/or the informants were accessible to the researcher. Characteristics of several other schools or programs are mentioned in the study in order either to compare or contrast some features in a category, or to broaden the scope of the overall picture. Data from those schools or programs were obtained primarily from printed sources, but in some cases, from informants.

Informants were chosen initially from recommendations of international educators (mostly colleagues) who knew something about U.S. branch programs. The first informants the researcher contacted reaffirmed the researcher's belief that the investigation was viable and necessary because (1) the branch campus venture in Japan was a new and often misunderstood phenomenon, (2) there was little synthesized information on U.S.-Japan educational ventures, and (3) although informants viewed their programs as "successful," they admitted there were many problems setting them up and that others might benefit from knowing what was involved in establishing programs abroad.

In some instances informants offered suggestions for how to conduct the study, whom to contact, and how to refine the set of questions being asked for clarity and relevance. Some informants also cautioned the researcher that many administrators or educators might not be willing to be interviewed for fear of being misquoted or misunderstood. They cited two reasons: (1) the issue of branch universities or programs was very controversial, especially in Japan, where the Japanese press had expressed, in most instances, a very negative attitude toward U.S. branch programs, and (2) a 1990 IIE (Institute of International Education) publication, Profiting from
Education, had been judged "negative and inaccurate in part" by several administrators and others involved with setting up programs. One administrator asked, "Whose side are you on?" and "What's in it (the study) for us?" "Are you going to hurt us, or help us?" The researcher provided professional and character references and carefully explained the purpose of the study and eventually gained the confidence of many informants.

The first informants suggested other possible informants to contact because of their direct involvement in the process of planning, negotiating, or implementing a particular program. Because of their involvement in the events under investigation, many individuals in several other institutions (not branch campuses) were also interviewed, including people at the U.S. Embassy in Japan, the Japan-United States Educational Commission (Fulbright Program), the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture of Japan (Monbusho), the U.S.A-Japan Committee for Promoting Trade Expansion, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, and the Laurasian Institution. The researcher also interviewed a businessman who was a Chamber of Commerce member of a Japanese community which was sponsoring a U.S. branch university, and a banker who had been partly responsible for helping to arrange a controversial bank loan to support the U.S. branch campus.

Students were not interviewed in this study because the central focus is on the process of establishing and administering a program of study and students are not involved in that process. Granted, students are a critical component of any educational program, but the purpose of this research was not to analyze student views of the branch campuses. Student perspectives could be a valuable study for the future.

Reliability and Validity

Talking to a number of people from many perspectives in many settings over a period of time, and then comparing and analyzing the interview responses with printed reports provided a valuable cross-check on information gathered and on the
credibility of the informants. After reviewing all the data it became clear that, despite observing minor disagreements about how a particular program was functioning, the researcher had discovered consistent trends and patterns which could provide valuable insights into the process of establishing U.S. branch campuses. Whenever any small discrepancy appeared in the data, it was checked and cross checked with other informants and with other printed material to clarify the information in order to protect the validity and reliability of this study.

Personal and telephone interviews were important to this study because informants added information that was not available in print. Site visits provided the researcher a chance to observe what was really happening to talk to teachers and support help, such as secretaries and librarians, not only to get their perspective, but also to verify information from other respondents.

Gathering data through a variety of techniques and sources helped the researcher to better understand the overall branch campus phenomenon and the individual situations better, but more importantly, to understand what the people involved perceived the situation to be. In addition, the consistent nature of the data convinced the researcher that an assumption made in this study, namely, that all respondents answered questions honestly to the best of their ability and knowledge of a given situation, is true.

While it was not possible to get an "emic" view of this situation in Japan, the researcher was able to obtain the opinions of several Japanese individuals, and some general attitudes towards U.S. branch campuses from Japanese newspapers. A future study may be able to remedy this imbalance.

Data Collection Methods

The data presented in this report were collected during a three-year period from (1) conferences and workshops on the topic, (2) telephone and personal interviews with people in the United States and Japan, (3) on-site visits and observations in
Japan, and (4) printed documents, both published and unpublished. A chronological summary of the research process can be found at the end of this section.

Conferences and Workshops

The investigation began in May 1990 when the researcher participated in an all day preconference workshop entitled "Developing Competence in Dealing with Japan" held in conjunction with the 42nd annual National NAFSA: Association of International Educators Conference in Portland, Oregon. At the workshop, information was presented, issues were discussed, and questions were raised by several American and Japanese administrators as well as other interested and/or involved persons from both countries. The topic was further discussed at several separate sessions during that conference with both Japanese and American administrators and educators. Several of the presenters encouraged the researcher to investigate the topic further because of the nature of the situation and because so little information was available at that time.

Data were obtained from other conferences and workshops in addition to the previously mentioned conference in Portland, Oregon, in May 1990. Because the researcher was unable to attend the May 1991 NAFSA National Conference held in Boston, Massachusetts, cassette tapes of all sessions pertaining to U.S. higher educational institutions in Japan were obtained and reviewed. A colleague who attended the conference supplied the researcher with extensive notes and information. Many of the conference presenters, who were recorded on tape, were later interviewed by the researcher in order to verify information.

In November 1991, as an invited participant, the researcher participated in a 4-day workshop entitled "Setting Up the EFL Program Abroad: Issues and Concerns of U.S. Institutions," held in Washington, D.C., and sponsored by NAFSA. Several people who had helped establish programs in several countries, including Japan, served on a panel. Discussions between the panel of experts and the participants focused on many of the same issues that the researcher had chosen to include in the
present study. Extensive notes and all workshop sessions were recorded on cassette tapes. All data were later reviewed and analyzed.

The researcher also attended TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) international conferences in March 1991 in New York, and in March 1992 in Vancouver, B.C., and NAFSA's 44th annual conference in May 1992 in Chicago, Illinois, in order to attend sessions on the research topic and to talk to people who were involved with establishing branch campuses in Japan. Again, sessions were recorded, printed information was collected, and all data were analyzed.

**Telephone and Personal Interviews**

In October, 1990, a research proposal for the study was presented to and approved by the researcher's Program of Study (POS) Committee and a request for permission to use human subjects was subsequently submitted to the Human Subjects Review Committee at Iowa State University. After receiving approval of the research plan from the Human Subjects Review Committee at Iowa State University, the researcher began conducting formal telephone interviews starting on May 6, 1991.

The usual procedure for obtaining data within the U.S. was that a telephone call was made to a possible informant, an explanation of the project was given, and the informant was asked if s/he would be willing to participate in the research. If the informant agreed, a future interview time was arranged, and a copy of the researcher's questions was sent so that the informant could read and study them before the telephone or personal interview. For people in Japan, usually a letter or faxed message asking for permission and an appointment was sent to possible informants. (Please see Appendixes E and F for a sample letter and a list of questions sent to respondents.) Respondents in Japan were interviewed during the summer of 1991 and in January, 1992. All informants gave all information verbally. Informants did not fill out questionnaires, nor did they write reviews or notes and send them to the researcher. However, they supplied printed documents including internal
publications about the branch school or program as well as newspaper and journal articles in many cases.

Although the researcher informed respondents that interviews would last no more than one hour at a time, respondents often were so anxious to discuss their programs or their own involvement in those programs that interviews sometimes lasted up to two hours. In some cases, two or three separate interviews took place for about one hour each time. Later, some personal interviews in Japan lasted almost three hours because they often included tours of the facilities. In almost all of the cases the personal interviews were recorded on cassette tapes and extensive notes were taken. The information gathered was then transferred to a computer.

Exact transcriptions of the actual interviews and information from presentations at conferences or workshops which were recorded on cassette tapes were not made for two reasons: (1) the overall amount of material collected was so great, and (2) much of the information on the tapes was not relevant to the central focus of this study. Instead, the researcher took extensive notes after listening to the tapes and noted patterns, trends, and problems which were discussed repeatedly by many respondents. That information was then compared and cross checked with information gathered from other respondents and from printed information.

What emerged from questions and information on the tapes and from various printed sources was what later evolved into the key research questions, listed later in this chapter. The research questions reflect concerns that the researcher and many respondents discussed, such as steps in the creation process, problems encountered throughout the process, and procedures or strategies that were used to deal with those problems. The patterns, trends, and problems discussed with respondents then became the basis for the four major variables chosen for the study. As mentioned earlier, informants indicated that those variables were the key issues that may influence the creation and the survival of branch campuses, and they were the most relevant issues for future planners to take into account.
On-Site Visits in Japan

While living and teaching in Japan from June to August 1991, the researcher visited branch campuses and other educational institutions and interviewed eight people: two who were directly involved with setting up programs, one who was presently running a program, one who was overseeing developments in many of the branch programs, and four educators who had taught at U.S. branch campuses in Japan in the early stages of development. The researcher wanted teachers' perspectives on the branch campus phenomenon in addition to administrators' perspectives. After both verbal and written permission was obtained from the respondents (Please see Appendix G for permission form.), the interviews were recorded on cassette tapes. Two-hour personal interviews were conducted with each respondent.

The respondents gave general and specific information about their programs, specific information about their involvement, personal views about the individual programs they were associated with, and their opinions about the overall branch university situation, present and future, in Japan. Administrators provided printed documents, including brochures, some of their program's records, and periodical articles. In addition, they suggested other possible informants, people who had been involved in some way with the establishment of several branch campuses. From September through December 1991, additional telephone interviews were conducted with administrators at U.S home universities, and arrangements were made to visit more branch campuses and to personally interview more people in Japan in early January, 1992.

In January 1992, a second trip was made to Japan to collect data. Five branch campuses in four cities in Japan were visited and a total of twenty three people were interviewed including administrators, teachers, secretaries, a Japanese banker, a Japanese businessman, a member of the Monbusho (Japanese Ministry of Education), and a journalist from one of the leading newspapers in Japan. Ten of the respondents were Japanese. More printed documents were also collected from informants, and
copies of newspaper articles were obtained from the Diet (Japanese government) Library.

On-site visits were especially helpful to the researcher for several reasons: (1) to observe the actual branch campus settings, which included facilities and equipment; (2) to discuss the topic with additional respondents, including teachers, secretaries, and support staff; (3) to briefly assess the environment in which the branch campus was located; and (4) to collect printed information not available in the U.S.

Printed Materials

Early in 1990, the researcher began exploring U.S. branch campus issues by reading about and discussing the topic with several people in the U.S. who had been involved with establishing branch programs in Japan during the 1980s. From May 1990 to May 1993 printed articles, mostly from journals and newspapers, were collected and studied. As noted earlier, many of the articles were supplied by respondents. Other printed materials were collected from library searches both in the U.S. and in Japan. Still others were gathered from conference participants who had either participated in or studied the branch campus phenomenon, and then written about some aspect of it.

Some documents focused on the initiation of branch campuses while others focused on educational and cultural differences. A few articles discussed accreditation and the implications of misunderstanding the American higher education accreditation system. However, most articles focused on problems the branch campuses were having, and often gave detailed accounts of campus closings.

In order to "manage" the vast amount of the total data collected from all sources, a "dissertation diary" was kept on computer which included summaries of all conversations and interviews and some transcriptions, detailed conference notes, site-visit notes, and summaries of documents read. Various pieces of information were eventually "coded," as suggested by Bogdan and Biklen (1982) and Miles and Huberman (1984), as a way of organizing and analyzing the data. Codes included:
(1) setting, context, and environment, (2) sponsors, (3) negotiations and contracts, (4) the planning process, (5) faculty, (6) students, and (7) constraints in the process of establishing a partnership.

The following time line of events summarizes the data collection process used by the researcher.

Research Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 1990-May 1991</td>
<td>Researched the topic through the literature and discussed the topic with international educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1990</td>
<td>Presented a proposal to (and received permission from) POS (Program of Study) committee to conduct the research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1991</td>
<td>Attended sessions on research topic at TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) international conference in New York City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1991</td>
<td>Received permission to conduct study from Iowa State University Human Subjects Review Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1991</td>
<td>Obtained and reviewed cassette tapes of all sessions pertaining to U.S. higher educational institutions in Japan from NAFSA: The Association of International Educators 43rd National Annual Conference held in Boston, Massachusetts (Researcher was unable to attend).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1991</td>
<td>Began telephone interviews in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 1991-Aug. 1991 Made on-site visits to U.S. branch campuses in Japan and conducted personal interviews with administrators and educators while living and teaching in Japan.


January 1992 Made on-site visits to U.S branch campuses in Japan and conducted personal interviews with 23 people.

March 1992 Attended sessions on research topic at TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) international conference in Vancouver, B.C.


January 1992-1993 Continued investigation by conducting interviews, analyzing written communication, and reviewing the literature.

Research Plan

Early, preliminary research questions were designed to determine how U.S. home campuses "changed" into new branch campuses in Japan. The first questionnaire was modeled after Kettner, Daley and Nichols' "A Model for Organizational and Community Change," in their book, *Initiating Change in Organizations and Communities*. The initial questionnaire was mailed to several informants before they were interviewed. However, most of the first respondents did not think the idea of "change" accurately described the situation. They indicated that U.S. branch programs were a completely new and innovative venture, not a program that was modified and improved and that the home campus had not changed. Therefore, a new set of questions was developed to fit the situation, and those questions were then
used for later phone interviews in the U.S. Eventually, the questions were shortened and further refined and used for respondents both in the U.S. and in Japan.

One question which nearly all informants judged fair and relevant, which was on the initial questionnaire and which the researcher always asked, was "If this part of the process could be done again, what are your suggestions for doing it differently?" The answers to this question invariably produced much of the most interesting data because the answers included problems and constraints encountered in the process of the creation of the programs.

Research Questions

As noted earlier the following research questions were developed and refined after talking directly to many people and by analyzing information on tapes and in print. As patterns and trends began to become clearer and problems became more obvious, questions evolved and were refined as more data were collected. With the intent of collecting and analyzing data from the viewpoint of other universities or programs wanting to establish campuses in Japan, the study was initially set up to include general questions about:

- the philosophy behind the programs
- the purpose and methods of setting them up
- goals and objectives, and whether those were met for Americans and for Japanese
- negotiations
- decisions on financial and academic aspects of the program
- transition issues or problems
- implementation of the programs
- student transfers to U.S. universities
- constraints in the process
- evaluation of the programs
The research in its early stages was designed to try to get specific answers to the following questions:

(1). Who was involved in setting up the program? When did that process begin? How did the plan develop? Why was a branch university or program developed? When did the program officially open?

(2). What was (or is) the purpose of the program? What were (are) the goals, objectives, philosophy? Who developed these?

(3). Who was (is) involved with negotiating finances and academic control? Who controls governance and funding?

(4). Who runs the program from the U.S. side? Who made (makes) decisions about the educational objectives? About implementation of the program? Is there an academic coordinator at the University in the U.S.? Is there a separate academic coordinator in Japan?

(5). What constraints or problems were (are) there in setting up or running the program?

(6). Who is in charge of standards? Accreditation?

From those beginning ideas and questions, the following questions were developed and categorized:

**Purpose, Rationale, Goals, Risks**

What is the purpose of U.S. higher education in Japan?
Why should U.S. universities establish branch campuses in Japan? What are some advantages for the home university?
What is the educational benefit to the U.S. institution?
What is the value, internationally and domestically?
What is the motivation, or rationale, for setting up a program overseas?
What are the goals of U.S. branch universities or programs?
What are the risks—for the host country partners, for the home university? Will the benefits outweigh the costs?
Why is there a rush to establish U.S. branches in Japan?
What about establishing branch campuses in other countries?

**Financing and Control**

How is a branch campus financed?
How are funds disbursed? How are long term obligations arranged?
How are short term obligations arranged?
Who has control over the resources, including money, land, buildings, and equipment?
Who has control over the educational aspects?
Who has control over recruitment of faculty? Recruitment of students?
How is recruitment handled?
What are some problems associated with various aspects of control?
How can an institution maintain an American style education in Japan when there are vast educational and cultural differences? Who decides on cultural issues?
Is there danger of a sponsor discontinuing support? What happens if a sponsor discontinues support?

**Administration**

How are overseas campuses administered and staffed?
Whom will branch universities serve, and how? (Japanese students, U.S. students, U.S. faculty, others?)
How can set curricula be transplanted from the U.S. to another country?
What does it take for an overseas educational venture to be successful?
How is "success" defined and measured?
How is the venture evaluated? By whom? When? What are the problems in cross-cultural evaluation?
Are U.S. branches getting "2nd class" Japanese students?
Are U.S. branches 2nd class institutions?
What are the consequences if the venture fails?
Who is legally and ethically accountable for discontinuance of a program?

Setting up the Program
What does one have to know before going into another country to set up a program?
What are the home universities’ responsibilities?
What are the Japanese partners’ responsibilities?
How long does it take to establish a branch campus?
What are some constraints in the organizational process?

Implementation
How is the program implemented?
Who is involved in the implementation?
How will "adjustments" to the program be made? By whom?

Student Concerns
Why do students choose overseas campuses?
What kinds of students choose U.S. institutions overseas?
Why don't students go directly to the states?
How can students determine which school is a "good" U.S. branch, and which is a "questionable" school?
Are students who attend overseas branches prepared for university work in the U.S.?

Accreditation
Who accredits branch campuses?
What is the process for accreditation?
Why is accreditation important? To whom is it important?
Are standards and quality assurance a concern, or problem?
To whom are standards and quality assurance a concern?
Much of the data gathered from this questionnaire is not included in this document because some of it does not relate directly to the central focus of this study. However, the data not included here may provide further research possibilities.
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present and describe data that were collected between 1990 and 1993 from respondents at seven separate U.S. institutions of higher education which started branch campuses in Japan between 1982 and 1990. The data, gathered from many interviews and discussions, consist of ideas and perspectives of the key respondents in this study, that is, planners, administrators and international educators who were directly or indirectly involved with establishing U.S. branch campuses in Japan. In addition, information from individuals from other institutions who were involved in some way as well as related material from printed sources are also included. The information presented is usually a composite of respondents' answers and recommendations. Recommendations are included in this chapter because they were offered, in some instances, as answers to many of the research questions that were asked.

In an attempt to protect the confidentiality of the respondents and the institutions that participated in this research pseudonyms or general terms are used when describing the situations. Occasionally, an informant's direct words are used, but without attribution. (A list of informants can be found in Appendix A. A list of the institutions studied can be found in Appendix B.) Brief profiles of the seven institutions studied are included in this chapter.

Several issues that were questioned, studied, and discussed during the investigation were

(1) the process by which branch institutions are established (from initial idea, through the negotiations, through creating and implementing procedures)
(2) who has control over financial and academic issues
(3) what types of students the branch campuses attract
(4) recruitment practices
(5) types of courses taught
(6) the use of English or Japanese language in courses
(7) TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language), or other test requirements
(8) accreditation
(9) language, culture, and educational differences
(10) land use in Japan
(11) expectations of parents, students, administrators, and teachers,
(12) negative press
(13) the closing of institutions or programs
(14) the value of a U.S. university degree when graduates apply for a job in Japan.

In order to manage the vast amount of data generated from investigating the above issues and to fulfill the purpose of this study, the issues were reduced to four broad categories, or variables, which are the central focus of this study:

(1) planning and setting up the program
(2) partners/sponsors
(3) control over the financial and academic aspects of the program
(4) the influence of the external environment on the program.

Information from some of the general issues listed above are included in the descriptions whenever it is judged necessary to add clarification or to give a more complete picture of the overall branch campus situation. Some of the issues that are not dealt with in this study might provide future research ideas or projects.

Profiles of Institutions and Programs

The following profiles are offered so that the reader may have an idea of the types of institutions that were studied, how and when they were started, and what their present status is at the time of this writing. Information for the profiles was gathered from personal interviews with administrators and educators at the branch campuses during on-site visits, from administrators at the U.S. home-based institutions, and from the institutions’ handbooks.
Institution A

Institution A began offering classes in April 1982 to Japanese as well as foreign students. Institution A had been approached in 1981 by an intermediary, representing a group of Japanese businessmen who were interested in establishing a branch campus in Japan.

The Japanese businessmen's idea was to offer only an intensive English program, but that didn't follow the mission, goals or objectives of the U.S. home campus. After about one and a half years of negotiations, the Japan campus opened in a large metropolitan area and offered a pre-college Intensive English Language Program and a graduate M.Ed. program in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. Gradually, credit bearing courses in the Arts and Sciences were added and expanded. The programs now offered include the pre-college Intensive English Language Program; degree programs in Undergraduate Studies; and Masters and Doctorate degree programs in Graduate Studies. Faculty from the U.S. home campus are brought to the Japan campus for up to two years to teach the credit bearing courses. Faculty from other institutions are hired when necessary. English as a Second Language teachers may be hired from anywhere.

Institution A changed partners in 1991. It is now working with its third partner and has recently moved to a new location, but it is still within a metropolitan area. The Japan campus has its own governing board composed of Japanese nationals and one notable former American senator. The board maintains fiscal responsibility for the program. However, the responsibility for all academic matters including the academic budget, admission, programs, policies, staffing, and student records rests with the U.S. home campus. The program is administered in Japan, but with close ties to the administration at the U.S. home campus. The institution has produced more than 500 graduates so far. Enrollment during the 1991-1992 school year was about 2,200 students. About 150 students a year go to the American home campus. The rest of the students stay in Japan because the branch campus offers a complete program of study.
Institution B

Institution B was located on the outskirts of a large urban area near other educational institutions. The U.S. home campus of Institution B, since at least 1982, had developed a strong commitment to internationalism and had wanted to expand international educational opportunities in other countries, including Japan, for faculty and Japanese and American students. The establishment of Institution B in Japan was a joint effort of the home campus and the state in which it was located in order to promote cultural understanding and economic development with Japan. The city in which the home campus was located had established a sister-city relationship with a city in Japan, and the home campus had gathered strong support from government agencies and business interests.

The U.S. home campus had many requests from Japanese organizations to form a partnership for a branch campus in Japan. After turning down a request from the U.S.A.-Japan Committee for Promoting Trade Expansion, a small educational company was eventually chosen for a partner, and after about two years of negotiation, Institution B opened in April 1990, offering an intensive English training program in a large metropolitan area of Japan. The plan agreed upon initially was to follow the ESL (English as a Second Language) program with a low-level General Education credit-bearing program to attract more Japanese students, and to add a Japanese language program, which might encourage American students to study abroad.

However, opposition from the sponsor, who was not able to increase enrollment as he had hoped, and opposition from a new administrator at the U.S. home campus forced the discontinuance of the program in April 1992. Strains had developed early in the partnership when the sponsor leased an office building in Japan for the "campus" and planned and set up everything without consulting the American counterparts. Because of cultural differences regarding space and privacy, a number of changes were later made. Additional problems developed over budgetary and curriculum matters, as well as over administrative practices.
A total of 67 students were enrolled in the program when it closed. Some students were allowed to transfer to an American university or college in the U.S.

**Institution C**

Institution C began as an English program in April 1988 in an office building in a large metropolitan area of Japan. An earlier two-year contract with a Japanese Foundation had provided for Japanese students to study English at the U.S. home campus. The Japanese Foundation suggested establishing an English program in Japan based on the home campus program. Negotiations for the new program lasted about one year. A contract specified everything in writing and was very detailed. Small revisions were made continuously, but "neither the concept, nor the mission changed."

There were many problems getting started including cultural misunderstandings, hiring teachers, setting the managing fee for running the program, and getting the branch campus infrastructure (admissions, advisors, residence halls) in place. Organizers of the initial program planned for 60 students; 160 showed up. Administrators worked through the problems and complications and began offering low-level academic courses spring 1989.

The program is now in its fourth year. The present student body numbers about 230 students. Students typically study English for one year, then transfer to the U.S. home campus or another U.S. college or university. More English instruction in the U.S. is usually necessary before students can begin academic work.

A 1991 self-study following guidelines provided by TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) was conducted concurrently with a self-study done at the U.S. home campus. (Please see an example of one type of a self-study in Appendix H, and a copy of TESOL Core Standards in Appendix I.) The conclusion at the branch campus was that the initial build-up phase is over, and "the institution is somewhat established in its identity and its procedures." Students cited the branch
campus as "a needed alternative to traditional Japanese educational choices at the collegiate level" despite the "inadequate facilities."

**Institution D**

Institution D is sponsored by a Japanese corporation. The U.S. home institution is one of several state-supported higher education campuses in the state system. The mission of the U.S. home campus stresses concepts of access and excellence and admits students from all backgrounds in the belief that every human being has a right to the best possible education. The U.S. home campus is located in a large metropolitan area of the U.S. and has primarily a Hispanic and Black student population, but almost no Asian population. The majority of students at the Japanese branch campus are Japanese, but students from Korea, Taiwan, and the U.S. are also enrolled there. About half of the Japanese enrollment comes from the area surrounding the branch campus.

The U.S. home campus was approached in 1988 by an intermediary who helped arrange negotiations between the U.S. institution and the Japanese sponsor. The Japanese sponsor offered land and spacious facilities. After traveling to Japan and negotiating with the Japanese sponsor, the U.S. home campus president decided it would be an advantage to the home campus "to expand opportunities of access and excellence in an international setting."

The Japanese campus opened in April 1990 in a rural area located about 45 minutes from a major urban area. Students first enroll in the ESL program, and unlike at most other branch campuses, are admitted to regular college status and begin earning credits (even for English instruction) toward a degree at the home institution. Once students reach a certain level of English proficiency, they may select from a variety of regular liberal arts courses in the curriculum, taught entirely in English. After completing the appropriate course offerings at the Japanese branch campus, students may take the remainder of their courses at the U.S. home campus.
or another U.S. college or university. Present enrollment at the branch is about 250 students.

The following three institutions were aided in their establishment by the U.S.A.-Japan Committee for Promoting Trade Expansion. The idea behind the committee "was to ease trade-induced tensions between the two nations through a series of projects, including a center for international businessmen and setting up U.S. branch campuses around the country" (Bachman, April 19, 1990).

**Institution E**

Institution E is located in a rural area of Japan. In mid-1986, an administrator at Institution E's U.S. home campus read a one-sentence advertisement in a newspaper about possible educational joint-ventures and called Senator Gephardt's office for information as directed by the advertisement. By February, 1987, two top U.S. administrators from the home campus traveled to Japan and identified two possible cities for a joint venture with a municipality. The President of the U.S. institution began negotiations soon thereafter. By July 1987, a letter of intent was signed, in December 1987 a contract was signed, and in May 1988, the new branch campus was opened in temporary buildings while permanent buildings were being built.

Although Institution E was established as a university project, it started with only an English as a Second Language (ESL) Program. "The ESL Program was necessary to make the other happen." Later, General Education credit-bearing courses were added and expanded and students and faculty moved into new facilities. The program started with 450 students and has sent about 200 students to the U.S. home campus or other U.S. colleges or universities.

Although the branch has had its share of problems, and the enrollment is now lower than earlier semesters, the overall program has been somewhat stabilized. In order to gain support from the local community, administrators in Japan created a type of "extension" program to go out into the community, especially into some schools and businesses. The branch campus organizes informational meetings, teaches
English in night classes to local citizens, and generally promotes the idea of a partnership for better understanding between Japanese and Americans.

**Institution F**

Institution F is a part of a midwestern state school system. It is directly affiliated with one of the schools in the system, but was organized primarily by administrators from the central administrative offices of the state school system. Planning began in November 1988 after officials attended a "matchmaking event" with about 20 other state universities and 60 Japanese municipalities in the U.S. About 18 universities at that time were interested in the same city where Institution F eventually set up the branch campus. Later, the list of 18 universities was narrowed to three, and in February 1989, Japanese municipal officials visited those three American campuses, negotiations took place, and a decision was made.

The U.S. contingency wanted to take advantage of an economic and a political opportunity. They made decisions quickly because of the circumstances, started "ill-prepared and have been playing catch up ever since." Because of initial constraints, Institution F opened in May 1990 with limited facilities and administrators, and many problems from hurrying into the project. Problems included cultural misunderstandings, wrong expectations, and lack of set-up money.

About 250 Japanese students and 52 American students from the university's seven U.S. campuses were enrolled at that time. Institution F claims to be the first U.S. branch campus to have had American students. Additional facilities, including a library and a recreation center, have recently been built as part of the commitment made in the initial contract despite the fact that enrollment has decreased.

**Institution G**

Institution G is located in a rural area of Japan. Administrators at the U.S. home campus, located in the southwest, began negotiations in 1987. Many discussions and trips to Japan followed. Unlike most branch campuses, Institution G tried a pilot
English program before actually opening the branch campus. Negotiations were held between 1987-1989, and in May 1990, the branch campus officially opened in temporary facilities.

Because of political problems between the Japanese mayor, who had helped to arrange the joint venture, and his opponents, a lawsuit was filed by more than 4,000 townspeople to keep the U.S. university from continuing its program. The lawsuit was resolved and the branch campus continued as planned in its temporary facilities while waiting for a new campus to be built. However, the incident became the focus of lengthy negative publicity, and the branch campus has been struggling to overcome the negative advertising it received and to gain the trust of people in the local community.

Enrollment from the local area has been reduced because of the bad publicity. Total enrollment is now less than 100 students, ten percent of whom are from the local community. The program offers ESL and a core curriculum in general education courses. The program is now in its fourth year.

Types of Students Who Attend U.S. Branch Campuses in Japan

Respondents report that there are many types of Japanese students who are attracted to U.S. branch campuses. Some have just finished high school and were top students in the Japanese high school system, whereas some have been out of high school for some time. They may be men or women who do not somehow fit into the traditional Japanese higher education system. A list of "types" from many respondents include those who

- have chosen not to sit for the difficult Japanese university exam
- have failed the Japanese university exam (some may still be trying to pass)
- want a U.S. education specifically
- want an alternative to the Japanese education system
- want to be bilingual and prepare for international jobs
- have parents who have money and choose the university for their children for various reasons
- come out of curiosity
Main Findings

It was reported that, in every case of an educational joint venture between the Japanese and the Americans between 1982 and 1992, the Japanese sponsor or an intermediary first approached an American higher education institution. Respondents generally agreed, however, that the joint ventures were a combination of combined interests; that is, when Japanese sponsors or intermediaries approached U.S. institutions, the U.S. institutions, as well as the Japanese, were looking for new internationalization opportunities in some form or other.

Respondents also generally agreed that although each branch campus started out with somewhat different circumstances, a series of similar "appropriate" steps was necessary to bring about the actual joint venture, and that the way an institution works its way through those steps may have a major influence on the quality of the program as well as on its prospects for its future. Therefore, respondents offered a list of recommendations, or steps in the process of organization, in order to demonstrate how branch campuses were initiated and to alert future planners to some of the difficulties or problems of such ventures.

The recommendations are a combination of comments gathered from many respondents through personal or phone interviews at the selected institutions, from special conference presentations on this topic, and from discussions with other people who were directly or indirectly involved in initiating and establishing overseas campuses, primarily in Japan. According to the respondents, the recommendations are applicable to initiating and implementing the establishment of branch campuses in Japan, but may also be relevant to creating institutions or programs in other countries as well. Some of the steps overlap in the "preconditions" and "planning stages," and in reality, may not be as clear cut as they are presented here. The steps were not necessarily followed in the exact order in which they are listed here because each circumstance was different; that is, each branch campus was created at a different time with different Japanese partners in different locations. However, there were
enough similarities in each situation to warrant grouping them together as a composite response to the questions raised by the researcher. The statements made in this chapter are, in most instances, paraphrases of many comments made by many respondents. They are grouped into the four major variables that are the central focus of this study.

The Planning Process

Many respondents indicated that before the actual planning is started some "preplanning" or "preconditions" were necessary. Other respondents included some or all of the following preconditions as part of the overall planning process. The following recommendations were made:

1. The overseas campus project must be directly related to the mission of the home campus in order to gather and maintain support for the new program and to fulfill the obligations to the accrediting agency. Some respondents said there should be a "mandate" from the institution's mission to expand international activities.

2. An American institution must have strong support from key administrators, faculty senate, and political entities in order to create a new institution or program.

3. A preliminary proposal may have to be written. The proposal might include a request for seed money for initial investigations of the sites in Japan, a request for approval from a Board of Regents or other governing body, and might later lead to a formal contract.

4. Before even a proposal is written, an American institution needs to assess its strengths and weaknesses and decide how it can build on its strengths, which may include its mission, goals and objectives; existing U.S. home campus programs; the infrastructure of the university, including admissions, advising, housing, and special services; and the types of support previously listed. An administrator with years of experience in planning overseas campuses stated that
American institutions should be able to answer the question, "What is your purpose for going there?" and cautioned, "Don't go for the wrong reasons."

(5) Planners should talk to administrators at American schools already in Japan. One administrator at a branch campus said that universities and colleges were still coming to Japan to explore the possibility of setting up campuses, but not one has ever talked to those who are already there, to the U.S. Embassy, or to the Association of American Colleges and Universities in Japan (AACUJ). This comment was contradicted by one informant who said two other schools had asked the branch campus he was affiliated with for information.

(6) Decision makers should get a list of Americans and American institutions and companies in the prospective host country from alumni, the U.S. Embassy, the Chamber of Commerce, or professional companies such as Price Waterhouse or Arthur Anderson. In other words, respondents said, "Do your homework."

(7) Planners should contact alumni in the prospective host country and assess support from them. One respondent claimed that his institution did not set up a program in Japan, even though they have experience with establishing and running several programs in other countries, because of alumni opposition to the idea.

(8) Planners should find out what Japanese companies are in the home state and city and assess what, if any, support or opposition there might be from them.

The following list of recommendations are a compilation of what most respondents indicated were essential steps in the actual planning and setting up process. As noted earlier, some of these steps may overlap with the previous list.

(1) Do a careful feasibility study, which may take one to three years.
   (a) Conduct a market survey. Check information and statistics which show trends about student needs and populations around the world. Those statistics may help administrators know whether or when to set up new programs and where.
Gather as much information as possible about the host country. Contact alumni, the U.S. Embassy, the Chamber of Commerce and any other agency that might be able to provide relevant demographic, economic, cultural, political or educational information.

Learn as much as possible about school laws, rules and regulations in the other country. "Can you be legitimized according to the other countries' rules?" Decide whether that is important or not to the U.S home institution. Contact The Japan Ministry of Education (Monbusho). The Japanese Ministry of Education has no control over U.S. branch campuses. U.S. branch campuses are governed by the U.S. home institution according to the home campus mission and institution guidelines. Therefore, the Japan Ministry of Education does not recognize the branch campuses as "legitimate" higher education institutions, nor does The Ministry recognize degrees from the branch campuses as University degrees. They recognize degrees earned by graduate students at U.S. universities in the United States, however.

Learn as much as possible about the legal system including contract laws, regulations for educational institutions, taxes, and insurance. Check on tax laws and the duty charged on what people take into the country.

Check on working rules and regulations. "Immigration in Japan is not exactly happy to have the branch campuses there. Immigration laws can be a problem, but if you go with a partner, you get the benefit of someone interceding in sticky situations. There can be difficulties, even with a partner, but it's a little easier."

Check on other legal concerns. Hire an attorney who has had experience in international situations. There are companies in the U.S. who can help on tax issues, legal issues, and insurance matters. Some tax rules keep changing and planners have to keep up with them.

Check local laws in the city or area of possible location. Find out what laws the institution must abide by.
(h) Check health and safety conditions for faculty and staff.

(i) Check on housing and living conditions for faculty in the host country.

"This is critical. It can make or break a program!"

(2) Identify and work with an accountant or financial officer early, before any negotiations take place.

(a) Key people need to go to Japan to check on the situation personally. The home campus may need to provide seed money to finance exploratory trips to the host country. Seed money often comes from some research foundation at the home campus and may or may not ever be recovered. The average number of trips is four with several people involved each trip. The cost for 4 trips runs about $20,000-$25,000, but can easily run up to $50,000, including air fare and per diem. This activity often takes place during the negotiation stage and can take 1-3 years to complete satisfactorily.

(b) Find out what faculty salaries and conditions would be and what cost of living adjustments (COLA) are offered or allowed.

(3) Don’t go overseas alone. Institutions need a good partner of some kind; for example, another higher education institution, a corporate sponsor, a municipality, or some combination. "We couldn’t have made it without a partner." Know the partner or sponsor well. Information about partners or sponsors can be gathered for the institution by private companies, alumni, the U.S. Embassy, and other educational institutions. Caution: Don’t hire the same company to investigate the sponsor that the sponsor has hired to investigate the U.S. institution! One administrator recommended "extreme care in choosing a partner. What you want to avoid is surprises. You need to do a lot of background work."

(4) Write a proposal for the project. If the proposal is approved by the home institution and its governing bodies, hire an interpreter and prepare for negotiations with the sponsor or partner, which may culminate in a formal contract. The partners or sponsors will have their own interpreters.
Respondents offered suggestions on ways to write a proposal, but acknowledged that there are many ways to handle the situation depending on the circumstances. Therefore, respondents gave general guidelines and anecdotal information. For example, it was reported that one program in Japan was started because a U.S. institution had already established a partnership with a Japanese foundation. The foundation had been sending Japanese students for two years to the home campus in the U.S. to learn English. The foundation then requested that the same program be taught in Japan with financial backing from the foundation. A proposal, and later a contract, was written based on the "pilot" program at the home campus. The contract was later modified to accommodate the addition of General Education courses in Japan, the transfer of students to the home campus to complete their degrees, and details to cover previously unanticipated needs.

In another instance, a U.S. institution arranged a joint venture with a municipality on an institutional basis, rather than on a program basis. Although the English as a Foreign Language Program was central and critical to the establishment of the institution, the proposal and the contract were written quite differently than the previous example to reflect the different kind of partnership.

**Writing a Contract (from an American perspective)**

Suggestions for writing a contract have been gathered primarily from American respondents. Some Japanese administrators and educators and one Japanese intermediary were interviewed, but because of time and money constraints, it was not possible to hire interpreters or to interview Japanese sponsors in order to obtain a Japanese perspective for this study. The researcher recommends that obtaining data that would reflect the Japanese perspective would be invaluable information to allow a better understanding of the entire situation of U.S. branch campuses in Japan.

Respondents said that before planners get to the contract stage of the process, many first need to write a proposal to satisfy requirements at the home institution, to request permission to establish a new program, or to request seed money for the
initial stages of the program, such as for the feasibility study. Sometimes a proposal is written as a preliminary step to writing a contract with the Japanese partner. Some respondents recommended that when writing a proposal before negotiations, planners should put as much detail into it as possible. "Details are critical to discussions and negotiations. Details are critical when preparing to build or rent buildings."

It should be understood that U.S. public-supported institutions are not allowed by law to own land or buildings in another country. In U.S.-Japanese educational partnerships, the Japanese sponsor provides the land and buildings and operational funds and the U.S. institution provides the academic services. Because U.S. administrators and educators do the actual "work" once a branch campus is established, it is usually they who decide what facilities, equipment and supplies they need or want in order to be able to carry out those services, but these also must be negotiated. It was reported that differences of opinion on details such as facilities, equipment and supplies can lead to major conflicts between the American administrators and Japanese partners.

Other recommendations for writing contracts made by several respondents were

1. Use a phase by phase approach. Start with ESL/EFL (English as a Second or Foreign Language), and add GE (General Education) courses later. State larger goals with a time frame and stipulations; then expand. "However, if you can get a good partner or a good program from the beginning, go for it all."

2. "Start broad if you have to, but to add on (especially in Japan) is very difficult because it involves change."


4. "Grab everything that's not nailed down—it's hard to get stuff later. However, it depends on the country, sponsor, and the specific situation."

5. Specify space requirements. Space is a major consideration because different cultures have different considerations and perspectives about how space is used.
(6) Specify exact equipment needs. There are major differences between what people think is necessary, appropriate, or comfortable, for example, desks, chairs, audio-visual aids, computers, and office furniture for teachers and administrators. Include maintenance of equipment, not just providing it.

(7) "Handshakes are fine, but people in power can change rapidly, so write everything down."

Having a formal contract carefully written in great detail was strongly advised by all American administrators and planners that were interviewed in order to minimize misunderstandings and to give direction and clarification for each party's responsibilities and liabilities for the present and the future. The actual negotiating of the details of the contract was often a major limitation to the process cited by respondents.


Contracts are foreign to the Japanese way of doing business, and Americans and Europeans would do well to keep this fact in mind at all times. Exposure to the West, which has resulted in the adoption of many aspects of the Western legal framework, has led to the use of written contracts, especially when negotiating deals with Western companies, of course. But the Japanese don't like contracts and tend to feel that if personal trust and integrity are absent, the mere possession of a piece of paper will not salvage the situation. Many Japanese will not even bother to read a contract before signing it because they don't attach substantive importance to it. This is safe enough in Japan, but Japanese who are unaware of the Western fetish for legalistic wrangling and getting everything in writing sometimes find themselves in unfortunate situations when dealing with foreigners. Likewise, foreigners who think a deal has been carved in stone once the papers are signed are frequently shocked to discover just how cavalier the Japanese attitude toward a contract can be if circumstances make it "unfair" in their eyes.

... The foreign negotiator must understand that the Japanese dislike haggling over contracts. They put much more emphasis on establishing whether or not they can trust the foreign partner (pp. 91-92).
American respondents, too, emphasized the fact that building and maintaining trust with a partner or sponsor was a major ingredient to an amicable and successful joint venture. Respondents summed up the difficulties that U.S. educators have when negotiating with Japanese businessmen into two categories: (1) There are fundamentally different philosophical, cultural, and educational beliefs overall between Americans and Japanese, and (2) There are fundamentally different philosophical and cultural approaches to negotiating between those in the profit sector (businesses or corporations), and those in the non-profit (educational) sector. However, negotiations do take place, contracts are written, agreements are made, and new branch campuses are established. Compromises are somehow made on both sides and the project proceeds. Some agreements have been lasting, others have not worked out as well as expected. Zimmerman noted that "no agreement will stand the test of time unless it is mutually beneficial" (p. 93). This aspect will be discussed further in the section on institution or program closings.

What to Put into Contracts (from an American perspective)

The following list is a compilation of responses from several informants and is based on their direct involvement in writing contracts for joint educational ventures between Japanese partners or sponsors and American higher educational institutions. Respondents reported that some items on the list were added after they encountered and worked through problems.

(1) The scope of the project, or a "statement of effort."
   a) What you are going to do
   b) What you are going to provide, in great detail
   c) What you expect the sponsor to provide, also in great detail

(2) Housing arrangements, in great detail, because the concept of space and privacy is very different in different countries. (Respondents emphasized "detail" after having worked through "problems" where something had been assumed to be understood.)
(3) Transportation, which may include air fare plus per diem to get administrators and faculty settled in the host country, as well as ways and means to get to and from the Japanese campus on an everyday basis. Some contracts state that the sponsor will pay for all travel, and for exactly how many people; others are not so specific.

(4) Local support staff, how many, what they will do and what they will be paid. Most of the support staff is hired in country because Americans don't usually know the language, whereas in-country people are bi-lingual, want the jobs, and will usually do a good job.

(5) Technical support people to service equipment. Instructors and administrators don't, won't, or can't do certain things.

(6) Payment schedule. Include salaries for ESL (English as a Second Language) teachers, general faculty, administrators, and support people. Include COLA (cost of living adjustments) and how everything will be paid and in what currencies, etc. (Please see further discussion of this topic in the "Control Section" of this chapter.)

(7) Taxes, which are the basis of many disputes because of different tax laws in each country. The recommendation was to "Get your own financial people to figure all this out before you do anything." Many respondents recommended sending the institution's financial experts to Japan in order to help them understand the situation better.

(8) Direct and indirect costs—state clearly and precisely. "The Japanese do not have a system using indirect costs and find it difficult to understand." (Please see further discussion of this in the "Control Section" of this chapter.)

(9) Overseas allowances for shipping and storage.

(10) Information about medical exams, insurance, and pets.

(11) Customs fees. Who pays when faculty and administrators take "stuff" over there?
(12) Contingency plans. Write into the contract that whatever is not specified is the responsibility of the sponsor.

(13) Indicate when contracts will be renewed and when and if they can be renegotiated. Once a year is usual.

(14) Miscellaneous other costs to consider

   a) postage and federal express charges
   b) telecommunications (TELEX, phones, fax)
   c) shipping of equipment and materials
   d) faculty recruitment
   e) student recruitment
   f) FICA social security on allowances
   g) medical evacuation insurance

(15) Attachments to Contracts:

   a) detailed job descriptions
   b) reporting lines
   c) conditions of employment
   d) operations manual
   e) academic policies and procedures
   f) student handbook and rulebook
   g) anything else that seems pertinent

(16) Other details to add: Where will an institution get:

   1) Materials and supplies, such as

      a) curriculum
      b) audio/video tapes
      c) reference materials/library
      d) student textbooks
      e) English Proficiency Tests
      f) office supplies
      g) instructional supplies
h) miscellaneous supplies, such as aspirin and other over the counter medications

2. Equipment, such as
   a) tape recorders
   b) VCR's
   c) video cameras
   d) language laboratory
   e) converters
   f) generators
   g) PC's
   h) typewriters
   i) Fax machines
   j) graduation gowns

Respondents, some of whom had worked in many different countries, said the two preceding lists will vary depending on whether an institution goes to a developed or a developing country. For U.S. branch campuses in Japan availability of most items is not a problem. However, many items on the list, especially electronic equipment, are not usually bought in Japan because the cost is higher in Japan than in other countries. In addition, most English language texts used at branch campuses are often the same as those used at the home campus. Therefore, they are shipped from the home institution. These considerations must also be indicated in contracts.

The language of the contract is considered very important by American respondents. Some said it was important to question: Who should write the contract? Who will translate? Many respondents thought that both languages should have equal force. One respondent said, "Basic linguistic differences and cultural taboos are incredible," which can lead to misunderstandings and disagreements. Although some U.S. planners and administrators knew the Japanese language and many Japanese sponsors knew English, it was important to write contracts that satisfied each partner. Respondents recommended that both American and Japanese
partners have their own interpreters, and that key planners review and discuss each item carefully with the sponsor. In addition to basic linguistic differences, respondents cautioned that there may be cultural or legal differences to consider. "Be prepared for items a sponsor may want to put into a contract, such as no females, no Jews, no blacks, or certain laws to follow in their country." Respondents also made the point that affirmative action laws apply to overseas campuses as well as to U.S. institutions.

A typical contract may be at least 300 pages long, including many appendices, detailed salary schedules, job descriptions, and descriptions of facilities, equipment, and supplies that are required. The biggest mistake people make, according to several respondents, is being in too much of a hurry to go over there; as a result they leave too much out of contracts, which often leads to confusion and misunderstandings.

Japanese Partners or Sponsors

Japanese partners, or sponsors in U.S.-Japan educational joint ventures have been characterized as entrepreneurs, specifically businessmen, politicians, or corporations that have an interest in promoting trade through educational institutions. In some instances, entrepreneurs were looking for a good investment and an institution on which to attach their name. In Japan, education is not restricted to a non-profit status. Other sponsors, because they may have received their own higher education in the U.S. either because they did not fit into the Japanese educational system and were able to get into the American system, or because they or their parents deliberately chose an international alternative, wish to help other Japanese obtain some type of American education. Still other sponsors are construction companies and the owners visualized increased projects in local communities if a higher education institution were established there.

As noted earlier a Japanese sponsor can also be a Japanese municipality. A municipality partner may be a city or may include a city and a prefecture. That means that funds for the U.S. branch campus might come from both city and
prefecture sources. However, this arrangement can be a source of conflict because of varying political attitudes between city officials and prefecture officials. In other words, some political factions may want to use funds for a U.S. branch campus, other factions may not. Some respondents thought that branch campuses sponsored by municipalities, or the "public sector," were perhaps more assured of survival than those sponsored by entrepreneurs, or the "private sector." They suggested that those in the private sector might find it easier than a municipality to "pull out of an agreement" if the enrollment or financial situation changed drastically.

Sponsors are a critical variable in this study because they control the financial aspect of branch campuses. Because sponsors provide the financial support, they sometimes try to control the academic aspects as well. This issue will be discussed further in the control section of this study. In some instances, in addition to providing the resources, sponsors have also had the responsibility of recruiting students. Some sponsors have been criticized for "inaccurate or misleading advertising," which has led to confusion and misunderstandings, and eventually the loss of students. For example, in an advertisement, students may be led to believe that they can graduate from an American university within a specific period of time. The way the advertisement is written may misrepresent the time it takes to learn English and earn a degree, the type of American school or program offered (a junior college vs. a four year university), or it may lead the students to believe that graduation is guaranteed. To minimize many of these problems, some branch campuses have worked out agreements for Americans and Japanese to work together on recruitment.

From their experiences respondents cited the following general characteristics of Japanese partners or sponsors:

(1) Sponsors are benefactor types, entrepreneurs, politicians, many individuals or groups, many combinations.

(2) Sponsors are remarkably well-informed on:
   a) American education
b) business practices
c) finances

(3) The Japanese are the "shrewdest negotiators in the world. There is no compromise. They know what they want. American counterparts should know what they can deliver, know what it costs and how to deliver."

When respondents were asked "What's in it (a U.S. branch campus) for them (sponsors)?" answers included: prestige; they want their name on something. Respondents indicated, however, that universities in the U.S. too have been started by people who had "big money" and wanted to be known for their philanthropic endeavors. "It's not a whole lot different over there." Other respondents reported that some sponsors hoped to make money, but "maybe down the line."

Respondents were asked what would happen if sponsors didn't make money. For example, "Is there the danger of a sponsor pulling out?" Most respondents agreed that it was very possible, but they suggested that the reason was usually political, not because sponsors were not making a profit—or that banks collapsed. The recommendation was that planners should discuss this possibility (discontinuance of the program) with the president of their university before they made a deal. Program discontinuance will be discussed further in another section of this chapter.

Control over Finances and Curriculum

As noted earlier one of the limitations of creating a branch campus is trying to work out mutually acceptable agreements during the negotiation stage. Negotiations usually include detailed aspects of the academic program in addition to detailed aspects of the operating budget. It should be understood that all the set-up money in all the institutions surveyed for this study was provided by the Japanese partner or sponsor, with the exception of some seed money for early exploratory trips for a few campuses. Negotiations are often power struggles regardless of how amicable they may be.
Respondents said that major problems or at least "difficulties" have arisen in almost every U.S. branch campus over the operating budget. The reasons are attributed to (1) cultural differences, (2) business practices (profit-making) vs. educational administrative practices (non-profit-making), and (3) motives for establishing a U.S. branch campus. Respondents pointed out that in the Japanese culture, there is no concept of and therefore no experience with "indirect costs," or "overhead" expenses which Americans have worked with for years and which are part of the budgetary system at most U.S. institutions. As a result, Americans "manipulate" the budget by asking for percentages in some areas, or specific flat fees in other areas, or exchange rate fluctuation adjustments, in order to cover necessary costs of running the program.

Japanese partners or sponsors are guided by their cultural, political, economic and educational philosophies and may perceive their needs or motives and those of the students in the program differently than the U.S. partner does. For example, after a program has been initiated, American administrators may be asked to allow some classes to be taught in Japanese instead of English; administrators may be asked to hire fewer teachers and increase the size of individual classes in order to save money; or, they may be asked to admit students who are not academically admissible according to U.S. standards in order to increase enrollment and tuition revenue. However, all respondents claimed that a U.S. university that’s accredited is required to produce the same program overseas that is produced in the U.S. using the same standards. Respondents also recommended that all conditions of that nature be clearly specified in a contract. Regardless of what is in a contract, one administrator said that somewhere along the line, all of the institutions, for either financial or cultural reasons, will be asked by their Japanese partners to make changes in their academic curricula or standards. He cautioned that administrators must resist complying with such requests, because if they don’t, they will lose control of their academic program.
Discontinuance of Programs

The struggle for control was cited as one of the major reasons that schools or programs closed. In some cases it's a struggle over money; sometimes it's over courses and in what language they should be taught; sometimes it is due to miscommunication and misunderstanding, and sometimes it's a combination of all of those factors. Respondents also cited competition for students and overall declining enrollments as causes for discontinuance of programs. However, some respondents tended to "blame" the Japanese sponsor for inappropriate or inadequate recruiting practices. Some respondents said that, in some instances, the partnership is just "not a good match."

One example of what some respondents considered "not a good match" was a school that lasted only eight months in Japan. U.S. officials had envisioned a "transplanted American college, with all courses taught in English, including a planned vocational program modeled after that of the home campus." That vision was soon clouded by the realities of the Japanese labor market. As it became clear to the Japanese partner that "students who graduated from the American vocational program would be ill-prepared to compete for jobs with those trained at Japanese schools, the Japanese side of the partnership began pushing for changes" (The Japan Times, Oct. 21-27, 1991). The partner wanted different types of vocational courses and wanted them taught in Japanese. The American partner insisted that the vocational training be taught the way it was taught at the home campus, and in English. In that particular case, however, the issue of control was compounded by "bickering over money that began as soon as the partnership was joined."

Fluctuations in exchange rates had caused losses for the U.S. institution. "They had no idea of what its revenues were." In addition, the cost of operating the campus turned out to be higher than the U.S. institution had anticipated, so the Japanese partner began negotiating to change the financial arrangements to their advantage. Later, officials at the institution admitted that some of their expectations were "unrealistic." The former provost remarked, "I'd like to view this as a
misunderstanding of culture, some lack of patience and just a different view of education."

Some respondents called this scenario unfortunate and cited it as an example of "poor planning." Some said that the American school probably didn't do its homework, and that these issues should have been worked through and resolved before the program was ever set up.

In another instance a 6-year-old language program associated with a major U.S. university folded. According to written reports and a teacher who worked in the program, the Japanese sponsor failed to recruit enough students. As it turned out, at the beginning of one semester, more teachers showed up than students. Some observers suggested that that was one way for a sponsor to "pull out and save face;" that is, blame the situation simply on enrollment. However, some reports said the sponsor simply ran out of money. If there were disagreements over financing or curriculum control, they were never made public.

In another instance a branch campus closed because the U.S. home campus ran out of money. The U.S. campus had filed for bankruptcy and was on probation by its U.S. accrediting body "long before it opened the branch." Nevertheless, the branch survived two years in Japan. One administrator said, "I don't have the slightest doubt that one of their reasons for coming to Japan was to help their own financial resources." Other administrators agreed. One respondent said he thinks the Japanese partners didn't do a serious job of investigation.

The Environment

For the purposes of this study the environment is defined as the external physical location and the political, cultural and monetary forces, including the sponsor, that may influence a U.S. higher education institution or program in Japan. Pasmore (1988) wrote,

All organizations exist in the context of other organizations and larger systems: systems of government, systems of nations, ecological systems, transportation
systems, systems of cultural beliefs, systems of trade, monetary systems, and the solar system, to name a few. It is convenient to speak of the totality of systems surrounding and influencing a focal organization as that organization’s environment, realizing, of course, that the environment of any organization is immensely complex and continuously changing (p. 7).

Respondents reported that the overall environment was a critical variable to consider, and that the physical location of a U.S. branch campus was one important aspect of the environment that could impact on the success (or survival) of a branch campus. For example, some of the joint programs in Japan are located in large metropolitan areas, and some administrators said they find that type of environment an advantage because of the potential to recruit many students. As in many countries many young people migrate to the larger cities in search of jobs, education, and adventure. Administrators said they think that if a U.S. institution or program has the "right" sponsor, appropriate recruiting practices, and a solid program to offer, they will not have trouble attracting students. But, they said, there can be "a problem in this equation," and that is space—in the form of land, buildings and facilities.

In the large metropolitan areas of Japan, space in any form is a precious commodity. Two problems for some branch campuses were cited: (1) cultural differences regarding space, privacy, facilities, and equipment needed, and (2) the cost of facilities and equipment. Buildings for classrooms, offices, student services and recreation are scarce and expensive. In some cases office buildings, not necessarily suited for academic work according to American standards, are rented and furnished by Japanese sponsors according to Japanese standards. Because the Japanese partners have the fiscal responsibility, they must pay for the necessary items, so they make some decisions on buildings or equipment that are not always compatible with American cultural preferences. American administrators and educators can request, suggest and even demand what they think is needed, but to get what they want is not always easy or possible because of the restrictions placed on them by forces in the environment. Sponsors may not be able to acquire what Americans think is
important, or sponsors may not wish to acquire what Americans want because of cultural differences and cost. Some American administrators suggested that some of these problems can be minimized, if not eliminated, by clearly stating exactly what is needed and desired in the contract, including dimensions for desks, chairs, classrooms, offices, and apartments. Other administrators admitted that they have little or no control over some of those elements.

Because living standards in the U.S. can vary widely from those in Japan, housing for faculty members has been a concern for some people, but administrators and planners said that arrangements are usually worked out eventually to the satisfaction of most people who work or teach in the programs, despite some "inconvenience" and additional cost. As noted earlier, some administrators said the housing situation can make or break a program. Many respondents suggested that all the people involved need to be flexible.

In rural areas there is obviously more space, and land is not quite as expensive as in the cities; thus, more spacious buildings, classrooms, libraries, recreational facilities, and housing units are usually built new by the Japanese partner. However, trying to recruit students to stay in the area and go to the new schools has sometimes been a problem. For example, a coal mining city of about 120,000 residents decided to try to get a U.S. branch university to their locale because the mining industry shut down. The perception was that even "older" residents could take advantage of the more flexible American university program, compared to a more rigid Japanese type university program. However, once the mining jobs were gone, people went with them and within a very short time, the population dropped to 36,000. The pool of potential students had dwindled dramatically.

In another rural area, a well-known U.S. university was invited to establish a branch campus there to "keep young people from migrating to the city (Tokyo)." However, because of some political problems between the mayor, who had helped to arrange the joint venture, and his opponents, a lawsuit was filed by more than 4,000 townspeople to keep the U.S. university from continuing its programs. According to
Japanese respondents, the lawsuit specified that local money should not be used to finance a U.S. branch campus. However, in their opinion, the lawsuit was a political maneuver by the mayor's opposition and was directed toward the mayor rather than toward the U.S. branch campus. The opposition apparently disapproved of the way the mayor acquired the money, and they wanted to embarrass him. Japanese respondents also believed that the "transaction" of arranging a partnership was "too quick."

The university continued as planned in its temporary facilities; however, it became the focus of lengthy negative publicity, which then led to a drastically reduced enrollment from the local area, which was exactly the opposite outcome from what had been anticipated by U.S. planners and Japanese sponsors when the project started. Although the U.S. home institution has provided continued strong support, the branch campus has been struggling to overcome the bad publicity and to gain the trust of people in the local environment. At stake now is the building of the new campus—and the ultimate survival of the institution in that location.

In another rural situation quite the opposite happened. The U.S. university gained the trust and confidence of the local people because 1) the mayor had inspired some positive press, and 2) the branch campus created a type of "extension" program to go out into the community, into some schools and businesses. They set up informational meetings, English classes in other places in the community, and night classes at the branch campus, and generally promoted the idea of a partnership for better understanding between Japanese and Americans. Although that school has its share of problems, and the enrollment is now down slightly from earlier semesters, the overall program seems to have stabilized and the institution has enjoyed a more favorable environment than some institutions in other areas.

The challenge is to try to find the "right" mix of partners and environment. Pasmore (1988) wrote, "Failure to design the organization to fit with the environment is as dangerous as totally ignoring the environment; while the ultimate effects of a mismatch between the design and the environment are not always immediately
obvious, they are usually severe" (p. 7). Pasmore indicated that it was more than a challenge; it was a necessity to analyze the environment. "The environment, regardless of its levels of complexity and turbulence, remains the final judge of organizational success" (p. 13).

Designing and linking U.S. educational programs with the "right" environment is an issue closely aligned with the theoretical base of this study, organizational theory and design. Specific cases show that some U.S. institutions carefully arranged over a period of time the structures that Butler claimed was necessary for decision making. Other cases show that some U.S. institutions perhaps rushed through the organizational process too fast and suffered negative consequences as a result. One respondent described the situation in an institution he was affiliated with. He said to start the branch campus when they did--when they were not really prepared--was a matter of seizing a moment in history because the political situation was "right" at that time. But their haste caused many problems, and "we have been playing catch up ever since." However, he said if they had waited until they got everything in place the way they wanted, the joint venture never would have happened because the governor was voted out of office, some administrators at the U.S. home campus changed; and thus, the support from the U.S. side was not what it had been earlier.

Advantages of U.S. Branch Campuses in Japan

Because the process to establish U.S. branch campuses in Japan sounded so complex and difficult, the researcher asked respondents what they considered to be the real advantages and disadvantages of these cross cultural linkages. For U.S. institutions, the following advantages to establishing branch campuses were cited:

- to fulfill the mission of the U.S. home campus;
- to increase the prestige of the home campus;
- to provide international teaching experience for faculty members;
- to increase enrollment at the home campus;
- to provide cross cultural contacts for American students; and
to increase revenue from tuition, "indirect" or "overhead" costs and "cost savings" on faculty.

Respondents explained that cost savings on faculty is realized when U.S. home-based faculty go to the Japan campus for one semester or up to two years. While the faculty member is at the Japan campus, the Japanese sponsor pays the salary of that faculty member. In the meantime, the U.S. institution may hire a temporary replacement for that faculty member at the home-based institution at a lower salary rate. Several faculty members may be rotated each year, so the cost savings may be substantial, but the savings are not perceived to be profit.

The issue of "profit" is debatable and very controversial among administrators and educators involved with setting up U.S. branch campuses. Respondents insisted that profit is not being made by the U.S. institutions or by the sponsors, save for one or two exceptions. They claimed 1) that the money gained from the venture is poured back into the programs and 2) that the costs to run a program in Japan are very high. Respondents said that most sponsors have not yet realized any "real profit," but hope to "down the line." (The issue of profit will be discussed after the "Advantages and Disadvantages" section of this chapter.)

For Japanese, the following advantages of branch campuses were cited:
- for sponsors, prestige and money; and
- for students, an alternative to the Japanese higher education system, linguistic and cultural learning experiences, which may help students to make a smoother transition to an American home based campus

A future study to explore the Japanese perspective might help to correct the imbalance of information in this part of the study.

The Question of Profit

The issue of whether profit is being made at U.S. branch campuses in Japan, or who might be making a profit, was discussed often by many respondents, conference participants, and authors. Chambers and Cummings (1990) implied that profit was
the motive behind at least some of the U.S.-Japan educational ventures. The publication caused controversy among educators and administrators because many people in the academic world either didn't agree with the Chambers and Cummings' implication, or didn't want to admit that somebody was making a profit from education. Many respondents said it was a matter of semantics.

The term profit is not usually associated with institutions of higher education in America. U.S. administrators prefer to use the term "overhead" or "indirect costs" as deserved compensation for the cost of programs and services offered. A respondent said that "overhead" is more "palatable" than "profit," and is "fair." The Japanese, however, have no concept of indirect costs or overhead because their budgeting systems are different. Some of the confusion over terminology and budgeting styles between American educators and Japanese businessmen caused misunderstandings during the negotiation process and has produced subsequent negative reactions in the Japanese and American press.

Despite the misunderstandings and criticism, however, one expert on U.S.A.-Japan educational ventures believes Japanese sponsors' have provided new opportunities for U.S. higher education. Shepherd (1991) wrote

Profit or non-profit—what does it matter? Maybe what matters is the attitude or motivation of the people involved. Are the designers of these ventures motivated by profit? . . . I'm not convinced the major players succeeding (at some level) are motivated primarily by money. In many cases, the financial investments from the Japanese partners have provided the U.S. institutions with an extraordinary opportunity to be on the cutting edge of a grand experiment in international education (p. 27).

However, an administrator at a conference on the topic of U.S. overseas branch campuses said, "On the U.S. side most, if not all, of the institutions that are now partners in an overseas venture would probably not be involved if the financial conditions had been unfavorable. In some cases, the institutions' commitment may be rather shallow; that is, they would make the venture only if the price were right."
Another respondent said, "There is profit being made—but it's skewed. Branch campuses keep faculty employed."

Profit making at branch campuses has been uneven at best. Some sponsors were reported to be collecting up to ten percent of the overall budget to cover their set-up fees. Other sponsors were reported to be losing money now, but were hoping to make money in the future. U.S. home institutions' gains reportedly came from student tuition when students transferred from Japan to the U.S. campus, from faculty salary savings when temporary faculty were hired at a lower rate to teach at the U.S. home campus while a regular faculty member taught in Japan, and through a general fee, either a set fee or a percentage of the budget, for providing the services in Japan.

According to several reports, the "problem" of profit stems not just from linking not-for-profit academicians with for-profit entrepreneurs or corporation executives where the mindset may be very different, but it also comes from critical cultural, educational, and budget system differences between two very different countries. Those differences include the concepts related to direct costs, indirect costs, overhead, and profit making. In Japan, where there is a national educational system supported by many and various types of private schools and institutes, the term profit in education is not uncommon. The Japanese people may not like the system, but they accept it and are willing to pay large sums of money in order to help their children achieve scholastically. Results of a study (Yee, 1988) claimed that about half of Japan's families pay for out-of-school tutoring for their children at private schools at an average cost of $15,000 per year. Respondents in this study said that, realistically, probably more than half of Japan's families pay more than $15,000 per year. Much of the literature describes the value Japanese people place on education. A long-held tradition and cultural belief of the Japanese people is that everyone must be educated. Tames (1991) wrote that one of the reasons Japanese people are willing to pay so much money is that they believe "the acquisition of skills and knowledge is both the key to individual success and a patriotic obligation" (p. 14).
Summary

State supported U.S. institutions of higher education are established in Japan for various reasons and motives. Japanese partners provide the capital, land, buildings, equipment, and all operating costs, while the American partners provide the educational services.

While some schools have enjoyed reasonable success in maintaining student enrollment and amicable partner arrangements, others have had to close amidst misunderstandings, confusion and conflict. Some of the reasons that were cited for the discontinuance of some programs were lack of adequate preparation and planning, disputed control over finances and curriculum matters, disagreements with sponsors, and negative physical or cultural environmental aspects.

The measure of "success" has been controversial. For some schools, survival has been the criterion for success or failure. For others it may be whether the numbers of students or programs are increasing or decreasing, or how many students complete the initial English language requirements and go on to the home based campus. Still others view success as finding the "right" partner and fit with the environment.

Finding appropriate partners has been a challenge. Regur (1992) sums up the responses of many respondents.

A common source of difficulty lies in the dynamic relationship between the Japanese partner and the American administrator. Identifying the appropriate partner is probably the most important factor to succeed. The ideas and values motivating an entrepreneur or politician are different from those motivating an educator, regardless of their nationality. In an area where there are not yet any proven formulas for success, it is the risktaker, the lone entrepreneur who will be most eager to sign contracts quickly. American administrators are known to have signed on with partners only to find out later that they were completely unsuitable and unreliable. A few partners have gone so far as to disappear with the tuition money and/or use program funds for personal use (p. 12).

Another ingredient for success, according to Regur, and echoed by the respondents, is high-level, ongoing commitment from the American university. Without commitment a joint venture cannot succeed in Japan. Relationships in
Japan "often bear fruit only after years of contact" (p. 13). Some administrators said that as difficult as it may seem to establish a program, the difficulty is sustaining a program over a long period of time. In a newspaper article, one administrator was quoted as saying, "You don't build a college in a year or two. Opening a campus anywhere is difficult. It is a complicated process to go out and pull together those kinds of resources. The effort demands patience and flexibility and a willingness to keep the big picture in mind" (Poulin, 1991, p. 15).
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION, SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The role of education in any society is a sensitive issue. Education has political, economic, moral, and professional implications relevant to central social issues of the larger society. (Singleton & Ebuchi 1970, p. 231.)

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the results of this study that were described in the previous chapter. The discussion will be framed within the four major variables chosen for this research but will also include discussion of some issues related to the major variables that have been considered controversial by respondents and authors including 1) the manner in which branch institutions have been established, 2) disputes over who has control over finances and academic issues, 3) the types of students branch campuses attract, 4) student recruitment practices, 5) accreditation issues, 6) language, culture, and educational differences, 7) land use in Japan, 8) expectations of parents, students, administrators, and teachers, 9) negative press, 10) the discontinuance of some branch campuses, and 11) the questionable value of a U.S. university degree from a branch campus in Japan when graduates apply for a job in Japan. Implications of many of these controversial issues will be incorporated into the discussion of the four variables. Also offered will be comments about the prognosis of the branch campus movement in Japan as well as implications for those who may still be tempted to initiate programs there. Recommendations for future studies will also be offered.

Discussion

Planning and Setting Up a Program

Setting up educational ventures overseas is a complex process involving many steps and many variables. The results of this study indicate that within the four major variables investigated in this research, other critical sub variables may also influence the success or failure of a U.S. branch campus in Japan including time and money during the planning and implementation stages, and administrators once an
institution or a program is established. However, these sub variables may impact on all four major variables at any stage in the life of a branch campus. Time and money sub variables are discussed within the planning variable, and the role of administrators is discussed within the environment variable.

**Time**

In every case studied, respondents discussed the issue of time. First, they discussed when they were approached by a sponsor or an intermediary, when negotiations took place, when the branch campus opened, and why they started at that particular time. Second, respondents talked about "timing" as it related to the political and economic climate; that is, each U.S. home institution believed that creating a branch campus in Japan depended on having monetary and political support at the "right" time. For example, in one case, the economic and political situation changed drastically shortly after a commitment was made and a contract for a joint venture was signed; that is, a supportive governor was voted out of office, and administrative and monetary support was reduced within the home institution for various reasons. Respondents claimed that if they hadn't taken advantage of that "moment in history," the branch campus might not have been established. Unfortunately, that kind of timing led to many problems, some of which have been difficult to overcome, because of the third issue concerning time; that is, not having enough time to prepare adequately for the actual creation and establishment of the overseas campus.

In six of the seven cases studied, respondents said they needed more time to prepare for the venture because of the complexity of the situation. In response to the question, "What would you do differently if you were able to do this again?" the answer was nearly always that the U.S. home institution would have taken more time to work their way through the initial organizational process. Even though some administrators had had experience in other overseas ventures, they said they didn't have enough time to explore or anticipate enough of the educational and cultural
differences that were encountered later in Japan. Many respondents cited the need for more time to prepare a more comprehensive contract. An academic director wrote, "The more advanced preparation that there is before the contract is signed, the more chances there are for success." According to Gagliano (1991), "... some of the international activities undertaken have been ill-considered, supported by inadequate campus infrastructure, with poor procedures for monitoring quality and insufficient personnel and resources to competently do the job" (p. 11).

Timing has been a topic of discussion in many of the newspaper and journal articles written about U.S. branch campuses in Japan. Regur (1992) said that timing was a critical factor in Institution A's success. At the time that Institution A was invited to establish a branch campus in Japan, between 1980 and 1982, the then Prime Minister of Japan had made the term "internationalization" a buzz word, although he never really defined the term nor made it clear what it really entailed. The term became popular on American campuses as well. One respondent said, "Internationalizing the campus is a very trendy and complicated issue. But, most people don't have a clue to what it really means." Nevertheless, in the early 1980s, the Prime Minister of Japan had stirred the interest of many businesses and corporations, as well as international educators and politicians.

By 1985-1986 discussions of the trade imbalance between Japan and America became popular. A group of politicians in both the U.S. and Japan, building on the internationalization idea coupled with the trade imbalance issue, decided to take advantage of that "moment" to organize the U.S.A.-Japan Committee for Promoting Trade Expansion. As noted earlier the purpose of that committee was to encourage the establishment of American branch campuses in Japan as one way to address the trade imbalance — through joint ventures in higher education. To date, the committee has helped arrange three joint ventures in Japan.

The implications now are that economic and political times have changed in Japan since U.S. branch campuses were initiated and, as a result, some programs have
been discontinued and it is unlikely that new ones will be planned. As some respondents said, "The time may not be right."

Money

The time may not be right because the economic situation in Japan has changed drastically since the beginning of this phenomenon in the early 1980s. According to some respondents, establishing a U.S. branch campus in Japan can cost between $15 to $20 million or more, depending on where the campus is located, how much land is used, what kinds of buildings are built or rented, and the size of the program. Chambers and Cummings (1990) claimed that to establish a branch of a Japanese university would cost at least $70 million. Respondents said that, to set up a new Japanese university, it would cost at least two to three times the amount spent on a U.S. branch campus, and it would be more difficult because of the strict Japanese Ministry of Education rules governing the establishment of new universities in Japan. The point is that Japanese sponsors apparently initially believed that establishing U.S. branch campuses in Japan was a good investment, but many sponsors are now rethinking their involvement because it takes more than just initial set-up fees to run a branch campus.

Operating costs for administrators, teachers, and maintenance are usually not included in set-up fees. Operating money comes mostly from tuition and fees, which run about $10,000 a year per student, which is as high or higher than tuition at respected private institutions in Japan (Shishin and Hiatt 1989). Students are also assessed an additional one-time first year registration and testing fee. But tuitions and fees alone usually do not cover the actual expenses of running a higher education institution. Therefore, sponsors have had to supply more resources, which is an issue that has become a source of conflict for some branch campuses, and has caused the discontinuance of some programs.

Other conflicts related to financial arrangements can arise between municipalities and branch campuses. For example, at one branch campus location, the mayor and
some municipal officials made the decision to sponsor a U.S. branch campus in their city. However, that decision was not popular with some local citizens and some political factions. As a result, more than 4,000 citizens signed a petition, filed a legal complaint, and, with backing from the mayor's opposition, sued the mayor for using their tax money to pay for a U.S. branch campus (Japan Times, Oct. 6, 1989 and Oct. 17, 1990). U.S. administrators at the branch campus and Japanese respondents in that city suggested that the whole issue was "mostly political," rather than opposition to spending money on a foreign university. However, the negative publicity from the situation resulted in reduced enrollment, especially from the local area, and thus, reduced tuition income.

Another issue regarding money, and often discussed among respondents and conference participants, was the question of profit, primarily because of the unique combination of non-profit educational institutions linking with profit making businesses. For further information on the issue of profit, please see Chapter 4.

**Partners/Sponsors**

Since the early 1980s, more than 130 U.S. higher education institutions have explored the possibility of establishing branch campuses in Japan, and at least 30 to 35 American universities have set up branch campuses there with Japanese financial partners. Money issues seem to be inextricably related to sponsors because many branch campuses in Japan, as explained earlier, have been sponsored by businessmen, politicians, or corporations. Sponsors are entrepreneurs, and regardless of how honorable their philanthropic motives and intentions may be in creating and operating an overseas branch campus, it is probable that they do not want to lose money. The prime concerns of the corporate sector anywhere are market share and profitability, while academia's priorities are geared towards developing and communicating knowledge (The Times Higher Education Supplement, December 7, 1990).
Many respondents said they think that proprietary programs do not fit with academic missions. One of the problems, especially during the planning stages, respondents and authors agreed, is that although academicians are not trained in business practices, they have to try to think like business people when negotiating arrangements and contracts. In addition, U.S. tax laws discourage for-profit higher education, while Japanese educational institutions do not operate under the same kind of restrictions (Jarrett, 1990). Thus, the implication is that some sponsors may be tempted to overlook the academic mission in order to get their investment back, and perhaps even make some money.

Some sponsors have apparently come to the realization that they will not recover their investment and, therefore, they have discontinued support of a branch campus. One of the reasons cited for the new realization is that overall student enrollment in Japan is declining. Experts have predicted that between 1992 and 2,000, the enrollment will decrease by 25 percent (U.S. Embassy 1992, Regur 1992). As a result, competition for students has become fierce. Some Japanese sponsors, who do most of the student recruiting for branch campuses and have often spent at least one-third of the overall budget on advertising and recruiting, have been criticized for making improbable, if not impossible claims in order to attract more students, such as "Pass TOEFL in one year," and "Enter this school and graduate from an American college," as if it were guaranteed (The Japan Times, January 10, 1989). The truth is that many Japanese students who attend U.S. branch campuses take two to three years to learn enough English to be eligible for academic courses. Some never reach an appropriate proficiency level and, therefore, discontinue the program. Lenn (1991) wrote:

The American notions of individual responsibility in scholarship and education without guarantees of outcome are foreign to the Japanese. Recruiters, for example, do not broadcast a basic fact known to the educational community that the Japanese passing rate for English as a second language means that there will be many, and probably most, who will not progress to a degree level program. . . . In Japan, if admitted into any higher education institution, a Japanese student (and parents) often make the incorrect assumption that the student will be
successful academically—or at least graduate, as is the case with Japanese higher education (p. 17).

The question then must be raised, is it ethical to keep students in a program two or three years while they are trying to learn English when it is probably unlikely that those students will actually continue into a degree program? Administrators and sponsors are aware that Japanese parents are willing to pay huge sums of money to educate their children. Is this taking advantage of that situation?

**Control of Financial and Academic Matters**

As noted earlier, Japanese sponsors accept fiscal responsibility, whereas U.S. higher educational institutions accept responsibility for academic programs and services. One of the major concerns of American administrators, however, is that at some time, for either cultural or financial reasons, sponsors will attempt to control or to make changes in the academic curricula or standards. One of the reasons American administrators stressed the importance of including very specific fiscal and academic details in a contract initially was to avoid conflict with control issues once the program is implemented. A respondent said that Americans, "according to custom, want everything spelled out and then believe you follow it to the 'letter of the law'." In contrast, the Japanese will "allow" just about anything to be put into a contract, but then, "according to custom, will negotiate, or want to negotiate, everything as you go along."

From most American institutions' perspectives, American administrators in Japan must produce an American style educational program in line with the U.S. home institutions' mission, goals and objectives. The mandate to produce an American style program overseas comes also from accrediting agencies. If a U.S. home institution has been officially accredited and can show that the branch campus is an extension of the same standards, the branch campus is also usually accredited and must follow the same guidelines for admission standards and student requirements.
The issue of accreditation has been very controversial in the U.S. branch campus movement. Respondents and Lenn (1991) said that the accreditation issue is not easily understood by the Japanese because they have nothing comparable in their educational system. Although accreditation has been debated by many administrators and educators and is an important aspect of the U.S. branch campus topic, it is beyond the scope of this study. For more information readers are referred to American Higher Education in Japan, 1992; Lenn, 1990 and 1991; Gagliano, 1990 and 1991; Kataoka, 1990; and Crow, 1988, 1990, 1991.

Program quality and standards have been questioned and debated by many authors, administrators, and educators. Some U.S. branch campuses have been accused of lowering standards, teaching "second-class" students, and of being "second-class" educational institutions. Several U.S. organizations have addressed these criticisms. Two organizations which are not accrediting agencies but whose purpose is to "promote principles of good practice" and "facilitate cooperation and support among these programs," have created and printed guidelines. The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA), Washington, D.C. printed a document in February 1990 entitled "Principles of Good Practice in Overseas International Education Programs for Non-U.S. Nationals." (Please see Appendix J.) On February 8, 1991, the American Colleges and Universities in Japan (AACUJ) published "American Colleges and Universities in Japan Guidelines," and one year later, updated that document. (Please see Appendix K.) The issues of standards and accreditation in overseas campuses would offer an opportunity for a valuable future study.

From a Japanese sponsor's perspective, there is a very high demand for "American-style" education (Peck, 1991), and an investment in a U.S. branch campus can often provide the sponsor an opportunity to gain prestige and monetary rewards. However, in order to contain or reduce costs to protect that investment, some sponsors may attempt to influence administrators to increase class size and hire fewer teachers or less qualified teachers. A sponsor may request classes which are not
approved by the U.S. home campus, or ask that certain types of classes be taught in Japanese, or decide not to provide some of the educational facilities, equipment, materials or maintenance services as earlier agreed upon. Some sponsors apparently think that providing the resources allows them ownership and control over the organization. One of the recommendations offered by respondents and listed in the previous chapter was that administrators not lose control over the academic aspects of a program. The results of this study indicate that most of the successful branch programs in Japan today have resisted efforts to change curricula or policies in order to please the sponsors. With the exception of a few modifications because of cultural and educational differences, the programs are primarily American-style in line with those of the U.S. home campus. However, it must be pointed out that some educational institutions with U.S. names not included in this study were reported to be teaching classes in Japanese, conforming more to Japanese educational practices and standards than American educational practices and standards, and, in some cases, "selling their institutional name," but not providing a U.S. style educational program. These types of institutions might provide future research possibilities.

The Environment

Results from this study indicate that the environment plays a major role in the success or failure of a U.S. branch campus in Japan. Political, financial, educational, and cultural forces within the environment provide both resources and constraints for Americans and Japanese in joint ventures. As discussed in Chapter 2, branch campuses are a combination of several theoretical organizational models, and they are subject to structures and systems operating in both the U.S. and Japan. The political, financial, educational and cultural forces, which shape the structure of branch campuses, can influence how a program is established, implemented and run. Key players in the environment are, of course, the decision makers, the Japanese sponsor, the community where the branch campus is located, and the top administrators at the branch campuses.
Top administrators in a branch campus have a pivotal role because they must interact not only with the home campus and with faculty, students, parents, and support staff (the internal environment) but also with citizens and factions in the external environment. It is their responsibility to help an institution fit in with its total environment. It is evident that, in most instances, administrators of U.S. branch campuses in Japan have been carefully chosen. For example, many of the American administrators interviewed for this study were bilingual and they were extremely knowledgeable about the educational, economic, and political situation in Japan. They were sensitive to the local culture and customs. From the researcher's observations and from information gathered from respondents, it appears that most administrators have communicated and interacted effectively with sponsors, administrators at the U.S. home campus, faculty, students, and parents as well as with organizations and individual citizens in the local community. However, some of the administrators in place at the time of the interviews for this study were replacements for administrators who, for various reasons, had not always been able to maintain good relations with sponsors or citizens of the community. Other administrators in other situations had been replaced because the U.S. home campus employed a rotation system for faculty and administrators.

Cultural and educational forces in the environment which directly affect the students that attend the branch campuses must also be considered. The environment, for example, has been cited as one of the major reasons students take so long to learn English. Students are in their indigenous setting, surrounded by Japanese language and culture, and are accustomed to responding to their Japanese educational style. The U.S. branch campus program administrators may have unrealistic expectations of those students. In addition, the U.S. program can provide only limited extra-curricular activities, compared to what they might provide in the U.S. To counteract the disadvantages of that scenario, one U.S. university with a branch campus in Japan not included in this study, requires Japanese students to start the English language program at the U.S. home campus. When students are ready to start their academic
programs, they go to the Japan branch campus for two years of basic general education courses, and then they return to the U.S. home campus to finish their studies and, hopefully, to graduate. Some of the respondents interviewed for this study labeled that approach "ridiculous." That approach does provide one solution to the problem of students taking so long to learn English. However, it also disputes the claim that overseas branch campuses are needed to provide a transition to American education institutions in the U.S.

Another aspect of environment which may not be evident until students complete their studies at a branch campus or at the home campus is what kinds of jobs students will get. When students return to their indigenous environment, will they be able to find jobs? What kinds of jobs will be available to them? What kinds of companies will hire them? Many Japanese young people hope to find jobs in big companies because of the higher salaries, fringe benefits, and social prestige.

Traditionally, the most notable Japanese companies will hire graduates from the most notable Japanese universities. Therefore, competition to get into the most prestigious universities is severe. Takai (1992) and most respondents discussed the topic of Japanese companies hiring university graduates and agreed that, in Japan, "the university attended virtually decides one's whole future ... university graduation is treated only as a ticket to employment. Employers are relatively not concerned with a prospective job candidate's major or his/her academic grades, but with the institution from which he/she graduated" (p. 3). One Japanese respondent said that students who are not accepted into the top Japanese universities are often "treated as second-class citizens the rest of their lives." However, she also said that if Japanese students can get a degree from a well-known American university in America, they may be treated well, but they may still have difficulty finding jobs, except perhaps in international companies that require the use of English.

Nakane (1970) said that Japanese society is "based on a rigid hierarchical order" and individuals are classified primarily according to the group to which they belong. Based on this premise, students not part of a traditional group, "would disrupt the
order and the links between existing members" (p. 105). Administrators at several branch campuses agreed that the premise is true, but they said that the situation in Japan was changing, albeit slowly. Some respondents claimed that many of their graduates have found "good jobs." Respondents also said that, on job application forms, some companies were no longer asking applicants for the name of the university they attended. A follow-up study of the types of jobs branch campus graduates get would be valuable. For further information about the traditional relationship of Japan's education system to its workforce, readers are referred to Nakane (1970), Wilson (1986), Ushiogi (1986), and Goodman (1990).

Summary and Implications

Results from this research indicate that:

• The goals, objectives and mission of a U.S. higher education institution should guide the establishment and implementation of a branch campus in Japan.

• It takes time and money to set up an effective branch campus in Japan. It is important to take time to investigate all aspects of the overseas campus project, including the Japanese sponsor; the physical location and facilities; the physical, political and cultural environment; the types of students who may be attracted to the program; and all financial and academic details of the program in order to minimize confusion and misunderstanding between Japanese and American counterparts. Setting up with inadequate preparation has caused lingering problems for some programs, and the discontinuance of others.

• A U.S. higher education institution should choose a Japanese sponsor who has motives and intentions which are similar to those of the U.S. home institution. It is important to find the right "fit" between the U.S. and Japanese partners and the branch campus environment.

• Negotiations require time, energy and expense for both American and Japanese counterparts. Each entity should have its own translator. It is recommended
that, ideally, American educational institutions retain lawyers who have had
overseas experience and who know the laws and customs in Japan.

- A detailed written contract can provide guidelines for both Americans and
Japanese partners so that they can understand better their risks and
responsibilities as well as who controls the various aspects of the program.

- Academics are not always knowledgeable about business practices, yet must learn
to deal with business people. Respondents suggested that administrators a) learn
from American companies, and b) learn more about Japanese business practices
before negotiating and drawing up contracts.

- Ideally, American academic administrators should have a combination of overseas
management experience, have EFL (English as a foreign language) training, be
bilingual, and understand the Japanese education system. Effective
communication between home campus and branch, between branch campus and
Japanese sponsors, and between branch campus and community may be one of
the critical factors that influence the survival of a branch campus.

- Administrators and staff support people to run the program in the overseas
campus should be chosen carefully. They should be people who can get along
with the partner and who are sensitive to the culture and environment in the
branch campus setting. No matter how much international experience people
have, they will still make mistakes.

- American administrators should participate in the student recruitment process and
should arrange the mechanism for this in the contract.

- U.S. higher education institutions should be committed to staying in Japan a long
time. Commitment and stability are very important to the Japanese people.

- U.S. higher education institutions should be prepared for changes. They should
have a plan for discontinuance, or "disengagement," of the program in order to
facilitate transfers or relocation of students and faculty, and possibly, to avoid
lawsuits. The political and economic scene may change quickly, causing
uncertainty. New administrators such as a dean or provost, at the home campus
or at the branch campus can also change the entire attitude and approaches to dealing with an overseas program.

Respondents' recommendation for those who may be tempted to create a branch campus in Japan in the future was an emphatic "DON'T! It is too complicated. The political and economic situation has changed, and the competition for students is too fierce."

But, "if you must":

1) Be prepared to spend time and money to do it competently.
2) Gather political, economic and philosophic support.
3) Choose the "right" partner and location.
4) Clarify and specify all issues considered necessary by the home institution and write those issues carefully in a contract. Renegotiate every year.
5) Consider the partner, who's paying all the money.
6) Be responsible to the community. Adhere to the laws, customs, taxes, and conduct of the area you are in.
7) Be responsible to the students. Deliver the best program you can. It’s a big investment on their part.
8) Do what you say you’re going to do.
9) Insist on a combined student recruitment effort between Japanese and American partners.
10) Be flexible. Bend a little when necessary because enrollment is difficult to estimate.
11) Learn from other U.S. branch campuses in Japan so that if other opportunities present themselves in Eastern Europe or elsewhere, you will be ready.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study began with a long list of research questions, many of which were answered by respondents who participated in the process of creating or implementing
U.S. branch campuses in Japan. However, some of the answers have led to further questions about the branch campus situation. In addition, because of language and time constraints, it was not possible to get answers to all of the original questions. Therefore, the following recommendations for future research are offered in the hope that further knowledge about this phenomenon will encourage increased understanding between Japanese and Americans. The recommendations are listed as questions and are grouped into broad categories of interest.

**Administrators and Faculty**
- What is the perception of overseas branch campuses in Japan by U.S. administrators and educators who are not directly affiliated with U.S. branch programs?
- What are the perceptions of faculty who have participated in overseas branch campuses in Japan? Compared to faculty who have participated in U.S. branch campuses in other countries?

**Sponsors**
- What are the perceptions of Japanese sponsors of U.S. branch campuses? In the creation part of the process? In the implementation part of the process? In the discontinuance part of the process?
- What political, educational, or cultural constraints are the most difficult for financial sponsors to overcome or work through?

**Educational or Cultural Impact**
- What is the impact of U.S. education in Japan on Japanese society? Have the U.S. programs influenced any changes in the Japanese educational system?
- What changes have occurred at U.S. home institutions as a result of having a branch campus in Japan? What changes have branch campuses in Japan had on international programs at the home campus?
Students

- What are the perceptions of Japanese students who have attended branch campuses and come to home campuses in the United States? Are they prepared for academic coursework at the home campus? Has attending a branch campus in Japan helped their cultural and academic transition to the American home campus?
- What are the perceptions of American students who have attended branch campuses in Japan?
- How well do Japanese students do academically once they go through the Japan branch campus and transfer to the U.S. home institution? A statistical analysis of Japanese students' academic achievements may be helpful. How do branch campus transfer students compare academically to Japanese students who come directly from Japan to the home campus without branch campus experience?

Job Possibilities for Japanese Students

- What types of jobs do graduates get after completing branch campus programs or after transferring from branch programs and graduating from U.S. home institutions?
- How have graduates from U.S. higher education institutions impacted on the Japanese job market? Have any hiring practices changed?

Accreditation and Standards

- How are U.S. branch campuses accredited? What campuses can be accredited and by whom? Why is accreditation important for branch campuses?
- How can U.S. branch campuses or educational programs be regulated in order to minimize the threat to American higher education's values, standards, and prestige?
Program Discontinuance

- What are the perceptions of Japanese and Americans on why institutions or programs were closed?

Comparison of Other Overseas Educational Institutions or Programs

- How do other educational institutions or programs in other countries compare to the Japanese phenomenon?

Conclusion

The U.S. branch campus experience in Japan has presented a challenge for some American higher education institutions, with some successes, and some surprises and disappointments. Cultural differences and educational expectations have led to confusion and disillusionment for both Americans and Japanese in at least a few cases. Yet, some U.S. branch campuses have worked their way through many problems and have survived. Others have not been so fortunate.

Success or failure of a U.S. branch campus program in Japan is influenced by at least the four major variables discussed in this study: 1) the planning process, 2) the Japanese sponsors, 3) disputed control of fiscal and academic issues, and 4) the environment. Success or failure is also influenced by the administrators at the Japan campus, who must communicate effectively with the U.S. home-based campus, the Japanese sponsor, faculty and staff, students and parents, and people in the local community. In each case studied it was evident that the "strongest" or most stable programs had strong administrators, individuals who were knowledgeable, experienced in international administration, and sensitive to the indigenous culture.

Although respondents discussed the planning process as one of the most critical variables, there was little evidence that any systematic theory or design was used to
create branch campuses in Japan. Some reasons for that may be 1) there were no guidelines available for innovative programs of the type that developed in Japan, and 2) each situation presented the planners with a different set of problems and circumstances to work through which involved timing, sponsors, administrators, and the environment. The results of this study suggest that most U.S. higher education programs in Japan were hastily developed without adequate preparation in order to capitalize on a political and financial moment in history.

It is evident that the Japanese perception of U.S. branch campus institutions and programs has dramatically changed for the worse in the last few years. Many Japanese have been disillusioned by the discontinuance of at least seven programs, by the unfulfilled "promises" of some recruiters, by the length of time it takes students to learn English, and by the fact that if a U.S. degree is attained in Japan, it is not recognized by the Japanese Ministry of Education, or by many Japanese companies. Because of the traditional hiring practices in Japan, it may be difficult for graduates of U.S. branch universities to find jobs in Japan.

This research also suggests that ESL programs alone, without general education credit-bearing courses, probably won't survive for very long in Japan. Most of the discontinued programs offered ESL only. Despite strong support from the U.S. home institution, strong administrators, quality faculty and course offerings, ESL alone was not enough to maintain a viable enrollment. First, the cost is too high for English only instruction. The Japanese can get English lessons cheaper at other English language schools, and many are available. Second, if credit-bearing courses are offered, an institution looks more like a legitimate college or university.

For those who really want to get further higher education but cannot get into the Japanese university of their choice, a "legitimate" U.S. branch university may be a good alternative. An advantage for some Japanese students attending branch campuses is an introduction to American culture and the U.S. higher education system, which can help to minimize their cultural shock if those students wish to continue their education at a U.S. home campus. Some disadvantages for Japanese
students attending branch campuses, or their parents, may be the high cost and the length of time it takes to learn English.

Advantages for U.S. home campuses include increased student tuition revenue and cost savings on faculty sent to branch campuses, and being able to offer faculty, and perhaps some American students, increased international and intercultural experiences. Disadvantages may be complexity in structuring and setting up branch campuses and loss of prestige when branch campuses close. It is difficult to determine advantages or disadvantages for Japanese sponsors. Apparently, some sponsors have achieved some prestige and some return on their investments. However, others have reportedly lost money and have discontinued support.

Although some U.S. higher education institutions are still tempted to consider establishing branch campuses in order to provide faculty development opportunities and to try to garner a steady source of income for the U.S. home campus (Regur 1992), administrators, decision makers, and potential sponsors are more reluctant now than before to join forces and are giving serious consideration to some of the trends that have developed in the past few years, which include

- the overall complexity of linking two very different educational and cultural entities;
- the changing Japanese political and economic situation
- stiff competition for students;
- difficulty negotiating and writing detailed contracts to protect American and Japanese partners;
- the struggle to maintain control over academic issues;
- the negative press, especially in Japan, which affects people’s thinking and attitudes towards U.S. branch campuses; and
- Japanese students’ changing interests from mostly liberal arts programs to specialized programs, such as MBA, high technology, and specialized courses.

These trends are viewed as important dimensions to the U.S.-Japanese educational linkages because lessons learned from the Japanese ventures may be applicable not
only to those who are still considering programs in Japan, but also to those who may be considering educational ventures in other countries.

U.S. branch campuses in Japan are the result of dedicated educators with a genuine interest in internationalizing education. However, it may take more than dedication and interest to make such intercultural linkages a success. At the time of this writing, only 15 to 18 branch programs are still operating, and respondents are predicting that only 5 to 7 will actually persevere. Cummings et al. (1986) summed it up when they said

Educational systems do not exist in a vacuum. They are natural outgrowths of a nation's history, culture, economics, and politics. As a result, one must be cautious in comparing the systems or the processes through which individual systems evolved. Few countries, and none in the industrialized world, are as fundamentally different as Japan and the United States. . . . Despite these differences, however, both Japan and the United States share the common desire to prepare themselves for the challenges of the twenty-first century. Both recognize that their continued prosperity and security depend on how well they meet this challenge (p. 19).

The "grand experiment" in international higher education in Japan may be coming to an end, but it's been a valiant effort, and those who have participated in the experiment deserve credit for their efforts in trying to create new understanding between the two cultures.
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APPENDIX A: LIST OF RESPONDENTS

The following people were either interviewed, or discussed the U.S.A.-Japan branch campus phenomenon with the researcher between May 1990 and May 1993. Some interviews and discussions took place in the U.S., while others were held in various places in Japan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doreen Juanita Blas</th>
<th>Masakatsu Oikawa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gail Chambers</td>
<td>Phillip Palin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Daesch</td>
<td>Connie Perdreau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Davey</td>
<td>Nana Mizushima Regur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared Dorn</td>
<td>Dale Rorex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Dunnett</td>
<td>J.R. Rothermel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenichiro Endo</td>
<td>William Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynold Feldman</td>
<td>Samuel Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroshi Fukurai</td>
<td>Shoji Shinohara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Gaston</td>
<td>Hiroshi Shirakawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Gottchalk</td>
<td>Richard Shreck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Harris</td>
<td>Bradley Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Cameron Hurst, III</td>
<td>Rosslyn Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masami Iida</td>
<td>Jane Stanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoko Jones</td>
<td>Yukiko Suda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takao Kanno</td>
<td>Michiko Sugano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusuke Kataoka</td>
<td>William Stout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Klasek</td>
<td>Kazue Suzuki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohji Katoh</td>
<td>Lee Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Peace Lenn</td>
<td>C. William Twyford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne McNamara</td>
<td>Midori Usuki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Modica</td>
<td>Beverly Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yutaka Morohoshi</td>
<td>Charles Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Murdoch</td>
<td>Shearer Weigert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Norris</td>
<td>Caroline A. Matano Yang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: U.S. BRANCH CAMPUSES INVESTIGATED

U.S. branch campuses or programs in Japan, affiliated with the following Universities and Colleges, were investigated by the researcher.

Arizona State University
City University of New York, Lehman College
Edmonds Community College
Green River College
Minnesota State University System
Oklahoma State University
Phillips University
Southern Illinois University
Temple University
Texas A&M University
The University of Nevada, Reno
The University of Pittsburgh
APPENDIX C: DOCUMENT FROM THE U.S.A.-JAPAN COMMITTEE FOR PROMOTING TRADE EXPANSION

A PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH

AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES IN JAPAN

When American universities are established in Japan, the following is expected of them:

(1) The universities are regarded as the Japanese branch of the American main campus.

(2) University management guarantees that the university is both an academically and economically sound operating institution.

(3) Educational policy is exactly the same at the Japanese campus as at the main American campus.

Through the establishment of such universities the following benefits will be expected in Japan:

(1) Universities are to become a base of international culture for the youth of various nationalities and a place where students have access to American education while residing in Japan.

(2) Through the participation of many nationalities with their varied and specific historical, political, and cultural backgrounds, these proposed colleges and universities will play a significant role in the enhancement of international understanding.

(3) Foreign students, particularly from ASIAN nations, can attain the same education as students in America.

(4) By introducing a new phase into Japanese education, the universities will become a cornerstone to build a "learning-oriented society" instead of a "school-carrier society."

(5) The establishment of this type of community could serve for the development of a more coherent and mutually binding relationship between the academic institution and its surrounding community.
(6) The function of this type of academic institution could contribute to the reduction of trade friction through the enhancement of international understanding.

The universities should have the following characteristics:

(1) The system of the universities is to be established according to the American educational system.

(2) The admission to the universities will be based on the same procedure as in the United States.

(3) The universities are to be open to any qualified person regardless of race or nationality.

(4) The proposed academic institution is to be for the higher education of students in all academic areas.

(5) All lectures are to be given in English.

(6) The lectures in some specialized courses will be financed by Japanese private firms, under a donor system. For instance, course "X" may be sponsored by company "Y" with the company undertaking all financial responsibility.

(7) The fellowships and scholarships are to be provided by Japanese industrial and business groups.

(8) The universities are considered as a part of an integrated community. Thus, students are provided the opportunity of staying either in university dormitories or with Japanese families.

The committee to establish American universities in Japan is being formed. The following have been determined:

The proposed sites are to be in several locations throughout Japan, with incentive measures being introduced to make the universities economically operative. Such measures include the following:

(a) Public land will be made available either free of charge or at a reduced price or under a lease program.
(b) The construction of the campus and the related facilities may be undertaken by Japan side and it will be released out to American colleges and universities under a long term condition.

(c) The endowment of chair will be underwritten by Japanese business group, and other financial assistances such as scholarships, etc. may be arranged.

(d) Host family arrangement for foreign students will be provided by the host committee.

(e) Integrated academic exchange and collaboration with local higher institutes are provided in order to enhance the challenging academic environment.

(f) Internship system will be provided, whereby upon graduation students may be able to work for Japanese local firms.

The benefits of the American-Japanese university connection include:

(1) Public benefits such as:

   (a) Educating students to enable them to become internationally aware and competent in understanding various cultures.

   (b) Deepening mutual understanding through the promotion of international fellowships, thus contributing to the reduction of friction not only between America and Japan (relative to the current trade friction) but among all nations.

   (c) Aiming at an international education system, with the fundamental philosophy being focused on the opening of Japanese educational market.

(2) The creation of an integrated academic community.

   (a) Effective utilization of public holding land through the program of utilization of private sector resources.

   (b) Emphasis to be placed on an integrated academic community. It is designed to create cooperative entities, making the university a part of the surrounding community.
APPENDIX D: PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF BRANCH CAMPUSES

(From the U.S.A.-Japan Committee for Promoting Trade Expansion)

PROPOSED GUIDELINES

For

The Evaluation of Branch Campuses of

United States Universities in Japan

October 24, 1989

AUTHORIZATION

1. The U.S. institution operating a branch campus in Japan has the written approval of appropriate governmental authorities in Japan.

2. Institutional endorsement of participation in a branch campus program has been verified by the president of the institution, that verification attesting to approval by the governing board (TO BE DISCUSSED: and appropriate faculty bodies).

3. The U.S. institution has received accreditation from its regional accrediting association, and has approval to include the branch campus within its accredited status.

4. Groups of universities, systems of universities, consortia and regional associations which establish branch campus programs are legally organized and/or incorporated according to the laws of their state and/or region and are recognized by the relevant state coordinating board or supervising agency for higher education.
SCOPE AND RESOURCES

5. The institution providing a branch campus program is at the baccalaureate level or higher.

6. The Japanese branch campus has identifiable physical facilities which meet the minimum conditions for equivalent educational facilities in the United States, including classrooms, offices, libraries, laboratories, services for disabled students and physical education arrangements.

7. The U.S. institution provides evidence of financial soundness and stability.

8. English is the primary language of instruction at the Japanese branch.

JAPANESE AND U.S. STUDENTS

9. Students recruited for the Japan campus will be selected in accordance with the same criteria used to select students for the U.S. campus. Students not from the United States will be evaluated with an awareness for the cultural difference between students from their native country and the expectations of the U.S. university.

10. The U.S. institution has a clear written agreement in which it establishes plans for protecting the academic credits of students who have not completed a pre-determined educational objective if and when the U.S. institution terminates its branch campus.

11. The U.S. university has established goals for participation by U.S. students in the branch campus program.

12. The U.S. university has established and distributed guidelines for the evaluation of the English as a Second Language (ESL) program.

13. All academic credits earned in Japan are recorded within the official records of the U.S. campus as transferable credit for the students concerns, and all academic credits are applicable to degree programs.

CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION

14. The Japanese branch campus program is governed by a written agreement between the institutions involved.
15. The U.S. university system, consortium or association has designated a single administrative unit responsible for administration and U.S.-based operation of the Japan branch campus.

16. The U.S. university controls the academic program, including curriculum, course offerings and academic organization and administration.

17. The U.S. university controls all faculty qualification and selection, including whether the faculty be U.S. or local hire.

18. The U.S. university controls all funds designated as academic administrative expenses. The budget has been established as a determined amount, based on either a lump sum or a fixed tuition for individual enrollees.

**ETHICS AND PUBLIC DISCLOSURE**

19. The U.S. university has not sold or franchised the rights to its name in Japan in return for a lump sum, annual payment or management fee, whether expressed in terms of a fixed amount or a percentage of income collected by the Japanese entity.

20. The U.S. university, and its Japanese partner, promote the branch campus program with factual, fair and accurate public communication about the goals, objectives, academic programs, degree studies and student services which are to be found on the branch campus. Such information will be reviewed by appropriate administrative officials on the main campus and found to be true and correct.
APPENDIX E: SAMPLE LETTER SENT TO PROSPECTIVE RESPONDENTS

The following is a sample of the type of letter either sent or faxed to prospective respondents after amendments to the initial project.

November 4, 1991

Dear Dr. :

Mr. suggested that I contact you to ask if you would be willing to help me with some research that I’m doing for my dissertation in International Education. I met with Mr. on August 31 when I was in Tokyo and have since communicated with him by fax. He has given me valuable information but said that you may also have relevant information concerning the development and current status of branch university in . At his suggestion I’m also contacting Dr. and Mr. .

To give you some idea of what I’m trying to do—my study is designed 1) to document the organizational processes used by several Japanese partners and U.S. institutions and/or consortia to transfer an educational program from the U.S. to Japan, 2) to describe some advantages and disadvantages of each particular approach, and 3) to assess some of the reasons some institutions have survived successfully while others have not.

The purpose of this study is to provide information for institutions or individuals who may be considering establishing branch campuses in Japan. This study is an attempt to answer some of the questions many U.S. educators and administrators are asking, such as:

1) Why should U.S. higher education institutions establish a branch campus in Japan? What’s the advantage for the home university?

2) Who will it serve, and how? (Japanese students, U.S. students, U.S. faculty, others?)

3) How is an overseas campus staffed and administered?

4) What are some constraints in the development process?

5) What are the risks?

6) Who will have control over the resources?
7) Who will have control over the educational aspects?

8) What are the U.S. institutions' responsibilities? What are the Japanese partners' responsibilities?

9) How long does it take to establish a branch campus?

10) What about accreditation?

11) What does it take to be successful?

12) How will "success" be defined and measured?

13) How will the venture be evaluated? By whom?

14) What if the venture fails?

Obviously, these questions are only a start! What I am hoping to ask you are questions that pertain specifically to your involvement in the organizational development of . I would also appreciate your perspective on the current situation, or status of that branch campus.

The goal of this research is to collect, consolidate and synthesize as much current information as possible about the development and the demise of several U.S. branch campuses, hoping that administrators and educators, when trying to create U.S. satellite institutions in Japan, can make informed decisions about whether to proceed or how to proceed because of others' experiences.

Since May 1991 I have been collecting data in the U.S. and Japan through interviews from key informants in person, by phone, fax and mail. From June 15 to August 30th, I taught English at the International University of Japan in Niigata prefecture. While I was in Japan, I was able to meet personally with four key informants and several others who had been involved directly or indirectly with the establishment of several branch universities. I also collected some printed materials that were not available in the U.S. Since my return on September 2nd, I've spoken with or exchanged written information with several more informants in the U.S.

My study will probably be limited to 6-10 institutions. As I said earlier, the focus will be on the organizational development of the institutions and some possible reasons some U.S. branch campuses or programs succeed and some don't--and I will then try to analyze whether the success or failure has anything to do with the way they're originally established or organized.
Because I am using the case study approach, I have not sent any formal questionnaires to any informants. Instead, I send a list of specific questions I'd like my respondents to consider before the actual interview and discussion. Although this is primarily a qualitative rather than a quantitative dissertation, I would like to include any records or statistics that might help to substantiate any "claims" made in the case study.

Some administrators in Japan, whom I was not able to meet with during the summer, have agreed to speak with me between January 7-16 about their involvement with satellite campuses, so I am tentatively planning a trip back to Japan in early January, between Iowa State's fall and spring semesters, to talk to more people. I am trying to complete my data collection by the end of January, 1992.

I would very much appreciate it if you could let me know as soon as possible whether you are willing to participate in this research and what your schedule is like in January. If you are not available to meet with me in Japan in January, would you be willing to talk with me by telephone, or to send information by fax or mail? I'm hoping that you will have time to consider my questions, and I would very much appreciate your response by fax as soon as possible so that I can make plans for my January trip. If you have any questions, please let me know.

For the record, I am an adjunct instructor and coordinator of the Language Learning Center (LLC) in the Intensive English and Orientation Program at Iowa State University (Dr. Barbara Matthies, Director). I've taught at Iowa State since 1979 and, in 1986, I took on the coordinator's responsibilities. In addition to my teaching and administrative roles, I have been pursuing my Ph.D. in International Education (Higher Education) with a minor in Technology and Social Change through the Professional Studies Department in the College of Education here at Iowa State. At this point, I have completed all requirements for the degree except the dissertation.

I will look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

Marge Graves
Department of English
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011
Tel: (515) 294-5628
FAX: (515) 294-6814
APPENDIX F: RESEARCH QUESTIONS USED IN INTERVIEWS

The following questions were asked of people who had knowledge of and perhaps some involvement with the organization of a U.S. branch campus in Japan:

1) What was your involvement with the establishment of ____________? When did that involvement take place? What was your role specifically?

2) What strengths and weaknesses have been identified in this new venture?

3) In your estimation, has this branch university been successful? How do you define "success?" What elements specifically have contributed to its success? What elements specifically might contribute to the failure of this particular branch campus?

4) If the entire organizational process could be done again, what are your suggestions for doing it differently? For the benefit of those who may want to establish U.S. branch campuses, what suggestions can you give them based on your experience?

5) Should other universities even consider creating more branch universities in Japan? Why or Why not? Are there enough in Japan now? Are those that are in Japan really meeting the needs of the students?

The following questions were asked of educators and administrators who helped to establish branch universities in Japan:

A. Identifying the Need for a Branch University

1) Who were the initiators of the branch university? Who approached whom? Who were the participants in the initial stages of development?

2) Where were the participants during this stage of the process? In the U.S.? In Japan? How much Japanese community participation was involved?

3) When were the first meetings held? When and where were subsequent meetings held?

4) What were the circumstances, conditions, issues, problems, or needs that prompted the creation of a branch university? Whose needs were considered?
5) Were any data gathered at this time? If so, what kinds?

6) Did participants establish working agreements? If yes, what were the agreements? If no, please explain.

7) Was a formal contract drawn up? What was in the contract? Who needed to approve it? What was the duration of the contract? What liabilities were there if the contract were not fulfilled?

8) What considerations were made for interpersonal, political, economic, cultural, educational, and gender perspectives on the situation? Who handled these aspects?

9) What hindrances or limitations were encountered in the initial stages of development? How were the hindrances or limitations reduced or eliminated?

10) What feasible alternative courses of action were considered?

11) How long did this initial part of the organizational process take?

12) What were the most difficult aspects of the negotiating process?

13) If this part of the process could be done again, what are your suggestions for doing it differently?

B. Setting Goals and Objectives

1) What goals were set to facilitate the establishment of this branch university? Was this a formal plan or an informal give-and-take exercise?

2) What explicit, measurable objectives were derived from the goals? Was there a consensus on the objectives?

3) What hindrances or limitations were anticipated in meeting those goals and objectives? How were those handled?

4) Was there a clear vision or at least some expectation of what might be achieved in any specified time; for example, the first year, or the first five years?
5) If this part of the process could be done again, what are your suggestions for doing it differently?

C. Designing and Structuring the Branch University

1) What formal or informal relationships and lines of accountability were specified? By whom? Who are in positions of responsibility now?

2) What administrative decisions were made about the focus and content of the plan, policy, or program to be initiated?
   a) Who would the "clientele" be? What types of students? How many?
      Where would they be from? What were their needs and expectations?
      How were those needs and expectations determined? How would the needs and expectations be met?
   b) Who would be the faculty? Staff? Other support people?
   c) What kinds of services would be offered?
   d) What programs, or courses, would be offered?
   e) How would students enter and go through the programs?
   f) How would the programs be administered and staffed?
   g) How would the programs be evaluated?

3) Who will control the academic aspects of the program?

4) What kind of resistance to this plan was observed at this stage? How was the resistance handled? By whom?

5) What considerations were made for how the branch university would affect the community of _________? How does the new institution fit into the community?

6) What are some still unanswered questions regarding the structure?

7) If this part of the process could be done again, what are your suggestions for doing it differently?

D. Resource Planning

1) How were anticipated costs (of all kinds) of the branch university identified? By whom?

2) How were the needed resources analyzed? By whom?
3) What initial resources were provided in the U.S.? In Japan?

4) How was a budget developed that tied resources to specific objectives? Who developed the budget? When was the budget developed?

5) What budget policies were made?

6) What long range budget considerations were developed?

7) Who controls the financial aspects of the institution now?

8) If this part of the process could be done again, what are your suggestions for doing it differently?

E. Implementing the Plan

1) What sequence of activities was initiated in order to put the plans into operation, the structure into place, and to carry out the objectives? How was this transition handled? By whom?

2) Once the process was started, what necessary adaptations and adjustments were recognized? How were they handled? Who directed the modifications and/or adaptations?

3) Were the people involved in implementation different people from those who were involved in the initial planning? If so, were there any problems with clarification of goals, objectives, responsibilities, roles, or resources?

4) What types of orientation to the branch university were offered? To whom was orientation offered? Students? Faculty? Other support staff? Community?

5) What materials, activities, programs or courses were added, revised or modified in the implementation part of the process?

6) Who controls that academic aspects of the program? Who has the authority to revise or modify the academic materials, activities, programs or courses?

7) If this part of the process could be done again, what are your suggestions for doing it differently?
F. Assessing the New Institution

1) When were evaluations done? At what intervals? a) What kinds of evaluations have been used to determine if the newly created institution is effective and efficient?

2) Towards whom were the evaluations directed? Students? Faculty? Administrators?

3) What method of evaluation is being used to measure whether students’ needs and expectations are being met?

4) What barriers to or delays in progress toward expected outcomes were observed? If expected outcomes were not as anticipated, what changes were made in the implementation plan?

5) What ongoing process of evaluation is being done in order to provide information that can be used to shape the direction of the institution, such as cost accounting, program quality, and enrollment?

6) What recommendations and opinions of students, their parents and faculty have been sought?

7) What strengths and weaknesses have been identified in this new venture?

8) What action has been taken to capitalize on the strengths and to strengthen or correct the weaknesses?

9) How has "success" been defined? Measured? At what stages were measures of success made?

10) If this part of the process could be done again, what are your suggestions for doing it differently?
I am asking you to agree to participate in this research project. I want to emphasize that your participation is entirely voluntary, and that if, after I explain the purpose and procedure to you, you feel that you do not want to participate, you are free to discontinue at any time. I hope, though, that you will decide to participate fully and for the duration of the study because the information which you will be able to give me is important to the success of this project and will make a significant contribution to our knowledge about U.S. branch universities overseas.

This study is designed to document the organizational development of several U.S. branch universities in Japan. The purpose of this study is to provide data for educators, administrators, colleges, universities, or programs that might be thinking of creating U.S. branch or extension programs overseas.

Because I am using the case study approach, extensive interviewing in person, by mail, fax and/or phone will be necessary with persons in the U.S. and Japan who have been involved directly or indirectly with the planning, implementing, and evaluating stages of the U.S. branch universities being studied. In order to protect the confidentiality of all respondents and institutions, I will use pseudonyms and general terms for the location of the institutions, such as "in a rural setting," or "in a metropolitan area," and general titles or roles for the respondents, such as "administrator," "faculty member," or "negotiator."

The procedure we'll follow is very simple. You will be asked to answer some questions which will make it possible for me to evaluate the development process. Prior to the interview, you will be sent a copy of the questions I will ask you. The only other questions I might ask would be some that are generated by your answers to the questions I have already given you. The initial interview will not exceed one hour in length, but I will ask permission to follow up the initial interview at a future time with possible further questions for clarification. Please answer all questions accurately and honestly. The validity of my research depends on the honesty of your answers. Do you have any questions about the research project, or about what you are being asked to do?
I agree to participate in the research project, as specified above, conducted by Margaret Graves, sponsored by the Professional Studies Department at Iowa State University.

Name ____________________________________________

Date ________________________________

Institution ____________________________________________
APPENDIX H: SELF-STUDY QUESTIONS*

These questions were developed in the late 1980's (exact date unknown) by Fox and Wintergerst to help U.S. branch campuses in Japan assess their programs.

A. Purposes and Goals

1. Is there a written statement of the purposes and goals of the program? If not, how are the purposes and goals defined? Is this definition considered effective in helping the program to realize its purposes and goals?

2. What are the goals and purposes of the program?

3. Are they made available to students, faculty, and other interested personnel?

4. Are they periodically reviewed and revised?

5. Are they recognized by the larger institution of which the ESL program is a part?

6. Do you have any concerns about the purposes and goals of the program?

7. Would you recommend any action related to the program's purposes and goals?

B. Program Structure

1. Are there adequate hours, levels, class size in the program?

2. Do the classes receive appropriate credit?

3. Is there adequate student orientation, counseling, and other support services?

4. Is there a language lab, reading/writing lab, tutoring to provide supplemental support to students outside of the classroom?

* Adapted from TESOL's Standards and Self-Study Questions. Prepared by Len Fox, Brooklyn College, and Ann C. Wintergerst, St. John's University, both members of TESOL's Committee on Professional Standards.
5. Do you have any concerns about the program structure and support services?

6. Would you recommend any action related to the program structure and support services?

Administration

1. How is the program administered?

2. How are faculty assignments made?

3. How does the administrative structure help or hinder the program?

4. How is the administrative staff evaluated?

5. How is the program related to the larger institution or to other units dealing with ESL students?

6. Is there an adequate allocation of financial resources to realize the goals of the ESL program?

7. Do you have any concerns about the administration of the program?

8. Would you recommend any action related to the administration of the program?

Instructional Staff

1. What are the qualifications of the instructional staff?

2. How are staff hired, oriented, advised, supervised, evaluated?

3. What is the ratio of full-time to part-time teachers?

4. Are the salaries at the same level as those of other staff in comparable positions? Are the salaries satisfactory?

5. Do ESL staff have the same working conditions as other staff in comparable positions? Are the conditions good?

6. Do you have any concerns about the instructional staff?
7. Would you recommend any action related to the instructional staff?

C. Curriculum

1. Are the materials and methods used in each course effective in helping students to achieve the program's goals?

2. Are there written curricula including performance objectives for each course? Are they considered good?

3. Is there articulation among the various courses?

4. Is there provision for reviewing and revising the curricula?

5. Do you have any concerns about the program curriculum?

6. Would you recommend any action related to the program curriculum?

D. Program Procedures

1. What are the guidelines and procedures for recruitment of students to the program?

2. What are the criteria for admission of students to the program?

3. Are there effective student testing procedures for initial admittance, placement, movement from level to level, and exit from the program?

4. What records are maintained for each student? Are the records confidential? Are they used in an effective way?

5. Is the physical plant safe, comfortable, and conducive to learning?

6. Do you have any concerns about the program procedures?

7. Would you recommend any action related to the program procedures?
E. Program Assessment

1. Are there regular faculty meetings which allow you to assess and improve the program?

2. Are the faculty regularly engaged in projects aimed at improving the program?

3. Do you regularly do a systematic self-study of the program (for example, once every five years)?

4. Do you have a current plan for implementing change (for example, a five year plan)?

5. If you have such a plan, how was it arrived at and how will it be implemented?

6. Do you have any concerns about the assessment of your program?

7. Would you recommend any action related to the assessment of your program?
This document presents the TESOL standards for programs designed to teach English to speakers of other languages, specifically programs outside the United States in contexts where English is taught as an international language (EIL).

These standards serve as a set of principles guiding ongoing efforts to create and maintain high quality language teaching programs by all concerned: teachers, students, administrators, and relevant outside agencies, private or public, profit or non-profit.

These standards provide a set of generic guidelines, designed for all concerned to espouse and work towards. It is acknowledged that many language programs are severely under-resourced, with teachers working under difficult conditions. In some country situations, particular political and/or legal concerns may impede the implementation of some aspects of these standards. In addition, the standards outlined in this document may not entirely agree with country-specific sociocultural values and assumptions about language learning and teaching. Nevertheless, it is felt that this set of standards will serve to motivate and stimulate the growth and development of language programs, with details negotiated as the need arises to meet specific, local situations.

This is an initial statement of quality criteria, to be supported by materials designed to aid in their implementation. In particular, a manual of self-study questions will be developed to aid programs seeking innovation and improvement.

**Statement of purpose**

This set of principles describes aspects of language teaching programs that members of TESOL believe are inherent characteristics of quality programs. Such programs recognize that language is an essential tool of communication and can be instrumental in fulfilling academic, professional, and personal needs. They also acknowledge that there are differences between second and foreign language learning and that all languages and cultures are worthy of respect and appreciation.

A quality program seeks to actualize this set of principles in establishing its goals. These principles serve as well to guide the development, realization, and evaluation of appropriate performance objectives and operational procedures. The goals and procedures of each program are available to all teachers, students, administrators, and pertinent government agencies as well as members of the general public in a written document which describes the purpose, scope, and nature of the program. A quality program avoids all practices which are exploitive of staff, students, and the public.

In particular, the principles are written for non-state programs, that is, adult and continuing education programs which provide English language training. However, it is hoped that the ultimate application of these principles be wider.

**Organization structure**

**Administration.** A quality program of English to speakers of other languages is under the direction of an appropriately-trained, experienced administration which is knowledgeable and supportive of EIL program goals and objectives. It is desirable that the administration have substantial knowledge of English Language Teacher (ELT) management practices and personnel development. The administration employs, supervises, and manages the instructional and support staff. Throughout decision-making regarding personnel practices, management and utilization of resources, and evaluation of program activities, input from the instructional staff, support staff, and students is sought and utilized in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. An esprit de corps is a vital force in a quality program.

**Instructional Staff.** Language teaching programs employ instructional staff who have professional language teaching preparation and experience for the assigned duties. The instructional staff is concerned with direct, classroom teaching. As far as possible, all members of that staff have at least a bachelor’s or first degree and preferably additional teaching and other academic qualifications. In addition to classroom teachers, there are trained individuals with extensive ELT experience who serve as curriculum and testing advisors as well as others who fill roles as teacher resource persons and computer and/or language laboratory assistants; these duties may be in addition to classroom teaching assignments and be part of regular work responsibilities.

**Support Staff.** The support staff of a quality program provides services both for students and instructional staff which are designed to meet academic needs as well as non-academic concerns that may influence students’ progress in language learning. Examples of support services for students include orientation, academic counseling, extra curricular activities, and emergency help.

The support staff, upon consultation with the administration and instructional staff, engages in promotion of the program that directly represents the instructional objectives and merits of the program, monitors students’ and the society’s needs in the particular EIL context, and seeks mutually satisfying relationships among all concerned.
These tasks may be undertaken by the administrators and instructional staff. Instructional and support staff may overlap in their duties and responsibilities, although in most programs, the support staff are not engaged in direct teaching.

**Instructional resources**

To the extent that resources allow, a quality program provides instructional materials to facilitate successful language learning. They are organized for ready-use, up-to-date and accessible to all instructors. Instructional resources include print materials, audio and video cassettes, with accompanying teacher manuals and resource books; video recorders, portable tape recorders, and video playback machines; realia, a picture file, and slides. Quality language programs consider the feasibility of computerized language instruction and self-access labs of audio and video materials for students. A resource library of relevant books, journals, and other materials is maintained. Procedures for the selection, evaluation, purchase, and upkeep of the equipment and materials are clearly understood and all concerned are actively involved in decision-making related to these matters.

**Physical facilities**

A quality program is housed in appropriate, clean, and safe physical premises. Classrooms and offices are not overcrowded; adequate ventilation, heating, cooling, and lighting are provided. Where appropriate to the goals of the program, there is space for informal meetings and discussions, and English language newspapers and other materials are available for the staff and students.

**Curriculum Development**

A quality program of teaching English to speakers of other languages implements a curriculum that indicates expected learner outcomes in the various instructional components. Methods and materials, selected and/or developed for the particular age, skill level, and needs of the students, are compatible with the goals of the program. Instructional decisions, such as the format and intensity of the program, class size, program and course objectives, learning activities, and performance standards, are made in line with the objectives of individual courses as well as the needs and interests of the student, the institution, and society at large. The administrative and instructional staff share in the responsibility for this decision-making with systematic input from the support staff and students served by the program.

**Program development, evaluation, and revision**

A quality program engages in periodic assessment of its curriculum and courses by the administrative and instructional staff in response to changes in students’ needs, new trends in ELT, applied linguistics research findings, and the changing global context. Furthermore, assessment of the students and their progress in meeting the instructional objectives is taken into consideration. There is a direct, interdependent relation between the instructional objectives, curriculum and courses, and evaluation of the students. Input from the support staff is sought as well. Periodic assessment by students, the instructional and support staff is also made with respect to non-curricula aspects of the program. These evaluations lead to revision of the program, with subsequent development of new courses or new components and to improved procedures.

A quality program seeks periodic external evaluation through consultation with experienced, recognized professionals trained in ELT program management and development. These individuals work with the administrative and instructional staff to supply needed expertise and to provide objective appraisals of the program’s effectiveness.

**Evaluation of students**

A quality program evaluates student progress on a regular basis. The evaluation instruments are objective and culturally appropriate while at the same time selected or developed according to principles generally recognized in the field of ELT. They can be drawn from among the evaluation programs available from established publishers; however, they relate directly to the stated instructional objectives and courses of the program. Students are regularly informed of their progress in writing.

In addition, a quality program makes available information about standardized, external tests for students who need to take such tests in pursuit of personal and career goals.

**Professional staff**

A program is concerned with matters that relate to quality and professionalism in ELT. The number of untrained members of the instructional and administrative staff is kept to a minimum. There is a plan in place with specific, stated procedures for ameliorating the situation within a realistic and specified time frame to bring those individuals to expected professional TEFL standards.

The number of part-time, half-time, and temporary full-time staff constitutes as small a ratio as possible of the entire instructional staff with a plan in place containing provisions for eliminating exploitative conditions. There is a reasonable balance in the number of administrators, full-time and part-time instructional staff, and other professional staff members.

A quality program recognizes that professional, trained instructors and staff seek work in a supportive environment marked by the presence of similarly-trained colleagues and where exploitative practices are absent. Professional staff members have an active commitment to the program, carrying out their duties and respecting their contractual agreements. Where resources are limited and other constraints are present, priority is given to the employment of appropriately trained staff.

**Professional staff development**

A quality program actively supports and engages in continuing staff development for all employees. There is continuous.
ongoing inservice training, using a range of learning modes and combinations, conducted by members of the regular staff as well as by invited trainers from outside. There is support, financial and other, for membership in professional organizations, for attendance at workshops and conferences, and for participation in various capacities in professional activities outside the workplace. The program, upon consultation with all concerned, engages in and/or encourages research on various aspects of ELT by staff in collaboration with outside scholars.

Teaching conditions

A quality program is concerned with aspects of ELT that are related to the effectiveness of the direct teaching operations. The teacher/student ratio is a relevant factor in student progress. The number of contact hours, preparation hours, and office presence of the instructional staff directly influences teacher effectiveness.

All instructional staff are given equal status and rights with regards to all aspects of employment, including but not limited to the possibility of job security and promotion. Reasonable notice is given on both sides when termination of employment is unavoidable. Release time is possible for all instructional staff to carry out assigned materials development and to meet other program needs as well as to engage in professional development. In scheduling direct teaching hours, all practicable efforts are made to meet the needs of the instructional staff members on an equal basis.

To the extent that resources allow, support for the instructional staff is provided; this support may be of various kinds, such as curricula and syllabuses, materials, teaching aids, language and video labs, and a library of recorded materials with transcripts. There is other support in the form of clerical help, mailboxes, office space, telephones, duplicating facilities with clear guidelines about copyright laws, and space for professional development seminars and workshops.

Employment concerns

A quality program seeks to hire and maintain a staff of trained, dedicated, professional ELT practitioners. In order to do so, the program recognizes the importance of such employment criteria as appropriate remuneration, reimbursement of transportation expenses, housing, and social insurance, health insurance, and pension plans. The program has clearly stated procedures with reference to these concerns and applies them without discrimination, the sole criterion being an appropriate combination of education and training, relevant experience, and merit. In addition, the program reviews its employment procedures and benefits periodically, in light of generally accepted ELT standards.

Prepared by the Committee on Professional Standards, August 1991
Approved by TESOL Executive Board, October 1991
APPENDIX J: PRINCIPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE IN OVERSEAS INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR NON-U.S. NATIONALS

Principles of Good Practice in Overseas International Education Programs for Non-U.S. Nationals

Regional Institutional Accrediting Bodies
Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

February, 1990

Preface

The regional institutional accrediting bodies of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation subscribe to the following principles of good practice in overseas international education programs for non-U.S. nationals. Each regional institutional accrediting body will apply these principles consistent with its own accrediting standards.

PRINCIPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE

Institutional Mission

1. The international program is rooted in the U.S. institution's stated mission and purposes and reflects any special social, religious, and ethical elements of that mission.

2. The faculty, administration, and governing board of the U.S. institution understand the relationship of the international program to the institution's stated mission and purposes.

Authorization

3. The international program has received all appropriate internal institutional approvals, including that of the governing board.

4. The international program has received all appropriate external approvals where required, including system administration, government bodies, and accrediting associations.

5. The U.S. institution documents the accepted legal basis for its operations in the host country.

Instructional Program

6. The U.S. institution specifies the educational needs to be met by its international program.

7. The content of the international educational program is subject to review by the U.S. institution's faculty.

8. The international education program reflects the educational emphasis of the U.S. institution, including a commitment to general education when appropriate.

9. The educational program is taught by faculty with appropriate academic preparation and language proficiencies, and whose credentials have been reviewed by the U.S. institution.

10. The standard of student achievement in the international program is equivalent to the standard of student achievement on the U.S. campus.

11. The international educational program where possible and appropriate is adapted to the culture of the host country.

Resources

12. The institution currently uses and assures the continuing use of adequate physical facilities for its international educational program, including classrooms, offices, libraries, and laboratories, and provides access to computer facilities where appropriate.

13. The U.S. institution has demonstrated its financial capacity to underwrite the international program without diminishing its financial support of the U.S. campus. Financing of the international program is incorporated into the regular budgeting and auditing process.

Admissions and Records

14. International students admitted abroad meet admissions requirements similar to those used for international students admitted to the U.S. campus, including appropriate language proficiencies.

15. The U.S. institution exercises control over recruitment and admission of students in the international program.

16. All international students admitted to the U.S. program are recognized as students of the U.S. institution.

17. All college-level academic credits earned in the international program are applicable to degree programs at the U.S. institution.

18. The U.S. institution maintains official records of academic credit earned in its international program.
The official transcript of record issued by the U.S. institution follows the institution's practices in identifying by site or through course numbering the credits earned in its off-campus programs.

Students

20. The U.S. institution assures that its institutional program provides a supportive environment for student development, consistent with the culture and mores of the international setting.

21. Students in the international program are fully informed as to services that will or will not be provided.

Control and Administration

22. The international program is controlled by the U.S. institution.

23. The teaching and administrative staff abroad responsible for the educational quality of the international program are accountable to a resident administrator of the U.S. institution.

24. The U.S. institution formally and regularly reviews all faculty and staff associated with its international program.

The U.S. institution assesses its international program on a regular basis in light of institutional goals and incorporates these outcomes into its regular planning process.

Ethics and Public Disclosure

26. The U.S. institution can provide, upon request, a full accounting of the financing of its international program, including an accounting of funds designated for third parties within any contractual relationship.

27. The U.S. institution assures that all media presentations about the international program are factual, fair, and accurate.

28. The U.S. institution's primary catalog describes its international program.

29. The U.S. institution does not sell or franchise the rights to its name or its accreditation.

30. The U.S. institution assures that all references to transfer of academic credit reflect the reality of U.S. practice.

31. The U.S. institution assures that if U.S. accreditation is mentioned in materials related to the international program, the role and purpose of U.S. accreditation is fairly and accurately explained within these materials.

Contractual Arrangements

32. The official contract is in English and the primary language of the contracting institution.

33. The contract specifically provides that the U.S. institution controls the international program in conformity with these guidelines and the requirements of the U.S. institution's accreditations.

34. The U.S. institution confirms that the foreign party to the contract is legally qualified to enter into the contract.

35. The contract clearly states the legal jurisdiction under which its provisions will be interpreted will be that of the U.S. institution.

36. Conditions for program termination specified in the contract include appropriate protection for enrolled students.

37. All contractual arrangements must be consistent with the regional commissions' document, "Contractual Relationships With Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations."

The Regional Institutional Accrediting Bodies Recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation:

Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, New England Association of Schools and Colleges
Commission on Vocational, Technical, and Career Institutions, New England Association of Schools and Colleges
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges, Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges
Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Occupational Education Institutions, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, Western Association of Schools and Colleges
APPENDIX K: ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN JAPAN

PREAMBLE

The major and growing representation of American higher education in Japan through the establishment of multi or single purpose academic programs, including free standing campuses and branch campuses, has led to the establishment of the Association of American Colleges and Universities in Japan (AACUJ). Established for the purpose of encouraging educational quality among the representatives of American higher education, AACUJ is committed to accreditation as the primary communal, self-regulatory process of quality determination in American higher education. AACUJ is not an accrediting agency and membership does not imply U.S. accreditation. Accreditation can only be derived from the appropriate regional accrediting organization in the United States. Accordingly, the Association holds joint membership on the COPA (Council on Postsecondary Accreditation) Liaison Committee on Colleges and Universities in Japan.

MISSION STATEMENT

Although each college or university will have individual interests and objectives they should seek to meet the following needs of the host country, Japan.

1. Respond to the articulated Japanese desire to improve English language ability and inter-cultural understanding.

2. Provide the American style of higher education which has recognized special value in developing general and specific areas of knowledge and encourages students to think critically, creatively and independently.

3. Provide a forum and play a salutary role in economic as well as intellectual development. This mission is especially important for those campuses situated outside the major Japanese urban centers.

4. Provide a means for enhanced communication between Japan and the United States.
GOALS OF THE ASSOCIATION

The Association will function in an Ombudsperson role by providing not only information, but also by assisting members resolve real or potential educational problems. Specifically the Association exists:

1. to encourage academic quality among the American colleges and universities operating in Japan.

2. to facilitate the exchange of information among members, and between the membership and other American colleges and universities both in Japan and in the United States.

3. to provide accurate information on American higher education practices and purposes to the Japanese public.

4. to provide information to American colleges and universities which might be considering opening branch campuses in Japan.

5. to assist COPA and the regional accreditation associations in the United States by providing information and, if requested, personnel to help facilitate or participate in site visits to Japan.

MEMBERSHIP

Membership is fundamentally based on a status of being accredited or demonstrable intent of being accredited by an accrediting body which is recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. In cases of single-purpose academic programs (e.g., graduate business administration programs, language programs, etc.) it is understood that, where specialized accreditation exists for the program, the program should pursue such accreditation, but where specialization does not exist, it will be understood that the program is tied to a U.S.-based accredited institution.

Membership in AACUJ is voluntary. The Representative to the Association should be the Chief Academic Officer appointed and employed by the American college or university. Members agree to the following ideals:

1. Subscribe to the "Principles of Good Practice in Overseas International Educaion Programs for Non-U.S. Nationals".
2. Apply admissions standards consistent with those used for foreign students at the American institution. The admissions process must be controlled by the American institution.

3. Provide a curriculum consistent to that of the American institution. Courses normally taught in English by the home institution should be similarly taught in English on the Japan campus. If degrees are awarded at the Japan campus, the degree requirements cannot be less than those of the American institution's home campus.

4. Insure the quality of the courses and programs offered. Personnel from the American institution should be directly involved in both the instructional and administrative aspects of the Japan campus. The American institution's personnel must have direct supervision over the Academic Program.

5. Facilitate the ability of home campus faculty and students to participate in the programs of the Japan campus.

6. Encourage and facilitate the enrollment of students from the Japan program at the home institutions.

7. Faculty hired for the Japan campus who are not assigned from the home institution should have academic credentials consistent with those used for hiring faculty in similar programs at the home institution. The final decision on all faculty personnel matters must reside with the home institution or its formally delegated Chief Academic Officer in Japan.
APPENDIX L: EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS OF ACCREDITED U.S. INSTITUTIONS OPERATING IN JAPAN

The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

Accredited U.S. Institutions of Higher Education
In Japan
Serving Japanese Nationals
As of May, 1991

The following is a listing of the educational offerings of accredited U.S. institutions operating in Japan. For a complete list of campus addresses and accredited status of Japan based operations, please contact the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation at the address below. In Japan, inquiries may be made of Dr. William Sharp, Association of American Colleges and Universities in Japan (AACUJ) at (03) 3367-2802.

U.S. Institutions with Branch Campuses

American University League/Heidelberg College
Catholic University of America
Central Texas College
The University of New York/Herbert H. Lehman College
Mckendree Exchange Student Center
State University of New York/Sullivan County Community College
Temple University Japan
Tokyo American Community College/Los Angeles City College
West Chester University of Japan
Southern Illinois University
Texas A & M University of Koriyama
Phillips University Japan
University of Rio Grande Japan
Minnesota State University at Akita
Kameoka Urban Cultural Development, Ltd./Oklahoma State University at Kyoto
Concordia College Japan
Edmonds Community College Japan Campus
University of Nevada/Reno

U.S. Institutions with Language Programs

American Language and Culture Program (ALCP Japan) - Arizona State University
International Cultural Association of Japan Co., Ltd./California State University/ Northridge
Mount Hood Community College in Kurashiki
United States International University (To close end of 1990-91 academic year)
University of West Florida at Kobe
City University Japan
Lakeland College
Green River College at Kanuma (To close end of 1990-91 academic year)

U.S. Institutions with Free-Standing Graduate Programs

Boston University Graduate School of Management at Sanyo
Teachers College Columbia University MA Program at Simul Academy
Graduate School of International Management/International University of Japan (Dartmouth College)

U.S. Institutions Planning Future Activities in Japan (which have notified their respective accrediting body)

University of Maryland's Graduate School in Kanagawa
Troy State University
Mississippi State University
Fashion Institute of Technology
Coastline Community College
Foothill College
School for International Training