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Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine the reasons why Japanese visiting scholars visited the United States, their activities and experiences during their visits, their challenges and support for their transition, and personal and contextual factors that affected their transition in different stages. Although short-term international scholar mobility has recently increased, there are few studies on the population of international visiting scholars. In addition, while there is an overall increase in the number of international scholars, the number of Japanese scholars is decreasing. This qualitative study explores the Japanese visiting scholars’ experiences of transition by drawing upon Schlossberg’s adult transition model (e.g., Anderson, Goodman, & Schlossberg, 2011).

The findings show that the purpose of visit and activities during the visits varied by individuals, although most activities were individual and professional ones, such as conducting research, networking, and teaching. While the first-time visiting scholars engaged in English practice and observation of cultural differences, the scholars with family members reported social experiences through their children’s schools. Several scholars worked on institutional relations during their visits. The challenges that the visiting scholars faced varied by the timing during their transition. Common challenges
included finding opportunities at their home institutions, finding the host universities, setting up life in a new community, finding opportunities for interactions, and dealing with language and cultural issues. The expected challenges after their returning to home were mainly related to institutional arrangements and societal differences. The factors that influenced their transition included the arrangements at home and host institutions, academic fields, past American academic experiences, existing networks with Japanese and American colleagues, and their personalities.

Recommendations are provided for American and Japanese universities, individual visiting scholars, and the Japanese government. As for implications from this study, since the Japanese visiting scholars mostly relied on their personal connections and previous experiences for transitions, in order to utilize international visiting scholars for short-term brain circulation, institutional and governmental support and policy arrangements need to be structured as a part of the initiative for the internationalization of higher education.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

Statement of the Problem

This is a qualitative study on the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars in the United States. In contrast to other types of international mobility of scholars, such as full-time faculty members and postdocs, international visiting scholars maintain their affiliation with their home institution while they are abroad, and they subsequently return to their home institutions. The United States has been a leading host country for international scholars. The overall number of international scholars in the United States has increased from 84,281 in the academic year 2002-2003 to 122,059 in 2012-2013 (Institute of International Education, 2009, 2013c). During the same period, however, the number of Japanese scholars has decreased from 5,706 to 5,041 (IIE, 2009, 2013c). Although there is a trend of increasing numbers of these temporary and short-term moves of intellectuals (Ackers and Gill, 2008), the mobility of Japanese scholar is not necessarily aligned with the world trend.

The international mobility of scholars has a positive impact on society both through scholars’ research and advancement of knowledge and through their teaching, which uses cross-cultural perspectives to educate the next generation (O’Hara, 2009). International visiting scholars return to their home country after the visiting period finishes, and thus do not contribute to brain drain, where only hosting countries of highly educated individuals benefit from their moves; but rather, their presence can have a positive influence on both sending and receiving countries. In this way, their stays abroad can be considered as brain-circulation (e.g. Regets, 2007; Saxenian, 2005). Knight (2004) also emphasizes the international visiting scholar as one of the key
resources for the internationalization of higher education, which is an important strategy for universities in the current era of globalization. Furthermore, the international scholarly exchanges through visiting scholars can also be potentially useful in increasing the opportunity for international research collaboration, since they often follow the actual interactions among scholars (Jeong, Choi, & Kim, 2011; Numprasertchai & Igel, 2005).

Despite some of these positive aspects, the individual scholars who move across country borders often experience difficulties in adjusting to their new environments, mainly due to language and cultural differences (e.g. Howe, 2008; Thomas & Johnson, 2004; R. Zhao, 2008). While their sojourns can be beneficial for themselves and for the institutions, it might be challenging for them to transition to a new place, to be included in the host community, and to have rich academic experiences in the relatively short amount of time they are abroad. In addition, there is a lack of studies on all types of international scholars despite their increase in number at American universities (Altbach, 1989; Thomas & Johnson, 2004). In particular, the recent increase in short-term international mobility (Ackers and Gill, 2008) also highlights the importance of studying the population of international visiting scholars.

The Population of International Visiting Scholars

International scholars or foreign scholars are described as “non-immigrant, non-student academics (i.e. teachers and/or researchers) hosted at U.S. colleges and universities” (IIE, 2013b, p. 110). They consist of different groups of people depending on their status, such as pre-tenure international scholars, international post-doctoral researchers, and international visiting scholars. In this study, international visiting scholars are defined as researchers who engage in academic activity (e.g. research, study,
and/or teaching) at a university in a foreign country with non-degree seeking status for a limited period of time while still maintaining their affiliation with their home institution (e.g. as a full-time employee); they subsequently return to their home institutions, which include universities, research institutions, the government, companies and other organizations; and they usually hold a graduate degree or are trained in a professional field prior to their visit. Visiting scholars are also called visiting researchers, visiting professors, visiting fellows, and visiting scientists.

International visiting scholars often work closely with a faculty member at the host institutions (Altbach, 1989; Zhao, 2008). Most international scholars report that their main purpose for their international visit was to conduct research (IIE, 2013b). Through their research and collaborative work opportunities, they can both advance their research work individually and develop networks with faculty members at other institutions internationally (Altbach, 1989). There are some organizations that particularly deal with international exchanges through visiting scholar programs, such as the Council for International Exchanges of Scholars (Altbach, 1989) and the Fulbright Programs in the United States (O’Hara, 2009). There are also other international visiting scholars who emerge outside of these fellowship schemes.

Although there are no statistics on the international visiting scholars that exactly match the defined population for this study, as one of the relevant data, IIE open doors report provides the number of international scholars. This number includes about 65% of scholars with J-1 visa, 25% of scholars with H-1B visa, and other visa statuses (IIE, 2014), which seems to be a broader than the population of visiting scholars of this study. In particular, among these visa statuses, J-1 visa scholars seem to be relevant to the
population of international visiting scholar. On the other hand, H-1B visa scholars are typically employed by American organizations as nonresidents up to 6 years. Since the visiting scholars of the current study are continuing their employment contract with the home institution outside the United States, H1-B scholars are not likely to overlap with the population of visiting scholar.

According to the Open Doors report, there were 122,059 international scholars in the United States in the academic year 2012-2013 (IIE, 2014). The number of international scholar was 84,281 in the year 2002-2003 and 106,123 in 2007-2008 (IIE, 2004, 2009). Although the top five sending countries, China, India, South Korea, Germany, and Japan, have been the same during the period, the trend of the number of scholars from these countries varied. Chinese scholars increased significantly from 15,206 in 2003 to 23,779 in 2008, and to 34,230 in 2013. India and Germany also increased the numbers over time during this period. By contrast, scholars from South Korea increased from 7,286 in 2003 to 9,888 in 2008, and then slightly decreased to 8,696 in 2013. The scholars from Japan continuously decreased from 5,706 in 2003 to 5,692 in 2008, and to 5,041 in 2013. Although the total number of international scholars increased during the last decade, the consecutive decrease of Japanese scholars in recent years is notable as an opposite trend.

Although the most recent data are not available, as another data source of the number of international scholar, the number of J-1 visa scholars is also helpful to know the trend of the scholar mobility. The US exchange visitor (J) non-immigrant visa (J-1 visa) includes three categories that are directly relevant to the academic-related exchange of visiting scholars: professor, whose main activities are teaching, research scholar,
whose main activities are research (both of whom stay for six months to five years), short-term scholar (whose stay is for less than six months) (U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Educational & Cultural Affairs, 2012).

In 2009, there were 26,370 researchers, 18,106 short-term scholars, and 1,369 professors visiting the United States under J-1 visas (Macready & Tucker, 2011, p. 36). Among them, the number of Chinese scholars was the largest in all three categories: 7,912 researchers, 2,792 short-term scholars, and 362 professors, while the number of Japanese scholars included 1,574 research scholars, ranked in the third, 359 short-term scholars, ranked in the thirteenth (Macready & Tucker, 2011, pp. 129–131), and 47 professors, ranked in the seventh (Macready & Tucker, 2011, p. 36).

As for the trend of the J-1 scholars, the number of Chinese J-1 research scholars increased from 4,832 to 7,912 during the year 2006 to 2009. During the same period, South Korean research scholars decreased from 3,297 to 2,968, German scholar decreased from 1,733 to 1,289, and Japanese scholars also decreased from 2,038 to 1,574, while Indian scholars increased slightly from 1,327 to 1,399 (Macready & Tucker, 2011, p. 132). By contrast, the number of short-term scholar has increased in all of these countries during the same period, though the increase of the number of Chinese scholars is still large in this category. Chinese scholars increased from 1,482 to 2,792, South Korean scholars increased from 391 to 490, German scholars from 725 to 1,370, and Japanese scholars from 177 to 359, and Indian scholars from 426 to 700. Although the number of short-term scholars has increased in all of these countries, the trend of the number of middle to long-term scholars varied by the sending countries.
As shown in the data above, the mobility trend of international scholars varied by their country of origin. This highlights the importance of considering the context of the visiting scholars’ home country when studying the population. The societal, political, economic, and cultural context of scholars’ home country could affect the mobility and the experiences of visiting scholars differently. The societal context of Japan, as an industrialized country with the third largest economy in the world, is different from those in rising economies, such as China and India. Moreover, the maturity of higher education system also vary by countries. For example, Japanese higher education is at the universal stage, where 60% of the population of tertiary age is enrolled in higher education in 2011 (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2011). The level of research in Japan is also recognized as high in some fields internationally. This might affect the dynamics of scholar exchange, including the reasons of their visits and the experiences during the visit, differently from those from other countries. Furthermore, from the recent trend of the number of international scholars in the United States, the consecutive decrease of Japanese scholars also calls for an attention. To study and to understand the mobility and the experience of Japanese visiting scholars would be helpful for both American and Japanese higher education institutions and policy makers to promote scholarly exchanges of these two countries.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to understand the reasons why Japanese visiting scholars visit universities in the United States, to explore their experiences, to examine their challenges and resources of support, and to understand how they perceive their transitions in terms of their resources for, and the stages of, transition. Within the
population of international visiting scholars, this study particularly focuses on Japanese visiting scholars who visit the United States, taking into account the particular contexts and academic culture of these two countries. Currently, internationalization of higher education is an emerging agenda in Japanese higher education; however, the mobility of scholars has not been highlighted in the political and practical discussion. Since the scholarly exchange through visiting scholars can potentially contribute to both the host and home institutions through their collaborative activities and knowledge advancement, understanding the situation regarding Japanese visiting scholars with a focus on their challenges and support during their transition will be meaningful for both Japanese and American higher education.

This study used Schlossberg’s adult transition model (Anderson et al., 2011; Goodman et al., 2006; Schlossberg et al., 1995; Schlossberg, 1981, 1984) as a theoretical lens. This model allows the researcher to examine the experiences of adults in transition holistically, looking at their multiple resources and stages within the transition. The key concepts from Schlossberg’s theory are the four S’s (situation, self, support, and strategy), which are the factors that affect transition, and the three stages of transition (moving in, moving through, and moving out). The transition theory is helpful to examine the experiences of international visiting scholars who are in transition at American universities and then go back to their home institutions. These concepts are discussed in the theoretical framework section.

**Significance of the Study**

This study contributes to the field of higher education practically and academically. For American universities that accept international visiting scholars, this
study provides information regarding scholars’ perceived experiences, which could potentially inspire ideas for improving services for them based on the analysis of their challenges when international visiting scholars are going through their transition to American universities. For universities that send international visiting scholars to American universities, especially from Japan, this study is an important resource to understand the perceptions of individual scholars who are engaging in international scholarly exchanges and collaborations. This might affect how they plan their international scholarly exchanges. The results of this study is also informative for prospective individual visiting scholars in that it will be helpful for them to prepare for their visits and maximize their time abroad by knowing how other visiting scholars perceived and went through their transition. For both sending and receiving institutions, the discussions and findings from this study are useful to consider the role of visiting scholars in effective internationalization strategies.

The importance of studying international visiting scholars in regards to the internationalization of higher education has also been stressed. International visiting scholars are included as a potential way to internationalize universities, through exchanges and engagement in collaborative research (Knight, 2004). From the Japanese higher education perspective, the internationalization of higher education is an emerging issue (MEXT, 2012a). Although there are programs and practices that send Japanese visiting scholars to foreign institutions, the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars have not been examined extensively and have not been directly considered in terms of their relationship to the internationalization of universities.
This study is also important because extensive studies on international visiting scholars are very limited despite the recent increase in the international temporal mobility of highly educated people. The overall trend of globalization and increased connections around the world emphasizes the importance of studying people who move temporarily. Despite these background, studies on international scholars are relatively limited (Altbach, 1989; Howe, 2008). Within the limited pool of the previous studies about international visiting scholars, there were a few studies on Chinese visiting scholars (Sun, 1987; Zhao, 2008; Zheng & Berry, 1991), some European nationalities (e.g. Ackers & Gill, 2008; Edler, Fier, & Grimpe, 2011), and Fulbright recipients (Stanford Research Institute, 2005). These studies mostly did not explore the process of transitional experience holistically. This study contributes by adding new knowledge in the field of higher education, especially regarding the population of Japanese visiting scholars in the United States with rich descriptions of their experiences during their transition. This study also introduces the use of Schlossberg’s transition theory to view the experiences of international visiting scholars with the framework.

**Research Questions**

The research questions to be answered from this study are:

1. Why do Japanese visiting scholars visit universities in the United States?
2. What are their academic, social, and personal experiences during their visiting periods?
3. What are the sources of challenges and support for Japanese visiting scholars?
4. How do Japanese visiting scholars perceive that personal and contextual factors affect their transition in different periods of their transition?
Research questions one through three are mainly relevant to one of Schlossberg’s concepts of 4 S factors that influence adults in transition, *situation*. The first research question asks about motivation and purposes, which triggered their situations in transition. The second question explores the activities and interactions within their situations. The third question examines the perceived stresses and challenges, which are also part of their situations. The final question aims to holistically examine how Schlossberg’s four S’s (Situation, Self, Support, and Strategy) and three stages of transition (moving in, moving through, and moving out) affect the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars.

Schlossberg’s theory will be reviewed in the following theoretical framework section.
Chapter 2. Theoretical Framework

The Transition Model

This study uses Schlossberg’s adult transition model (Anderson et al., 2011; Goodman et al., 2006; Schlossberg et al., 1995; Schlossberg, 1981, 1984) as a theoretical framework to guide the process of research. Schlossberg (1981) introduced a conceptual model to examine how adults adapt to transition at different times and with various resources. Then, Schlossberg (1984) developed a theoretical model to understand and assist adults in transition in the first edition of the book “Counseling Adults in Transition” by referring to other existing theories. In 1995, the second edition of the book was published, and Schlossberg et al. (1995) introduced the factors that affect transition as the four S’s (Situation, Self, Support, and Strategy), which are described later in detail. In the third edition of the book, Goodman et al. (2006) updated the model by considering technological advancement from global perspectives. Anderson et al. (2011) further elaborated the adult transition model by adding the perspectives of diversity and multicultural issues. The current study primarily references the concepts from the latest edition.

In this study, Schlossberg’s adult transition model is chosen as a theoretical framework for several reasons. First, this theory matches the characteristics of the population of visiting scholars who are in transition from their academic lives at their home institutions to American institutions. Second, since this theoretical perspective accommodates a variety of adult individuals who experience changes in their careers and family lives at different times, it is also applicable to the population of visiting scholars who differ from each other in terms of their backgrounds, fields, professional experiences,
and the timing and lengths of their visits. Third, Schlossberg’s transition perspective views life events or nonevents as important triggers for individual development (Anderson et al., 2011). This perspective is relevant to examine the experiences of international visiting scholars because they all experience an “event” that initiates their new life as a temporary visitor to the United States, which can bring them change in their roles, networks, and activities in their daily lives.

Schlossberg’s transition theory highlights the importance of perspectives on transition (Anderson et al., 2011). The theory describes that there are two types of transition owing to differences of individual perception: anticipated and unanticipated transition (Anderson et al., 2011). As a similar distinction, Fouad and Bynner (2008) described voluntary or involuntary transition in a working environment. While anticipated or voluntary transitions often give people time to prepare for events, unanticipated or involuntary transition might cause challenges because of the lack of psychological and physical resources to cope with the transition (Anderson et al., 2011). In addition, another factor to influence individuals in transition is the context, which includes one’s demographic characteristics, physical locations, financial situations, and larger historical, societal, political, and cultural circumstances (Anderson et al., 2011). For international visiting scholars, their new location, culture, and academic systems are contextual factors that hypothetically affect their experiences during transition.

**Process of transition.** Schlossberg’s transition model also describes the process of transition as three stages: (1) *moving in*, when people have to adapt to a new environment by becoming familiar with systems, customs, and conventions of the new place (2) *moving through*, when individuals start to get used to the new environment and
they reexamine their situation; and (3) _moving out_, when adults leave the environment and move towards another stage (Anderson et al., 2011). The final stage leads to a new _moving in_ stage of the next transition. In the first stage of _moving in_ to transition, orientation activities seem to be helpful to assist adults transition to the new place (Anderson et al., 2011). The authors also state that the length of the periods within these three stages will differ for each individual and each transition. In the cases of international visiting scholars, their _moving in_ stage includes the time when they prepare to leave Japan for an institution in the United States, and the time right after they arrive in the United States when they are figuring out the norms and culture of American universities. Then, after some time, they adapt to the new location during the _moving through_ stage. Finally, they _move out_ from the position of visiting scholar in the United States and _move in_ to the institutions in their home country.

**Factors that influence transitions: the four S’s.** According to the adult transition model, potential assets and liabilities for people in transition are conceptualized as the four S’s: _situation, self, support, and strategy_ (Anderson et al., 2011). First, _situation_ is influenced by the following factors: trigger, timing, control, role change, duration, previous experience with a similar transition, concurrent stress, and assessment (Anderson et al., 2011, pp. 67–68). In the case of international visiting scholars, their visits to an American university act as a trigger for their transition to a new life, which is accompanied by the change of their roles as visiting scholars. Although the duration of international visiting scholars’ transitions will vary from shorter than a few months to several years, they all stay in the United States as temporary visitors. The timing of their visits can be different from one scholar to another, in that some scholars might be early in
their careers, while others might be more advanced or towards the end of their careers.

The degree of control over the situation and the experience of similar previous visits might differ greatly from one individual scholar to the next. For instance, if the period of Japanese visiting scholars’ stays are long, they will likely have more chances to interact with people in the host university and community, and to engage in projects or research activities that require some long term commitment.

The second factor of the four S’s is self, which can influence an individual’s personal strengths or weaknesses to cope with the transition, such as personal and demographic characteristics (e.g. socioeconomic status, gender and sexual orientation, age and stage of life, state of health, ethnicity/culture) and psychological resources (e.g. ego development, outlook – optimism and self-efficacy, commitment and values, spirituality and resilience) (Anderson et al., 2011, pp. 73–83). If a visiting scholar is an outgoing person, they might participate many events during their visits, compared to a reserved scholar. A common characteristic of visiting scholars from Japan, the socioeconomic status of Japanese university faculty members and researchers is considered to be middle or upper middle class, although their salary depends on their academic positions (Altbach, Reisberg, Yudkevich, Androushchak, & Pacheco, 2012). They also experience cultural differences when they come from Japan. International visiting scholars’ proficiency in English language can be an asset or an obstacle while going through their transition to the United States (e.g. Zhao, 2008).

The third factor is support, which comes from family members, friends, colleagues, or other external resources in a community or an organization (Anderson et al., 2011, p. 84). Interpersonal interactions can be a source of emotional and affirmative
support (Kahn & Antonucci, 1980, p. 267), and they also provide honest feedback (Anderson et al., 2011). As a model to represent the sources of social support, Anderson et al. (2011) refer to Kahn’s (1975) “convoy” of social support, which is represented as a concentric circle with four layers, with an individual in the central circle, close family members and friends and partners in the second, relatives and friends from work and neighbors in the third circle, and co-workers, supervisors, distant family, and professionals (such as doctors and lawyers) in the fourth circle (Anderson et al., 2011). According to Goodman et al. (2006), among the four S’s, support is the factor that is the most likely to be changed. In the case of Japanese visiting scholars, their sources of support might differ by individuals, depending on their host university, department, and faculty members, in addition to the availability of support from their family members or personal networks.

The final factor is strategy, which is an individual’s way of handling transition (Anderson et al., 2011). According to Pearlin and Schooler (1978), potential coping strategies include altering the situation itself, reframing the meaning of the situation, and reducing the stress caused by the transition. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) categorized four modes of coping: direct action, inhibition of action, information seeking, and intrapsychic behavior, which includes denial, wishful thinking, and distortion (as cited in Anderson et al., 2011). As for the coping strategies of Japanese visiting scholars, it is expected that individual scholars will follow different strategies, based on their available resources within their situation. For instance, some Japanese visiting scholars might be actively seeking information and help from others, such as colleagues or administrative
offices at their host university, while other scholars might choose to be alone and try to find some solutions by themselves.

Table 1

*Potential Assets/Liabilities of Transition in Schlossberg Theory*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four S’s</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Event or Nonevent Characteristics (Trigger, Timing, Control/Source, Role Change, Duration, Previous Experience, Concurrent Stress, Assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Personal Characteristics Psychological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Social Support Types: intimate, family unit, friendship, network, institution (Convoy, Functions) Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Coping Responses (Functions, Strategies: information seeking, direct action, inhibition of action)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The information was adopted from Anderson et al., 2011, p. 62.

In summary, adult transition theory is helpful in examining the experiences of people in transition who are in different stages in transition -- either moving in, moving through, or moving out -- by focusing on the four key factors of situation, self, support, and strategy (Anderson et al., 2011). In addition, this theory is also helpful in considering the ways to improve support for adults in transition. Based on this theory, in the current study, the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars will be examined for their perceptions of these four areas of resources and how these factors affect visiting scholars in relation to the three stages within the transition. There are no studies that explicitly used Schlossberg’s theory of transition to examine experiences of international visiting scholars, although previous studies have addressed some of the factors related to the four resources separately (e.g. Zhao, 2008). Since this theory emphasizes the importance of perspectives of individuals who are in transitory positions (Anderson et al., 2011), the use
of a qualitative method is an appropriate way to explore their transition, which is discussed in more detail in the method section.
Chapter 3. Review of the Literature

Organization of This Chapter

This chapter discusses concepts and studies that are relevant to international visiting scholars in the existing literature. This section provides a literature review to understand the current contexts, issues, and previous studies concerning international and Japanese visiting scholars. Three purposes of this literature review are: to provide a framework to understand the population of visiting scholars in the existing literature, to highlight the importance of studying the population of international visiting scholars, and to identify the gap in the literature regarding this population.

There are six sections in this chapter. The first explores the current contextual backgrounds through three concepts: globalization, knowledge economy, and network society. Then, the second section discusses the mobility of scholars, which includes the concept of brain circulation, in relation to the population of international visiting scholars. The third section discusses the influence of globalization in the field of higher education, including the concept of internationalization, in relation to scholarly exchange through international visiting scholars. The fourth part provides a review of several studies on the population of Fulbright and Chinese visiting scholars. The fifth section explores the factors that affect the experiences of international scholars that are relevant to the current study. Finally, the last section provides an overview of the current context of Japanese higher education, including the challenges and the internationalization initiatives.

Global Trends

In this first section, some contextual concepts that characterize the current society which are relevant to the population of international visiting scholars are discussed. These
concepts are discussed in order to provide a conceptual context to frame the current study regarding the population of international visiting scholars. Three concepts are globalization, knowledge economy, and network society.

**Globalization.** One term often used to describe the current society is globalization. Many scholars have discussed the phenomenon of globalization extensively from different perspectives. Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, and Perraton (1999) provided a comprehensive definition of globalization from a historical analysis as:

a process (or a set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions – assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact – generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power (p.16).

This definition describes how globalization affects the nature of the relationship between time and space in the world moving toward an increasing interconnectedness. Held et al. (1999) discusses that although globalization is not a new phenomenon, recent advancements in transportation and information technology accelerated and intensified the trend of globalization. With the trend of globalization, the mobility of commodities, people, and information has increased in its scope; countries and regions around the world have increased their interactions with each other with the advancement of communication technology and transportation (Held et al., 1999).

The influence of globalization is also discussed in the field of higher education. Altbach (2006) refers to globalization as “the broad economic, technological, and scientific trends that directly affect higher education and are largely inevitable in the
contemporary world” (Altbach, 2006, 2007). With the trend of globalization, the international mobility of researchers, students, and other highly skilled workers has increased in number (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2010; Bhandari & Blumenthal, 2009; O’Hara, 2009), including the number of temporary movers such as international visiting scholars (Ackers & Gill, 2008; Bhandari & Blumenthal, 2009). Globalization has also increased the necessity of English language skills for worldwide communications (Altbach et al., 2010). The development of the global economy, and the growing need for English as the world language emphasizes the value of international educational experiences for students’ and scholars’ careers (Macready & Tucker, 2011; OECD, 2011). The international academic mobility through visiting scholars also operates within this context. As one way to respond to the phenomenon of globalization, higher education institutions are increasingly involved in the effort of internationalization, which is also discussed later in this chapter.

**Knowledge economy.** Another characteristic of the current society that provides a context of the mobility of international visiting scholars is the emergence of the knowledge economy. The idea of knowledge economy is often discussed as a social transformation due to the influence of globalization. The progress of globalization, especially in terms of the advancement of information technology and the increased flow of information, has contributed to the development of the knowledge-based economy (Altbach et al., 2010, p. 2). In the knowledge economy, intellectual capacity and knowledge-related properties are of increasing importance, especially due to monetary value (Iredale, 2001; Powell & Snellman, 2004). Intellectual products and creativity are increasingly seen as a resource of economic power and as commercial goods, while the
flow and exchange of knowledge with open access has also increased (Marginson, 2009). With the increase of the circulation of ideas, the ability to access information has become even more crucial.

In the knowledge-based economy, universities are a place to engage in discovery and the dissemination of knowledge and play a crucial role in maintaining the presence of power as a country. The current knowledge-based society also stresses the importance of researchers and intellectual workers who engage in knowledge production. In addition, society also emphasizes the mobility of those people in order to enhance their professional expertise for knowledge advancement (O’Hara, 2009). Opportunities to become international visiting scholars who move across countries and engage in research and other professional activities are also considered an important way to develop the capacity of those intellectuals who potentially add value to universities and countries in this knowledge-based economy.

**Network society.** The current society is also described as a network society, where advancements in information technology has increased the amount of complex and flexible interactions through various networks on a global level (Castells, 2000). Castells (2009) argues that in the network society, the ability to access and to control networks becomes crucial. Exclusion from important global networks can be a significant disadvantage to those that cannot access the networks, since more dialogues and communications occur through global networks (Castells, 2009; Held & Kaya, 2007). The discussion of inclusion and exclusion to the network is relevant to the concept of cultural capital, which allows access to educational opportunities.
The importance of network is also relevant to the field of higher education. To have access to the international knowledge community is considered an advantage for the advancement of research (Van de Sande, Ackers, & Gill, 2005). The mobility of academics is considered a potential way to be involved in those networks, to engage in the community, and to continue to maintain those networks. In order to participate in the network of the international knowledge community, the use of international scholars is considered a potential approach.

These three characteristics of the current society - the trend of globalization, the emergence of the knowledge economy, and the network society - are all relevant to the population of international visiting scholars. An increase in international mobility in globalization includes the mobility of international visiting scholars, who can work towards the development of network with international academic community. The international mobility of scholars can be beneficial for the advancement of knowledge and increase opportunities for collaborative research, which becomes important in the knowledge-based society. However, despite the potential importance of the population of international visiting scholars to the current societal contexts, they have not received much attention in the previous literature, which is discussed in the later in this chapter.

**International Scholar Mobility and Brain-Circulation**

In the second section of the literature review, international scholar mobility is discussed by addressing the concept of brain-circulation in relation to the population of international visiting scholars. The previous literature on international scholar mobility mostly discusses long-term migration and its consequences as one-directional moves, such as brain drain and brain gain; however, mobility increasingly has become multi-
directional (O’Hara, 2009) and referred to as brain-circulation (Gribble, 2008; Johnson & Regets, 1998; Regets, 2007; Saxenian, 2002, 2005). International visiting scholars, whose period of stay is mostly for a short- to mid-term period, have not been considered mainstream in the studies of scholar mobility. In the following section, the literature on the scholar mobility is discussed.

Brain drain and brain gain. International scholar mobility is “the movement of scholars across national borders” (O’Hara, 2009, p. 30). Including the population of academics, the brain refers to “intellectuals, scientists, and technicians” who have gained high skills and expertise through education or other types of training (Avveduto & Brandi, 2003, p. 4). The flow of highly skilled workers and academics has been initially discussed as “brain drain” and “brain gain” (OECD, 2004; Salt, 1997). Though there is no universal definition of brain drain (Avveduto & Brandi, 2003; Giannoccolo, 2004), brain drain usually refers to outbound moves of highly skilled professionals from their original countries; this is viewed as a loss of human resources, which potentially deteriorates the academic, economic, and industrial capacities in their home countries, while other countries receive benefits from the inbound migration as brain gain (Lowell & Findlay, 2002; OECD, 2004; Salt, 1997). The concept of brain drain has its basis in human capital theory, which connects economy and education; education is seen as investment to enhance a country’s human capital (Becker, 1964). Discussions related to these concepts often center on the fields of science and technology, which are closely related to the industrial and economic development capacities of the countries (Ackers & Gill, 2005a; Casey, Mahroum, Ducatel, & Barre, 2001; Gaillard & Gaillard, 1998).

Though brain drain is often discussed as an issue in developing countries (Adams,
developed countries also experience outbound moves of talents to other countries. For example, the United Kingdom originally encountered brain drain when it lost scientists to the United States and Canada in the 1950s to early 60s (Avveduto & Brandi, 2003; Cervantes & Guellec, 2002; Salt, 1997). Moreover, since the 1990s, a competition of talents among developed countries has become salient, especially in the field of information technology (Cervantes & Guellec, 2002). Though the United States has been accepting professionals in information technology and engineering fields (Cervantes & Guellec, 2002) in addition to academic talents from other countries (Hunter, Oswald, & Charlton, 2009), it has started to face competition for talents with other countries (Douglass & Edelstein, 2009).

**Brain circulation.** With the increase of international multidirectional moves of highly skilled workers in the 1990s, the phenomenon was described as brain circulation (Johnson & Regts, 1998), and the potential benefits for both home and host countries have been discussed (Gaillard & Gaillard, 1998; Gribble, 2008; Regts, 2007; Saxenian, 2002, 2005). This circular mobility of intellectuals has became salient with the advancement of communication and transportation technologies (Saxenian, 2005), which allows ongoing contact and interactions for scientists who move out of their home countries (Kim, Bankart, & Isdell, 2011; Saxenian, 2002). Improved circumstances and rising economic opportunities in their home countries seem to lure immigrants back to their home countries (Gaillard & Gaillard, 1998; Saxenian, 2005).

The concept of brain circulation highlights a potential benefit for sending countries (OECD, 2004; Regts, 2007; Saxenian, 2002, 2005). For sending countries, brain circulation can be beneficial in the development of networks with research
institutions in other countries and the returns of foreign trained people to their home country as potentially contributing to added human capital (Regets, 2007). In particular, the expected benefits of brain circulation include knowledge transfer to the sending countries (Casey, Mahroum, Ducatel, & Barre, 2001; Edler et al., 2011) or the use of developed international network as resources (Saxenian, 2005). This is both through the form of diaspora networks, which are transnational networks of migrants and has been discussed in some previous studies (Lowell & Findlay, 2002; Meyer & Brown, 1999; Zhu, 2009) and also due to return mobility. The international visiting scholars, who visit abroad temporarily and subsequently go back to the home country, show a circular movement, and can potentially be considered a form of brain circulation.

Within the concept of brain circulation, short-term migration has become an important area for potential research. There has been an increase in short-term moves, as opposed to long-term ones (Ackers & Gill, 2008; Okólski, 2006; OECD, 2008; Williams, Baláž, & Wallace, 2004). In the United States, among several different types of J-1 exchange scholars that are relevant to the population of international visiting scholars, the number of short-term scholars has increased (Macready & Tucker, 2011).

Though studies of brain circulation have highlighted the potential benefits for sending countries, the benefits of short-term mobility are relatively understudied. Ackers and Gill (2008) studied a sample of 89 scientists from Poland and Bulgaria regarding their mobility. The authors reported a trend in terms of an increase of short-term mobility both at the doctoral level and the post-doctoral level. The authors also found that many of these scientists move repeatedly and circulated, often at an early stage in their careers. The availability of affordable transportation has been one reason for the increase in short-
term “shuttle mobility” (Ackers, 2005a, p. 111). They also reported perceived benefits of short-term migration in accessing resources and equipment, developing opportunities for collaborative projects, and enriching careers for young scholars.

Within the limited scope of information about this area, Okólski (2006) stated that short-mobility with some fellowship programs that are aimed at increasing participant scientists’ social capital for the benefit of the sending countries has increased recently (p.13). The use of international mobility as a training program has also become more common, with aims of developing academic professional expertise and new ideas through exchanges, such as through the Marie Curie Fellowship Programme in European areas (Teichler, 2006). Further studies on this relatively new trend of short-term migration will be meaningful especially in different national contexts, because differences in countries and contexts matter greatly in understanding the issues related to migration (Ackers & Gill, 2008).

**Return mobility.** The potential benefits of brain circulation for the sending country highlight the importance of facilitating the return mobility of talents who have migrated. Todisco (2003) states that the returners who have acquired education or professional experiences overseas can be a resource for the improvement and development of sending countries. Though return mobility has not been studied extensively (Gill, 2005), some studies have focused on the return mobility of migrated scholars (Ackers, 2005b; Casey et al., 2001; Dustmann, Bentolila, & Faini, 1996; Gill, 2005; Kim et al., 2011). Return mobility, as a part of brain circulation, is necessary for the balanced growth of both sending and receiving countries (Ackers, 2005b). Mobility
through the form of international visiting scholars can be considered a way to ensure their return to their home country.

This literature also provides some insights regarding return migration. In order to benefit from the international mobility of scholars, removing potential obstacles for return mobility is important. One potential approach can be developing systems or programs to assist with scholars’ transition in terms of their travel, residence, and career-related support (Casey et al., 2001; Dustmann et al., 1996; Gill, 2005; Lowell & Findlay, 2002). Casey et al. (2001) discussed that a best practice for the return mobility of scholars is to promote exchanges under a certain program with support for both the return as well as re-integration into the home countries. Another approach is to provide information that is relevant and helpful for the scholars in returning to their home country (Lowell & Findlay, 2002). In both approaches, a key is to address career-related concerns at the home country, which could be done through online job postings, open recruitment, and evaluation systems of overseas experiences. Another important aspect to benefit from return mobility is that returners should reach a level of critical mass among the group (King, 1986). If the number of returnees is too small, it seemed to not have enough of an influence on the home country as a driver of innovation (King, 1986).

The re-integration issues are particularly relevant with scholars, such as postdocs, staying for a relatively long time without any clear plans about their future careers, as discussed by Cantwell & Lee (2010). By contrast, international short-term visiting scholars probably have less trouble with their re-entry since they are staying with a clear plan to go back to their home institutions. In this sense, academic exchange through international visiting scholars programs is a potential way to overcome the re-integration
concerns that international scholars often face. This emphasizes the importance of exploring the specific population of international visiting scholars in relation to their return mobility.

**Globalization and the Field of Higher Education**

This part of the literature review discusses globalization and its effects on universities and the professors who work at these institutions. This section examines existing discussions and concepts regarding the influence of globalization on the field of higher education. First, a discussion on the increased importance of research universities and the concept of world-class universities, which has been enhanced by the emergence of the world university rankings, is presented. Then, the center-periphery concept is reviewed to understand the historical and political contexts that have potentially affected the universities in the world. Third, the concept, including its definitions, approaches, and other sub-concepts, of internationalization of higher education is reviewed in relation to the population of international visiting scholars. Finally, international research collaboration as the main international initiatives for faculty members in relation to the population of international visiting scholars are reviewed.

**Universities in the globalized society.** In our globalized and knowledge-based society, the importance of universities has increased. In particular, research universities play an important role, due to their production of new knowledge and their training of future scholars and highly skilled professionals (Mohrman, Ma, & Baker, 2008). In the knowledge-based society, scholars and researchers, professional workers, and students who serve in the frontiers of the creation of knowledge, have also become crucial in relation to the country’s economic and industrial capacities (Altbach & Balán, 2007). For
the advancement knowledge, the enhancement of professional expertise through international exchanges of scholars, including as visiting scholars, has also become more important.

The increased interconnectedness among different countries also accelerates the competition among universities. Establishing world-class universities has become an emerging agenda in many parts of the world, including developing countries (Altbach & Balán, 2007; Salmi, 2009). The leading and influential ones are located in mainly developed countries, especially in the United States and the United Kingdom (Altbach et al., 2010; Salmi, 2009). The emergence of the world-class university rankings has increased pressure and competition among research universities around the world (Salmi, 2009), and some countries have started to take those rankings into account when considering their national higher education policy (Altbach, 2007). The rankings can be a factor as international visiting scholars decide the destinations of their visits in order to access highly ranked institutions. In addition, the degree of engagement in international scholarly exchange, including the number of international students and scholars, could be evaluated in the decision of rankings.

Center and periphery. Even though globalization has enabled institutions in many different countries to participate in the competition of knowledge, it is also the reality that the inequity of research tradition, history, and resources make it difficult for institutions in developing countries to join the world-class research university league (Altbach, 2007). Altbach (1998) discussed the worldwide spectrum of the world knowledge system as a “center - periphery” concept (p. 20). This concept also helps to understand why visiting scholars often visit universities in English-speaking Western
countries. The center - periphery concept explains that higher education institutions have hierarchical dynamics among them: top research institutions that are mostly in industrialized countries in the West take a leading role in academic research while serving as a model for other institutions in many other countries (Altbach, 1998). By contrast, institutions in the periphery mostly follow the research of the centers, and these periphery institutions are mostly located in developing countries and non-English speaking countries (Altbach, 1998, 2007). This phenomenon affects not only universities, but also the behaviors of individual scholars (Altbach, 1998, 2007).

The universities in the center have more resources, and they promote the standard of scientific research as including research methodologies, Western values, and the use of English as a scientific language (Altbach, 1998). Academic journals are often published in these centers in English; it is advantageous for faculty in the centers to publish articles because faculty with Western values often edit them, and article topics are frequently relevant to the context of the local community of the centers (Altbach, 1998). On the contrary, institutions at the peripheries have limited resources, and often are using English as a second language in order to join the academic knowledge system (Altbach, 1998). Scholars and students in the periphery often visit the center institutions in Western countries to try to narrow the gap between them (Altbach, 1998). The moves of international visiting scholars, who mainly came from non-Western countries to the United States can be also explained from the concept of center-periphery dynamics.

**Internationalization of higher education.** The trends of globalization and its influence cannot be avoided at higher education institutions (Altbach, 2006). In order to respond to globalization, internationalization of higher education has been suggested and
implemented as an approach (Altbach & Knight, 2007; de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2005, 2008). Internationalization of higher education is defined as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2003, p. 2). Internationalization refers to specific policies, programs, and initiatives that are taken by governments, institutions, departments and/or individuals to respond to the phenomenon of globalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Altbach, 2007, p. 26). J. C. Scott (2006) argues that internationalization should be included as a mission of the university by reflecting the globalized society where communication among people and transportation of knowledge has become global in scale (J. C. Scott, 2006). The term globalization and internationalization are often used interchangeably; however, they are different concepts (Altbach & Knight, 2007; P. Scott, 2000). The concept of internationalization highlights the idea that people possess control over how to internationalize themselves by planning and implementing policies and programs (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

The traditional rationales for the internationalization of higher education range from social/cultural, political, academic, and economic aspects (de Wit, 2002). Recently, there has been an emerging importance on the rationales for internationalization at the national level and the institutional level (Knight, 2004). The rationales for the national level include human resource development, strategic alliances, income generation/commercial trade, nation building/institution building, and social/cultural development and mutual understanding (Knight, 2004). By contrast, rationales of internationalization at the institutional level include international branding and profile,
quality enhancement/international standards, income generation, student and staff
development, strategic alliances, and knowledge production (Knight, 2004).

Knight (2004) refers to two approaches in the strategies of internationalization of
higher education: academic programs and research/scholarly collaboration (Knight, 2004).
Academic programs include student exchange programs, foreign language study,
work/study, faculty/staff mobility programs, and visiting lecturers and scholars (Knight,
2004). Research and scholarly collaboration refers to joint research projects,
international conferences and seminars, international research agreements, research
exchange programs (Knight, 2004). The movements and activities of international
visiting scholars are directly and indirectly related to both of these approaches and
strategies. However, literature that exclusively discusses international visiting scholars is
limited.

The strategies of the internationalization of higher education can be discussed as
either ‘internationalization at home,’ which takes place at home campuses, or
‘internationalization abroad,’ which focuses on the activities overseas (Knight, 2004,
2008; Nilsson, 2003; Wächter, 2003). The population of international visiting scholars
can be relevant to the context of internationalization both at home and abroad. From the
viewpoint of the host institutions, international visiting scholars can be a resource of
internationalization at home; from the standpoint of their home institutions, international
visiting scholars are considered to be ways for the institutions and their academic staff to
be internationalized through their experiences abroad, and consequently, enrich the home
campuses with their international experiences after their return. However, despite the
potential ways to utilize the scholars as a resource of internationalization, visiting
scholars have been overlooked in previous literature, which emphasizes the importance of the further studies on this population.

**Professors and international initiatives.** Globalization has affected the roles of faculty members and scholars. Traditionally, the role of faculty members has been closely related to the purposes of higher education institutions: teaching, research, service (Kerr, 2001), and administration for some (Enders, 2006). J. C. Scott (2006) suggests that, with the recent trend of globalization, the emerging mission of universities is internationalization. This implies that these roles of faculty are also increasingly influenced by their international relevance. Among these main roles discussed above, the degree of emphasis differs by the institutional type; at research universities, research is considered central (Clark, 1987). In addition, based on the academic disciplines, the emphasis also differs (Clark, 1987). In general, international visiting scholars in the United States mostly visit research universities with their main purposes for engaging in research activities and the enhancement of professional skills. In some academic fields, such as science and technology, engagement in collaborative research can be one of the main activities for international visiting scholars (Edler et al., 2011).

One of the international-related activities among academics is international collaboration in research. There are many ways to approach research collaboration, such as through the sharing of access to equipment, through the guiding of research methods, through publishing articles on academic journals together, or through the division of tasks in the research processes, and others (Laudel, 2001). Recently, there is an increase in international collaboration of research. The number of international co-authored papers in science and engineering has increased from 8% in 1988 to 23% in 2009 (National
Science Board, 2012). In 2008, more than 30% of all publications in international journals were the works based on international collaboration; this increased from approximately 25% in 1996 (The Royal Society, 2011, p. 46).

Collaboration of research includes both benefits and costs. Benefits of collaboration include sharing and transferring intellectual expertise (Katz & Martin, 1997) and stimulating a generation of new ideas by the exposition to diverse views and perspectives (Katz & Martin, 1997; Laudel, 2001). Research collaborations also help to include researchers in the scientific community (Katz & Martin, 1997). In addition, collaborated articles seem to be more influential and more likely to be cited (Katz & Martin, 1997; Lancho-Barrantes, Guerrero-Bote, & de Moya-Anegón, 2012; Pečlin, Južnič, Blagus, Sajko, & Stare, 2012), which is a driver of further international collaboration since it can lead to added visibilities and reputations of the work (Wagner & Leydesdorff, 2005). For developing nations, research collaborations with scholars in developed countries are effective ways to improve research capacity (Numprasertchai & Igel, 2005). By contrast, there are potential costs of research collaborations in terms of finance and time by travelling as well as repetitive communications (Katz & Martin, 1997). Building and developing relationships with other researchers for collaboration could also take time (Katz & Martin, 1997).

Although the advancement and the availability of information technology often assist the process of collaboration (Numprasertchai & Igel, 2005), a collaboration of research is often followed by informal and personal communication among researchers (Jeong et al., 2011; Numprasertchai & Igel, 2005). Researchers with frequent international visits for professional purposes are more likely to prefer international
collaboration of research (Jeong et al., 2011). Because international visiting scholars are able to meet and interact with fellow researchers through their actual visits, the visits are considered to be helpful in engaging in international collaborative research.

**Research Concerning International Visiting Scholars**

The literature on visiting scholars is extremely limited. Among the wider population of international scholars, the most recent studies are on foreign-born faculty members and postdoctoral fellows who mainly pursue their academic careers in the United States, but the studies on visiting scholars are scarce. Since the existing studies that are directly focused on visiting scholars are so limited, they are examined in detail with the summaries of findings, challenges, and ideas for future studies on this population. First, a report on the impact of international Fulbright visiting scholars (Stanford Research Institute, 2005) is reviewed, and then a few studies on Chinese visiting scholars in North America on cultural, language, and academic adaptation (e.g. Sun, 1987; R. Zhao, 2008; Zheng & Berry, 1991) are examined.

The impact of international Fulbright visiting scholars. Though there is a relative lack of literature on international visiting scholars, there are several existing studies that are helpful in understanding this population. The Stanford Research Institute (SRI) (2005) conducted an outcome assessment of the Fulbright Visiting Scholar Program with a survey of 1,894 Fulbright visiting scholar grantees from 16 countries between 1980 and 2001. The survey results are as follows: 1) the Fulbright visiting scholars reported overall satisfaction regarding their experience in the program; 2) their experiences as visiting scholars were helpful in their advancement of professional expertise (knowledge, skills, opportunities for publication, and presentation); 3) their
visiting experiences seemed to affect changes in their professional work by the utilization of new perspectives and skills; 4) they developed and tended to maintain the scholarly network and engagement of collaboration after their return; 5) they increased cultural awareness and understanding, in both the United States and other countries; and 6) they seemed to agree that the experience is helpful in terms of national interests because it enhanced mutual understanding (SRI, 2005).

While this study is helpful in understanding the experiences of Fulbright visiting scholars and their perceived impact that these experiences had on them, these results cannot be simply applied to other international visiting scholars who are not the recipients of Fulbright scholarships. For instance, the clear objectives and mission of the Fulbright programs and the organized support and various enrichment programs that are exclusive for Fulbright scholars could positively affect the scholars’ experience. Therefore, further studies on the population of international visiting scholars regardless of their funding sources are necessary in order to have a better understanding of the general population of international visiting scholars. In addition, the data were collected through large-scale surveys and mostly analyzed by quantitative methods. It did not give rich descriptions of how and why the scholars reported these answers, and it did not examine potential differences by countries, individuals, or other personal and contextual factors that might have affected their experiences differently. Conducting in-depth interviews with particular attention to individual differences will be meaningful in order to reveal scholars’ experiences and interactions while they are abroad.

**Chinese visiting scholars.** Several existing studies on Chinese visiting scholars in North America provide information on this population of international visiting scholars.
First, for the successful adaptation of Chinese visiting scholars, the English language seems to play an important role. Chinese visiting scholars in Canada reported their difficulties in English communication with Canadians, compared to Chinese immigrant students in Canada and non-Chinese Canadian students (Zheng & Berry, 1991). Among the specific competencies in the English language, Chinese visiting scholars highlighted a need to improve oral English communication for successful stays in Canada, while Chinese graduate students emphasized the needs for both oral English communication skills and writing skills (Sun, 1987). A dissertation study at a university in New York found that strong English language abilities and communication skills are imperative for Chinese visiting scholars to be effectively involved in the research environment in the United States (Zhao, 2008).

In addition, previous studies discussed some psychological aspects of Chinese visiting scholars in relation to their adaptation. Sojourners from China and Hong Kong, including visiting scholars, showed psychological difficulty in adjusting to Canadian culture and presented problems in integrating in the local environment (Zheng & Berry, 1991). These scholars hoped to have interactions with Canadians, but they reported fewer actual interactions than Chinese Canadians or non-Chinese Canadians (Zheng & Berry, 1991). The authors reported that these sojourners especially struggled during their initial transition period, three to four months after their arrival (Zheng & Berry, 1991), which is referred to as U-curve adjustment (Lysgaard, 1955). Chinese visiting scholars tend to have the attitude that they must separate themselves when they experience adaptation stresses (Zheng & Berry, 1991). A Chinese visiting scholar’s motivation for
pursuing international visits, open-mindedness, and positive attitudes helps him or her adjust to a new academic environment (Zhao, 2008).

The existing studies on international visiting scholars report some characteristics and aspects of their experiences. Though the experiences of international visiting scholars can be beneficial for professional development and networking, as found with Fulbright scholars, there are potential areas of challenge, such as language abilities for communication with local faculty (Sun, 1987; Zhao, 2008) and adaptation (Zheng & Berry, 1991). Though these studies are informative in terms of visiting scholars with specific backgrounds, such as the recipients of Fulbright scholarships, or those from China and Hong Kong, studies on different nationalities at different institutions could be explored in the future. Furthermore, these studies did not specifically examine visiting scholars in relation to the internationalization of higher education. There has also been no larger discussion of mobility of highly skilled people as a human resource, which is a potential conceptual framework to use to examine this population in future research.

Factors that Affect the Mobility of International Scholars

This section explores the factors that influence the mobility of international scholars which are relevant to the current study. Due to the limitation of existing studies on international visiting scholars as presented in the last section, this section also examines the existing studies on other types of international scholars, such as foreign-born faculty members, international postdoc scholars, and graduate international students at American universities. Although they are not international visiting scholars, they are presumed to share some similar experiences with international visiting scholars because of their foreign-born backgrounds and their need to navigate their academic and social
lives in the United States. Several key factors from these studies are discussed: motivations of visits, issues on adjustment and interactions, language issues, cultural differences, other personal resources that influence their experiences, time as a factor, and ideas of support for the population of international scholars.

**Motivations.** International scholars come to the United States for many potential reasons, presumably depending on their status, academic fields, countries of origin, and personal factors. In general, abundant academic resources and the availability of advanced instruments seem to serve as a “pull” factor that attracts international scholars to the United States, while other “push” factors, such as a lack of academic freedom and job security, encourage scholars to leave their home countries to pursue studies or research abroad (Altbach, 2004; O’Hara, 2009). Some of the push and pull factors of student mobility that were discussed by de Wit (2008) could be potentially applicable to the mobility of scholars, such as higher education opportunities, ranking and status of higher education, language factors, and experience with international mobility as either or both push and pull factors (p. 28). Although these factors are often used to explain the moves from developing countries to Western countries, it provides some ideas to understand the motivation of international visiting scholars.

While higher salaries and better academic working conditions often motivate foreign-born faculty members to seek faculty positions at U.S. institutions (Altbach, 2002), visiting scholars who receive funding from their home institution seem to have different motivations for their moves. For example, Chinese visiting scholars reported their purpose of visits to the United States not only as advancing their research and learning theories and methods, but also improving their English proficiency to be
competitive in academic careers in their home country (Zhao, 2008). Since the motivations and goals of visits might differ by nationality, further explorations with visiting scholars from different countries regarding their motivation will be meaningful.

Adjustment and interactions. Previous literature also discusses some challenges that international scholars face when they adjust to a new academic environment. The lack of contact with colleagues at host universities is also reported as a challenge among international visiting scholars, as presented above (e.g., Zheng & Berry, 1991). In addition, a lack of interaction with faculty members at host universities seems to be a common issue for international scholars, including full-time faculty members, visitors, and graduate students. For example, foreign-born faculty members find difficulties in creating collegiality in their department (Thomas & Johnson, 2004) and often feel isolated (Collins, 2008). In addition to the cultural and language differences as an obstacle, the lack of physical arrangements to foster communication among colleagues also limits opportunities for interactions (Thomas & Johnson, 2004).

Moreover, interactions with Americans also affect the academic and social satisfaction of foreign scholars. For the population of international graduate students, interactions with American colleagues seem to be beneficial for enhancing international students’ satisfaction in social experiences and their academic performance (Trice, 2004). Interactions between international and American students not only can serve as a social resource for international students to enhance their satisfaction, but also can reduce cultural stereotypes and contribute to mutual understanding (Perrucci & Hu, 1995). The issue regarding satisfaction and social interactions with people in the host countries could be examined with the experiences of international visiting scholars.
**Language issues.** English language proficiency is an obstacle that often affects the transition of foreign scholars to a new academic environment. Language proficiency is a key to help foreign scholars be included in the cultural community (Marvasti, 2005). For example, the limitation of English language abilities among Chinese visiting scholars was a potential obstacle for communication with local faculty (Sun, 1987; Zhao, 2008). In turn, strong English language abilities and communication skills helped Chinese visiting scholars adapt to an American research environment (Zhao, 2008). Moreover, international graduate students’ language proficiency also influenced their academic and social satisfaction regarding their life in the United States (Perrucci & Hu, 1995). Perrucci and Hu (1995) explain that frequent interactions with American peers are also beneficial to improve foreign students’ English language ability.

Although they were not studies on international visiting scholars, several studies on foreign-born international faculty members reported that while they were productive in research (Corley & Sabharwal, 2007; Mamiseishvili & Rosser, 2010), this population seemed to face difficulty in teaching because of the language barrier (Mamiseishvili & Rosser, 2010; Mamiseishvili, 2011). Foreign faculty members also worried about their effectiveness in teaching because of their accent (Manrique & Manrique, 1999). Foreign-born faculty members and foreign teaching assistants often experience difficulties, especially with language use, and tend to receive dissatisfactory evaluations from American students (Marvasti, 2005), although some other students perceived instructions by foreign-born faculty members positively in that they provide a chance to experience different pedagogical styles (Collins, 2008). The language issues seemed to be a factor that affects the experience of foreign-born faculty members. This implies that
international visiting scholars would also face similar challenge due to their language issues. Therefore, this could be examined further in studies of international visiting scholars.

**Cultural differences as a barrier.** In addition to language problems, the degree of cultural differences also serves as a barrier for international researchers to adapt to the new environment (Howe, 2008; Trice, 2004). International faculty members who came from different academic cultural environments seem to experience more difficulties in adjusting to American academic life (Thomas & Johnson, 2004). Foreign-born professors reported challenges in teaching because of pedagogical differences due to culture, in addition to language differences (Mamiseishvili & Rosser, 2010; Mamiseishvili, 2011; Thomas & Johnson, 2004). For international graduate students, the amount of interaction with US peers and their comfort level in interactions is affected by perceived cultural differences (Chapdelaine & Alexitch, 2004).

Previous studies acknowledged that some foreign faculty who were from specific cultural backgrounds might face more issues than others. For example, Wells et al. (2007) discussed that international faculty from the Middle East and Asian countries are less satisfied with the academic work life in the United States than those from other areas. A study on postdoc researchers also reported differences in perceptions between those from western countries and from non-western countries (Cantwell & Lee, 2010). As discussed in the language difficulty section above, international encounters often help reduce cultural stereotypes and prejudice; academic and social interactions not only improve satisfaction among international colleagues, but are also beneficial for mutual understanding (Perrucci & Hu, 1995). Since cultural differences seem to be a factor that
affects the experiences of international scholars differently, it needs to be also addressed in the current study on international visiting scholars.

Other personal factors that affect experiences. Previous studies discuss some other factors that influence the nature of the experiences during their international life. Some studies found that marital status affected international graduate students’ well-being. Sandhu and Asrabadi (1994) argue that international researchers who came with their spouses might be more likely to make contact with international scholars who came from the same country. Trice (2004) also points out that international graduate students with their partners tend to interact less with Americans because they might spend their social time with their family members, and do not need to receive psychological support externally by establishing relationships with Americans. In the study of international visiting scholars, marital status and family members could be examined as a potential factor to affect their transitional experiences.

In addition to the presence of spouses and children, there are other factors that influence international scholars’ successful transition to the American environment. R. Zhao (2008) discussed the factors that allow Chinese visiting scholars to better adjust in the American university, including motivation to learn, positive outlooks, open-mindedness, and communication skills, which are self factor of Schlossberg’s adult transition model, as described in the theoretical framework section. Chinese visiting researchers who are equipped with those qualities seem to be more resilient in adapting to challenging situations, and in finding more opportunities for interactions with Americans and non-American colleagues, which are also beneficial and reduce their language obstacles and cultural misunderstandings (Zhao, 2008). The personal characteristics as
seen in this previous study could be further examined in future studies on the experiences of international visiting scholars.

**Time as a factor.** The experiences and adjustment issues of international scholars can also be discussed in terms of time. Foreign teaching assistants reported that their language abilities improved and they became more comfortable using the foreign language as they taught more (Manrique & Manrique, 1999). As for the population of international graduate students, Trice (2004) explains that they improved their satisfaction over time if they frequently had contact with American counterparts, although the total length of the period in the United States does not automatically increase the amount of interaction or satisfaction level. The degree of prejudice regarding language and cultural issues can be reduced if foreign-born faculty members spend more time interacting with American students (Manrique & Manrique, 1999). The amount of time that foreign scholars utilize English and interact with American scholars seems to be important in improving the foreign scholars’ perceived experiences in academia in the US. The passage of time as a factor that influences the experiences of international scholars can be also explored more in studies on international visiting scholars.

**Japanese Context**

The final section of the literature review discusses the situation of higher education and scholars in Japan in order to provide a context that highlights the potential importance of Japanese visiting scholars as a research topic. This section provides current challenges that Japanese society and universities are facing, such as financial constraints and the decline of the population as a whole. Then, some recent initiatives of
internationalization of higher education are reviewed. Finally, existing programs that are relevant to visiting scholars are overviewed.

**Challenges that Japanese higher education faces.** Currently, Japanese higher education faces several challenges. First of all, Japanese universities have been facing financial constraints. In 2004, when Japanese national universities became incorporated, budget cuts were implemented at national universities for several years (Ishikawa, 2011). Then, in 2010, dramatic budget cuts to Japanese universities were announced, which invoked opposing discussions from presidents of national universities (Ishikawa, 2011). In Japan, public spending for research and development was 0.6% in 2003, which was already at a low level, compared to the average of OECD countries of 1.3% (Newby, Weko, Breneman, Johanneson, & Maassen, 2009). With limited financial resources, Japanese higher education has to deal with initiatives and reforms, including internationalization of higher education.

Another societal trend that affects Japanese higher education is the decline of the population in Japan. The population in Japan was 128.06 million in 2010, and is projected to be below 100 million in 2048 (National Institute of Population and Social Security Research in Japan, 2012). One of the impacts of this demographic trend on Japanese higher education is the decline of the college-age population. In 2012, approximately 45.8% of private universities in Japan could not fill their available seats (Nihon Shiritsu Gakko Shinko Kyosai Jigyodan, 2012). Because of the reduction in potential applicants to universities, there is concern that some universities at the mid- and bottom-tiers face a risk of lowering their standards of matriculation, or otherwise be unable to fill seats (Ishikawa, 2011).
In addition, the decline of the population has lead to a decline of the Japanese domestic economic market. Due to this trend, Japanese companies have increasingly considered seeking international operations, and have started to hire workers with skills and competencies that allow them to be able to work and communicate internationally (Ishikawa, 2011). With this change in domestic society and economy, Japanese companies and governments increasingly see the university as a place to train people to have international skills. The internationalization of higher education is considered a necessity in globalized society (Ishikawa, 2011).

The agenda of the internationalization of Japanese higher education is also relevant from an external perspective. The global competition for talent, which was discussed in the sections above, is also relevant to Japanese universities. Increasingly, the best and brightest are recruited internationally (Douglass & Edelstein, 2009; Geiger, 2004; Hawthorne, 2008; OECD, 2008). There is an increase in aspirations to establish “world-class universities” around the world (Altbach & Balán, 2007; Altbach & Salmi, 2011), which is also a prevalent view of the Japanese public and the Japanese government, especially with the increased attention to the world university rankings (Ishikawa, 2009). In order to increase the recognition of Japanese universities, the development and improvement of international aspects of universities has become an emerging political agenda (Ishikawa, 2011).

**Recent initiatives for internationalization of higher education.** The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan (MEXT) has been implementing several initiatives to promote internationalizing Japanese universities. The recent key initiatives include Project for Establishing University Network for
Internationalization (Global 30) and Project for Promotion of Global Human Resource Development Project (MEXT, 2012c). In Japan, the higher education system traditionally is strongly influenced by the government through the use of funding allocations on those programs, although some individual institutions develop some internationalization programs on their own.

One of the initiatives for internationalization is Global 30. This project aims at increasing the number of international students and scholars at 13 major universities in Japan (MEXT, 2012a). These universities receive government funding to develop English-taught bachelor degree programs and support systems for accepting highly qualified international students (Ishikawa, 2011). Though the funding period of Global 30 is five years (until 2013), these universities have a target goal to increase the number of international students from 16,000 to 50,000 by 2020 at those institutions (Ishikawa, 2011). The Global 30 program also includes a goal to increase the ratio of foreign faculty at those institutions (Ishikawa, 2011). As exemplified by this initiative, the acceptance of international students and faculty is a traditional approach of Japanese higher education (Horie, 2002). However, the creation of English-language taught courses has caused resistance among Japanese faculty members because of the concern of maintaining the quality of education as well as due to the long-standing tradition of Japanese higher education relying on the use of the Japanese language (Ishikawa, 2011).

Another key initiative of internationalization of Japanese higher education is Project for Promotion of Global Human Resource Development. This initiative is called “Global 30 Plus” (IIE, 2012b), and aims to allocate governmental funding to selected universities to develop programs for Japanese domestic students to study overseas
starting from fiscal year 2013 (MEXT, 2012b). While Global 30 focuses on accepting more international students and scholars in Japan, the Global 30 Plus focuses on the promotion of outbound mobility from Japan (MEXT, 2012b). This initiative was developed because of the recent “inward tendency,” meaning the number of Japanese university students who study abroad has been decreasing (MEXT, 2012b). The number of Japanese students who study abroad has decreased to 19,966 in the academic year of 2011-2012 (IIE, 2012a), which is less than half of the peak in 1997 when the number was at 47,000 (Ota, 2011). The recent initiatives for internationalization of higher education, Global 30 and Global 30 Plus, have been mostly centered on the student level; internationalization initiatives for the faculty have not been discussed as a central issue in recent projects.

Although the involvement of faculty members is crucial in the internationalization of higher education (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008), the reactions to international initiatives from faculty members seem to be mixed (Ishikawa, 2011). While some faculty members in Japan have engaged in incorporating international aspects in their own research and teaching, others seem to have responded passively to the internationalization of higher education (Huang, 2009). Even though there are societal needs and requirements to shift to internationalization, conservative professors do not welcome the increase of international students and scholars through the provisions of English-taught degree programs as implemented by Global 30, and are concerned with maintaining the quality of education delivered in English (Klaphake, 2010 as cited in Ishikawa 2011). This is probably because the Japanese academic system has used Japanese as the language of the institution traditionally, and it has been described a self-sustaining model (Ishikawa,
The prevalence of academic inbreeding at Japanese universities also potentially prohibits university reforms for internationalization. Academic inbreeding is “a recruitment practice in which universities hire their own graduates as faculty directly after doctoral graduation” (Horta, Sato, & Yonezawa, 2011, p. 36). Because this academic practice has been influential for the recruitment of new faculty at Japanese universities, scholars and researchers who did not graduate from Japanese universities or were trained abroad are potentially at a disadvantage and could lose their connections and human networks with scholars at Japanese universities (Horta et al., 2011). The practice of academic inbreeding could have potentially reduced the number of Japanese young scholars seeking academic degrees abroad and has potentially prevented the hiring of those foreign-trained scholars as well as foreign faculty with foreign academic degrees. This implies that it is important to cultivate international aspects in the work of traditional domestic faculty members.

**International initiatives for academic professions in Japan.** Since faculty members are key actors at universities (Green et al., 2008), enriching their international experiences is important in order to enhance academic competitiveness internationally. Though the promotion of international academic experiences among Japanese faculty has not been brought up in the recent discussion of internationalization initiatives, as discussed above, there are some existing programs for promoting international scholar exchanges. Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS), a governmental organization, administers programs that support the international collaboration of research and provides research fellowships for both Japanese and foreign scholars. One
of the funding programs is the Postdoctoral Fellowship for Research Abroad, which provides fellowships for young postdocs or full-time researchers at Japanese universities to have research abroad experiences (JSPS, 2012c). Among the applications from 888 researchers, 184 of them were selected as recipients in the academic year 2012 (JSPS, 2012d). Another JSPS program is the Institutional Programs for Young Researcher Overseas Visits (JSPS, 2012a), which allocates fellowships for 96 programs at the institutional level to develop young scholars’ international capacities from FY2009 to 2014 (JSPS, 2012a, 2012b).

Though there are other initiatives for promoting young scholars’ research experiences abroad, the impact of these experiences on the scholars’ professional and personal development has not been extensively studied. In addition, these JSPS fellowships are specifically for young scholars who were selected through the screening process individually or institutionally. However, there are other scholars who become international visiting scholars, including mid-career and older scholars. There are also other scholars who go abroad using other funding sources and have not been examined in the previous literature. Because traditional faculty members at Japanese universities are important actors in the implementation of internationalization initiatives, the promotion and development of programs that allow faculty members to advance their international academic experiences seem to be important both for their research and teaching.

Summary

This literature review provided a current broad context in which to situate the population of international visiting scholars and to examine the existing literature that is highly relevant to the population of international visiting scholars with the focus on
Japanese visiting scholars. The first section provided three broad contexts to understand the current society: globalization, knowledge economy, and network society. The second section of the literature review discussed scholar mobility with the concepts of brain drain, brain gain, brain circulation, and return mobility. The fourth section examined a limited pool of existing studies on the population of international visiting scholars (e.g. Stanford Research Institute, 2005; Sun, 1987; R. Zhao, 2008; Zheng & Berry, 1991). In the fifth section of this literature review, factors that affect the experiences of international scholars were presented through the review of studies. The final section of the literature review discussed the Japanese context, to provide a background to understand the population of Japanese visiting scholars as the subject of the current study.

Despite an increased potential importance of the population of international visiting scholars at universities in the globalized society, the population of international visiting scholars has been largely ignored in existing literature. In addition, the recent emphasis on international initiatives on higher education in Japan also highlights the significance of studying the population of Japanese visiting scholars as a potential approach for larger internationalization initiatives. While the review of the literature emphasized the rationale of studying this population, it also identifies a gap in the literature, which is the main focus of the current study: to examine the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars through the stages of transition using a qualitative approach. The next section discusses the methodology to research this topic.
Chapter 4. Research Methods

Research Questions

As discussed in the literature review section, existing studies on the experiences of international visiting scholars have mostly explored their cultural and language adjustment issues during their visits. An extensive study on the process of transition, including how scholars have located the opportunities to visit an institution in the United States while taking temporary leave from their home institution, has been missing from the literature. A few existing studies on the experiences of international visiting scholars were on visiting scholars from China. Since the differences in the societal, political, and economic context in their home countries could affect the experiences as international visiting scholars while they are in the United States differently, a further study is necessary to examine the experiences of visiting scholars from a different country.

The current study focuses on understanding Japanese visiting scholars’ experiences of transition in the United States. As discussed in Chapter One, the research questions to answer from this study are the following:

1. Why do Japanese visiting scholars visit universities in the United States?
2. What are their academic, social, and personal experiences during their visiting periods?
3. What are the sources of challenges and support for Japanese visiting scholars?
4. How do Japanese visiting scholars perceive that personal and contextual factors affect their transition in different periods of their transition?

This chapter discusses the methods of the current study. First, the selection of qualitative approach and the research design is explained. Then, population and sampling, the data
collection strategy, the coding process, the analysis procedure, the issues of trustworthiness, and the positionality of the researcher are outlined.

**Research Design**

The current study employed a qualitative research method with the use of interviews as the primary data collection strategy. A qualitative approach is appropriate when researchers are interested in understanding the process of a phenomenon, especially from participants’ perspectives on the ways they make sense of their situation (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998, 2002).

Among various types of qualitative research design, the current study used basic interpretive qualitative research. The characteristics of basic interpretive qualitative research include: researchers play a role as an interpreter of the meaning of the data, the data analysis is conducted inductively, and the findings are stated as descriptive text, rather than statistics or numbers (Merriam, 2002). In the current study, the interpretive qualitative design allowed Japanese visiting scholars to describe how they experienced the process of transition through their rich descriptions. In addition, the selection of qualitative approach is also reasonable for uncovering phenomena that have not been studied much (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). This also fits the nature of the current study, considering that there was no extensive descriptive qualitative study on Japanese visiting scholars.

Although qualitative analysis is usually an inductive process (Merriam, 2002), it also often utilizes a theoretical framework to guide the process; the framework also influences the research design (Creswell, 2007). This study drew upon Schlossberg’s transition model as a theoretical framework to guide the inquiry. Since Schlossberg’s
transition framework stresses the importance of individuals’ perceptions regarding their transition, the use of qualitative study and the direct engagement with the participants’ views through interviews are essential to utilize the theory to answer research questions. In addition, qualitative studies allow exploration of the complexity of multifaceted elements that affect participants and their situations holistically; this can lead to a deeper understanding of the phenomenon (Creswell, 2007). This characteristic of qualitative studies enabled the examination of numerous factors together that affect international visiting scholars’ transition to American universities, including Schlossberg’s four S’s.

**Sample**

The population of this study was scholars from Japanese universities who have spent at least one semester (12 to 15 weeks) at universities in an area in the east coast of the United States as visiting scholars during the period of 2011 to 2013. The definition of international visiting scholars was presented in the introduction section. These inclusion criteria were designed to answer the research questions effectively. First, participants needed to have spent a reasonable amount of time in the new environment in order to explore their experiences in the United States and the factors that affect their transition. For this study, the length of their visits was specified as at least a semester because academic institutions often use a semester as a typical segment of time. Semesters are commonly three- to four- months long. Second, in order to gather data from Japanese scholars who visited the United States relatively recently, participants were required to have visited the United States in the past two years.

This study used purposeful sampling to recruit information-rich participants (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002). The recruitment was done in several ways. I sent
recruitment e-mails to some relevant list-serves of Japanese people in an area in the east coast. I sent recruitment e-mails to some visiting scholars whose information was available on the websites of the host institutions in the United States. From the information that was obtained online, recruitment emails were sent to the scholars who were the recipients of Fulbright scholarships during the period. I also recruited participants at social gatherings of Japanese researchers in the area, and through my personal networks. Then, using a snowball sampling method, participants were asked to nominate other potential interviewees for the study (Merriam, 1998) in order to recruit other visiting scholars.

In total, twenty-six visiting scholars from Japanese universities participated in the study. I intended to approach 20 participants for this study. As a guideline of the sample size, Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006) states that twelve interviews can reach data saturation for a homogenous sample, while Kuzel (1999) suggests 12 to 20 participants for a more diverse sample. Since the participants included scholars from a various academic disciplines, ages, genders, marital statuses, and home and host institutions, the lager sample seemed to be appropriate. By the final interviews, I came across repeated themes and responses, and I concluded that the data had reached saturation (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

I recruited participants at an area in the east coast of the United States. Since the location of universities and the academic atmosphere of the area can be a factor that affects the experiences of international visiting scholars, this study only conducted sampling from this area. However, in order to recruit as many as participants for this study, I did not limit recruitment of participants to one institution in this location, but
from eight institutions. This area has multiple universities including an Ivy League institution. In this area, several institutions are leaders in hosting international scholars (IIE, 2013a). Due to the concentration of visiting scholars to those research institutions, one institution in the area dominated the number of participants with 15 out of 26. This is explained later in the limitation.

Other than the participants, there were two visiting scholars who stopped exchange of emails before setting up the schedule for interview. In addition, there were two visiting scholars who did not have time to take the interview, though one of them filled out the pre-interview questionnaire and sent it through email to me. There were two postdoc researchers who participated in the interview, but that they did not have an affiliation with the host university in Japan, which was found out at the interview site. These people and the pre-interview questionnaire were not included in the participants of the current study.

Although I outlined participant requirements in my recruitment email, there were some participants that did not meet the original participant requirements. For example, two participants had spent less than one semester in the U.S. However, I included their responses since their interviews responses gave similar accounts as other participants who spent more than three months. In addition, two participants did not have Japanese nationality, but worked for a Japanese university as faculty members. Furthermore, one participant did not hold a J-1 visa, which is the type of visa visiting scholars typically hold. I included their responses in the analysis because their responses shared similarity with other participants.
Among the 26 participants, fifteen of them were hosted at an Ivy-league research institution, four were at another private research institution, two were at another private research institution, and one participant each from two different private research universities, one public university, and two different private research centers. Their home institutions were 17 private universities and nine public universities in Japan. The participants included 15 associate professors, eight professors, one assistant professor, one physician, and one instructor. All but the instructor were tenured faculty members at the home university. Among them, 19 of them received doctoral degree and four of them received a master’s degree from a Japanese university as their highest academic degree. There were two participants received doctoral degree from institution in the United States and another scholar received from institution in the United Kingdom. As their funding sources, all of them received some financial support from their home institutions in Japan. As additional funding sources, five scholars used their supplementary self-funded, four Fulbright scholars, three private fellowships, two host university, one research fund. The list of participants and their characteristics are attached in the appendix, and personal characteristics of the participants are provided in the following.
Table 2

*Personal Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Academic Fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods of Visits</th>
<th>Time in the U.S. prior to the interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 months</td>
<td>6 months (1 month after returning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 months</td>
<td>7 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>8 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 months</td>
<td>9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 months (1 month after returning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 months (2 months after returning)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two participants were employed by Japanese universities, but they were not Japanese nationals. All but one participant were on the J-1 visa.
Data Collection

As a main data source of this study, semi-structured individual interviews were conducted with multiple Japanese visiting scholars. Interviews are an effective approach to access the inner thoughts and perceptions of the participants (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Since the nature of the research questions of this study is to understand visiting scholars’ perceptions about their transition experiences and uncover the factors that affect their transition, the use of interviews as a data collection strategy is reasonable.

A pre-interview questionnaire (Appendix A) and interview questions (Appendix B) were developed based on the research questions of this study. The concepts from Schlossberg’s transition model, such as situation, self, support, and strategy, also guided the development of the questionnaire and the interview questions. The pre-interview questionnaire mainly inquired about demographic information, the length and the timing of the transition, and previous similar experiences. Interview questions, which explored the participants’ transition, were organized chronologically. Questions related to experiences prior to the visits were asked at the beginning of the interview. Then, experiences during the United States were explored. Finally, questions related to the processes and prospects after they returned to their home institutions were asked at the end of the interviews.

The interviews were conducted from April to November 2013. I sent an email describing the requirements to become a participant to potential participants who showed an interest in taking the interview, to ensure they met the criteria. Additionally, the consent form that described the purpose, the procedures, and the issues regarding confidentiality was sent electronically so that potential participants could review these
prior to the interview and confirmation their consent to participate. At the time of interviews, the contents of the consent form were explained and discussed with participants before starting the interviews and any additional questions were answered.

With the participants, a pre-interview questionnaire was administered and a semi-structured individual interview was conducted for 60 to 90 minutes to explore the participants’ experiences as visiting scholars. The interviews were conducted in the Japanese language. For most of the participants, I set up a face-to-face meeting; however, some interviews were conducted online for participants who had already returned to Japan at the time of the interview.

**Coding and Analysis Process**

All interviews were conducted in Japanese, and then transcribed by the researcher. As suggested by Merriam (2002), the data analysis was started once I collected the first interview data, and while I was still recruiting new participants. The advantage of this strategy is to allow researchers to make modifications to ensure that the data collected address the research questions appropriately (Merriam, 2002). In addition, I recorded analytical memos to serve as a part of the analysis throughout the process of the data collection, transcription, and coding. Patton (2002) describes data collection and analysis as a dynamic process, where important insights for the analysis can emerge during the data collection. The analytical memos completed throughout the research process included potential patterns of codes, groups, categories, and themes.

In the initial phase of data analysis, data were coded or broken down to meaningful segments and categorized by some patterns into groups (Miles & Huberman, 1984). Coding is helpful to simplify the long interview data into a manageable piece of
meaningful components (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996). As an analytical process, the constant comparative method was used (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Although the constant comparative method was originally developed as a part of grounded theory, this method has been used for basic qualitative studies that were not necessarily aiming for building a theory from the data (Merriam, 2002). Through the constant comparative method, categories, groups, and codes were compared with each other, in order to consider a better way to connect categories, groups, and codes with each other to find patterns in the categories to draw themes (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In the analysis and coding, qualitative analysis software called HyperRESEARCH was used to assist in the process.

The data were inductively analyzed in the first cycle of coding by using the open coding approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). I searched for and coded comments in the interviews that were relevant to answering the research questions. For example, in relation to the research question one, interview data that described motivation and reasons for visiting were coded; activities and experiences during their visits were coded for answering the second research question; support and challenges through their transitional process as a visiting scholars were coded for the question number three; and other potential contextual and personal factors that affected their experiences of transition were coded for the final research question. During this process, I started to categorize the similar codes together across different interviews. If I came across better codes or categories when I proceeded the coding of new interview transcripts, I went back to the coded interview to examine the better way to code and categorize.

From the second cycle of coding, I repeatedly went back to the codes with the continuous use of the constant comparative method as an analysis strategy (Glaser &
While the data were mainly analyzed inductively, Schlossberg’s concept of the three stages within the transition (moving-in, moving-through, and moving-out) and the Four S’s was referred as a framework to categorize codes, especially for the research questions three (support) and four (situation, self, and strategy).

After repeating the process of reexamination of the potential codes, groups, and categories, an initial codebook was developed to respond to the research questions. In the development of the initial codebook, I solicited comments from a Japanese colleague as a peer reviewer, and received feedback from the members of dissertation committee to refine the codes. A doctoral student coded a few interview scripts that were translated in English by using my initial codebook. In addition, a Japanese researcher of higher education reviewed a coded interview in Japanese and gave feedback and comments regarding my codes and interpretation. Inter-rater comparisons appear below.

**Validity**

In order to enhance the validity of the findings of this study, several procedures were taken. First of all, I conducted pilot interviews prior to the current study to refine the research design and to examine the phrasing of my interview questions. During the pilot interviews, I conducted interviews with visiting scholars not only from universities and research centers, but also from companies and government offices, in addition to visiting students who were doctoral students at their home institution. Since differences in responses were observed by the type of their home institutions and their status, participants were limited to visiting scholars only from universities or research centers to seek homogeneity among the sample to enhance the validity of the analysis. The pilot
interviews were also helpful to modify the phrasing and the order of the original interview questions.

I examine the potential influence of my personal views and background on the research process and the analysis of the current study in the following statement of positionality. In qualitative studies, it is important to recognize the background and the worldview of researchers themselves because they will influence the selection of the topic, the design of the research, and the interpretation of the data (Creswell, 2007; Sipe & Ghiso, 2004). In addition, through interactions with participants in the research process, participants and their responses might be affected by the researchers (Rossman & Rallis, 2011, p. 33). The examination and awareness of reflexivity is beneficial to enhance the trustworthiness of the research process.

Furthermore, paying attention to ethical and political issues is also crucial to enhance the credibility of the research. As a basis of ethical practice of qualitative research, Rossman and Rallis (2011) stated the importance of mutual respect and reciprocal relationships for the researcher and participants (p.71). First, this study attends to the issue of confidentiality and privacy of the participants. The interviewees were promised by the researcher that personal information that would identify the participants would not be disclosed to the public. The information about the protection of confidentiality was explained in the informed consent process and in the consent form. Second, the participants were notified that their participation in the study was voluntary and they were able to withdraw from the study without any sanctions at any time. The participants were encouraged to ask questions at any time, including before and after the time they agree to participate in the study.
In the process of data analysis, a fellow doctoral student agreed to take on the role of a second coder for part of the interviews to enhance the validation of the analysis. Since the original interview data were in Japanese, it was difficult to find a second coder who could understand Japanese and also the context of higher education research. I translated three interviews in English and asked the fellow doctoral student to code the interview by using my codebook. In total, 11.5% of total interviews were coded by this external reviewer and reached 80% of inter-rater reliability. In addition, I consulted with a Japanese higher education researcher in developing my codebook and in reviewing a coded interview to raise questions. Their opinions were incorporated to refine the part of codes and the analysis.

**Positionality**

In a qualitative study, the researcher influences the research process through the interaction with the participants and the interpretation of the data. Therefore, it is imperative for the researcher to recognize and state clearly their values, experiences, and perspectives that might have affected the data collection and analysis process. I addressed my own background and its potential influences on my interpretations of data in the following paragraphs.

First of all, I am a Japanese international graduate student studying in the United States. My nationality influenced me to select the research focus of this study on Japanese visiting scholars. Previously, I worked at two Japanese national universities as an administrator and one of my responsibilities was closely related to international affairs of the university. I developed an interest in receiving an education in other countries to improve my capacity in the international context. I went to a graduate school in the
United States from September 2008 to May 2010 to study counseling psychology, hoping that I would utilize my expertise at a Japanese university as an advisor for domestic students who wanted to study abroad. After graduating from the Master’s program, I continued my study in the United States in the field of higher education in fall 2010. Through my previous study and current program experiences, I became interested in how international exchange might stimulate students’ and scholars’ intellectual and personal development, and consequently, influence the institution and the society as a whole.

My current status as a graduate international student in the United States might have influenced the interviewees. Though I was a degree-seeking student who studied in the United States longer than the visiting scholars who stay temporarily and were not seeking degrees, there were many commonalities, which might have affected the interview process and contents. The potential interviewees were also Japanese individuals who were engaging in an academic activity in the United States. This might helped me understand Japanese visiting scholars’ experiences, in that we were all going through academic experiences at American higher education institutions and come from the same country. In addition, my previous work experience as a university administrator might have helped me understand the academic culture in Japan. Participants might have been more open to talking about their experiences with me because of my previous work experiences at Japanese academic institutions, while they might have also been careful in choosing what they shared with me because of my position.

**Limitations**

This study has several limitations. One of the limitations is that this research uses a relatively small sample size that only focuses on Japanese visiting scholars in an area in
the east coast. The issue of generalization is a common limitation for qualitative studies (Creswell, 2003). The results drawn from the participants might not be applicable to the population of Japanese visiting scholars in general or international visiting scholars from other countries. However, the in-depth interview data from a small sample allowed me to examine the participants deeply, concisely, and holistically.

The second limitation is related to the sample. Since the population of international visiting scholars is relatively small, it was expected to have a difficulty in finding enough participants. In order to find a large enough sample, I did not exclude the participants based on their academic fields and their host universities and in the United States. This would make the participants less homogeneous, and might lose the depth of analysis on a particular population. On the other hand, this sampling allows an examination of the population of Japanese visiting scholars and how these variables could affect their experiences.

In addition, although the participants were recruited from eight different institutions in one region in the east coast of the United, 58% of them were hosted at a single institution. The concentration of the distribution of the sample at one institution might cause some biases in the finding, although it is difficult to know the exact affect how the distribution of the sample affected the findings. However, as described in the Open doors report of IIE, since large research universities tend to host international scholars more than other types of universities (IIE, 2013a), the concentration of the samples at a large research university might be unavoidable to some extent. Moreover, since the overall distribution of international scholars is also concentrated on several research focused institution, it might be somewhat generalizable to understand the
experience of Japanese visiting scholars. In addition, these large research universities are typically loosely coupled with a decentralized system by departments and centers. Therefore, this means that there would be some variation among the scholars even though they have visited the same institution.
Chapter 5. Purposes of Visits

This study examines the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars in the United States. Based on interview data from 26 visiting scholars from Japan, this chapter presents findings relating to the first research question: Why do Japanese visiting scholars visit universities in the United States? Seven major themes on the purpose of scholars’ visits emerged: research and publication, networking, international experience, development of English skills, teaching, family experiences, institutional initiatives, and location of their visits related to their objectives. The purposes of their visits were relevant to both the time and place as visiting scholars. While they intended to use their time as visiting scholars for multiple purposes during their visits, the locations of their visits at host universities in the United States often related to their objectives of visits.

Among the many purposes of scholars’ visits to the United States, reasons related to individuals’ professional development were most common, in comparison to reasons related to their home institution. Scholars’ professional reasons included advancing their research, developing scholarly networks, improving English language skills for academic purposes, and observing or participating in teaching during their visits. While a limited number of participants intended to engage in collaborative research with American colleagues during their visits, most others aimed to advance their individual research projects and publications. Most of the visiting scholars whose relatives accompanied them on the visit reported family-related objectives for their visit, such as spending time with family members or providing international experiences for their children. A few visiting scholars came with a clear objective at the level of their home institution, such as promoting scholarly exchanges between the two institutions. The location of visits was
also related to their objectives of visits differently by individual scholars. The visiting scholars came to the United States either due to the relevance of their professional academic interest in the United States, the centrality of the United States in their academic fields, or a broad interest in international experiences. In the following section of this chapter, these seven themes are presented in detail.

**Research and Publication**

One of the most common reasons for participants’ visits was to engage in their individual research at academic institutions in the United States. Nineteen participants reported that they were going to engage in individual research and professional development activities. Among the participants, ten visiting scholars were on sabbatical leave, and intended to use this time to make progress in their own research.

Since I wanted to research in the United States, I applied for sabbatical and was selected, so I got this opportunity. I wanted to improve my research by studying in the United States for one year. Well, my research will not be different whether I engage in my research in Japan or the United States. However, if I do my research here in the United States, I can see some other scholars with various perspectives, which is beneficial to improving my research. In addition, my academic field is relevant to international context.

One potential benefit of coming to the United States was to be able to be exposed to different perspectives, which could potentially deepen scholars’ research. In addition, for some participants, the temporary leave from the home university was considered helpful to secure participants’ time for research activities.
Typically, when I work in Japan as a researcher, I have to teach courses and to do administrative and institutional work, work related to academic conferences, and of course engage in my publications. So, I can say I am busy. In this sense, when I think about the development of my academic career, I would like to put the publication of articles or books at the center. In order to engage in publication, I need to do research, read, and take time to think about the topic of research for my publications. So I think it is essential to have free time for that. (#13)

Several participants reported that they did not have enough time to do research and to engage in publication since they had a heavy workload at their home institution for non-research tasks, such as teaching courses and taking a role in institutional work. Therefore, they aimed to make progress in their own research and publication during the time that they were in the United States.

**Cultivation of new research skills and themes.** Among the participants, six scholars reported that the purpose of their visit was to develop new research skills or to develop new areas of expertise. For visiting scholars who tended to be busy with non-research related work at their home institutions, taking a temporary leave from the home university was considered helpful in order to explore new potential research fields. One engineering scholar reported that he wanted to explore a new research topic during his time as a visiting scholar and especially at one of the top institutions in the United States, where he might also be able to receive insights from the scholars at the institution.

The reason for this visit was to launch a new research topic that I can work on for 5, 10, or 15 years from now on. … Since we do not discuss research topics with other professors at my home university, I wanted to put myself in an environment
which I feel like I am tiny and insignificant. Regardless of the place, either in Japan or abroad, if I go to a leading place in the field, I can remind myself about my ambition, fear, and risk that I had felt before. I feel fear of changing my research field. So, I wanted to work on it with some quality time. (#17)

Spending time at a leading institution in the United States was considered beneficial to visiting scholars, not only for developing new research expertise, but also as a source of stimulation and inspiration to continue being successful in the academic profession. In addition, several young academics in their early to mid-30s reported the development of new research skills, such as basic research, as the purpose of their visit. For these young scholars, experiencing the research environment at a top institution in the United States was an important professional development opportunity at this point in their career. One associate professor in the medical field, whose work at her home institution centered on clinical work, wanted to come to a leading lab in the United States in order to develop her research skills.

Though I graduated from a graduate school in Japan, and have conducted research and written academic articles, my research has been centered on clinical research. So, I can write an article based on clinical research, but if I aimed to publish in a better journal, I would need to conduct basic research by using cells and animals. Of course, it could be possible to learn this in Japan, but I did not have time when I had to see patients, students, and graduate students during the daytime. I did not have time to learn basic research at all. So, my honest feeling was that I wanted to learn basic research at a leading lab in a different country like a graduate student, although I have already received a Ph.D. (#25)
Somewhat common as with the comment of this mid-career researcher, young scholars also found aspects of continued self-improvement as scholars by putting themselves in a different environment. In addition to the lack of time to engage in developing research skills in Japan, having an opportunity for professional development to learn a new research skill with American and international colleagues at prominent institutions was considered an opportunity for continued professional development regardless of the career stages of researchers.

**Development of existing research themes.** While some visiting scholars intended to develop new themes or skills during their visits, seventeen scholars aimed to continue engaging in a research project that they had been working on prior to their visits. In these cases, visiting scholars sought quality time to focus on their publications. The continuation of publication during visits was common among the participants, especially among visiting scholars in the social sciences.

My field is in social sciences, and I think it is not enough to just pile up each article or to publish a book. I have to create a kind of philosophy or worldview by integrating the work of each article. I think it is not possible to achieve the level that I would like to reach with my potential ability by doing other tedious work and instructions for students in my seminar. Unless my level of concentration reaches a certain degree, I don’t think I can achieve the level of quality in a publication that I would be satisfied with. (#5)

In some social science fields, publishing a book seemed to be valued as an academic production. In such cases, the time to focus on their lengthy writing project during their time abroad was considered especially beneficial. Another visiting scholar in political
science reported that he brought some documents and materials that would be necessary for his publications in Japan and was planning to use resources at the host university to continue his work.

I have had to search for materials at the host university after I came here. I also have to work on several publication projects that I have been working on in Japan, and brought copied and scanned documents from Japan. But, I also sometimes ask graduate students to send a copy of necessary materials from Japan. (#13)

For scholars in the social sciences, time as visiting scholars was considered important to make progress in existing publication projects, in addition to some potential new publication by using documents and materials that were only accessible at the host university.

Four participants who were social sciences scholars held master’s degrees as their highest academic degrees. Three of the four participants reported that their goal was to finish their doctoral dissertations during their visits. These participants were all in their 40’s and started work as faculty members before they were awarded doctoral degrees; this had been the norm, especially in the field of humanities and social sciences in Japan, until recently. One participant explained that younger scholars were more likely to acquire a doctoral degree before beginning work as faculty members; this pressured her to finish her dissertation as soon as possible in order to attain her doctoral degree.

When I was a graduate student, the older generation of academics submitted their doctoral thesis right before their retirement, and I was in the same situation as those people. So, currently the younger generation already holds Ph.D. degrees, so I am in the middle of this shift of norms. I wanted to finish my doctoral thesis
as soon as possible, and I feel the pressure to do so. One of the purposes of my visit is to conduct research to write my doctoral thesis. (#9)

Another visiting scholar aimed to finish his dissertation during the visiting period since the lack of degree affected his promotion to become a full professor. He also felt pressure from his colleagues who had doctoral degrees.

I have not finished writing my Ph.D. dissertation yet. So, it was like I have been driving a car without a driver’s license, although I was able to find a faculty job before I finish writing my dissertation. I have been involved in several research projects, but I have not finished my dissertation. Writing a book is most important to me. At my current post, unless I have a Ph.D. degree, I cannot be a full-professor. I am at a department where there were many others from STEM fields and they wonder why I don't have a doctoral degree. There are some others like this situation in my generation in the social sciences and humanities fields. There is a pressure for me to finish dissertation formally and informally, so I have to have Ph.D. degree. (#15)

After they started work, these scholars experienced a shift in expectations regarding the degree requirements for faculty member promotion. Therefore, the participants without doctoral degrees tried to use the time as visiting scholars to conclude their doctoral dissertation or to publish a book based on their dissertation.

**Research Collaboration.** Although the majority of participants intended to engage in individual research projects during their visits, four scholars aimed to engage in research collaboration with American researchers during their visit. These participants were two scholars in economics and one scholar in business and medicine. These
participants had developed collaborative projects through pre-existing relationships with American colleagues prior to their visits. While two of the four scholars had received graduate degrees in Western countries and cultivated relationships through these avenues, the other two had developed relationships through their Japanese colleagues. One visiting scholar, who had been already working on a collaborative project, wanted to engage in the project more effectively through leveraging his physical presence at the host university.

Since my research collaborators are mostly here in the United States, the time difference has always been an issue. So, in order to bridge that difference and in order to enhance my productivity, it was beneficial for me to come here. … It does not pay off financially if we think about the costs because it is very expensive to live here in the US, even though I receive a little bit of financial support from my home university. But, I still believe that visiting the United States is valuable for me as a researcher to have this environment even though I had to pay for it myself. (#7)

Although it was possible to work collaboratively from a distance by using online communication tools, scholars’ physical presence in the United States allowed them to discuss research in person easily without considering time differences. Another visiting scholar also intended to work on a collaborative project with professors in the United States during her visit.

I had worked with colleagues in this subject. So, I wanted to conduct research with them together. In addition, the United States is an important country in business research, so I wanted to visit here. Since I have been working with these
two colleagues in the United States, I wanted to make progress in the collaborative project as much as possible during the visit. (#4)

In addition to making progress in collaborative research projects, the location of the host university could be an important factor that affected participants’ decision to become visiting scholars. In other cases, some scholars who did not originally plan to engage in collaborative research were able to start joint projects during their visit as the purpose of their visit; this is discussed in the next chapter.

**Networking and Interaction**

Another common reason participants visited U.S. universities was to develop scholarly networks through their interactions with researchers at the host community. Thirteen scholars reported this as a purpose of their visit, although most of these visiting scholars did not solely aim to develop networks during their visits. One visiting scholar hoped to have opportunities to discuss his research topic with other prominent scholars in the host community.

Since I have precious time during the visiting period, another purpose or motivation of this visit was to have discussions with prominent professors or to attend their classes in the world’s top institutions. (#22)

The participants thought that their physical presence in the United States would allow them to meet American scholars and exchange ideas. Another visiting scholar reported the difficulty of networking in Japan.

Another motivation to come to the U.S. was to network. I would like to develop a meaningful network at the host university, which cannot be done in Japan and only at international conferences. (#17)
Although it might be possible for the participants to meet American scholars through short research trips or at international academic conferences, participants reasoned that visiting the United States for a longer period of time would help them to build deeper networks with American scholars. Another visiting scholar, who was going to stay in the United States for two years, was planning to change his host university after one year to have more opportunities to meet other scholars in the United States.

Development of networks and connections with others is important. Therefore, I will change my host university after one year in order to meet other people, including scholars in my fields and other people who are active in many different fields. The network will become a resource for me and for my home university. So, I am planning to change my environment intentionally to develop broader networks. (#13)

By utilizing their physical presence in the United States, these visiting scholars hoped to interact with other scholars in the United States to extend their connections, which could be beneficial for the future.

Although there were not many, a few visiting scholars, especially those who had extensive international experiences prior to the current visit, aimed to use their research publications as a way to develop scholarly networks. These scholars were already comfortable in their use of English. They intended to receive feedback from prominent scholars in the United States to improve their own research in addition to creating networks with them.

I would like to meet various famous American scholars during the visit. In addition, I would like to present my research at many other American universities
… I would like to present my study and then meet various scholars and develop networks with them, and to obtain their comments on my research. (#4)

In the case of this scholar, the development of networks itself was not the only goal. The scholar intended to improve her research and publications through input from scholars in the host community. Scholars who had existing networks with American scholars beforehand often planned to reconnect with their American colleagues or to engage in collaborative research during their visits.

The development of scholarly networks was mainly pursued for individual scholars’ benefits, while a few scholars were motivated to promote scholarly exchange at the institution level. Institution-driven motivations are discussed in a later section in this chapter.

**Experiences of Living and Studying in the United States**

Eleven participants sought international experiences through their visit to the United States. These scholars had wanted to study abroad for a long time and their visit was their first long-term stay in the United States. One participant, who wanted to go abroad, finally found time to visit abroad before his colleague’s retirement.

Well, I am around the age of 40 now, but I wanted to visit abroad for research in my thirties. But, I was busy at that time, and I did not have chance to do that. But, my senior colleague will retire soon, and once he retires, I have to teach all of his classes. So, if I missed this chance, I thought I would never have a chance to visit abroad, so I received approval from my senior colleague, and was allowed to leave for six months to visit the United States. (#20)
Scholars, whose home university did not have a research leave policy or whose research field was not directly relevant to the United States, seemed to have difficulty visiting another country for a long period once they started work as academics at Japanese universities. Another participant hoped to observe the educational environment at an American university during his first long-term visit to the United States.

I had not studied abroad and I heard that graduate schools in the United States seemed to be quite rigorous. I wanted to actually experience it. … Since I did not have the experience of studying abroad, I did not know the American academic and educational system. If I experienced it, of course, I thought it would be beneficial for the management of my home university. (#24)

Scholars who had not had a chance to live and study in a different country hoped to live in a different country and to experience the American research environment to broaden their perspectives, as well as to conduct their own research during their visits.

In addition to their general interest in the academic environment and lives in other countries, some other scholars mentioned that having international experience would be beneficial for their academic career. One visiting scholar in the medical field mentioned the importance of having an experience of research abroad for his academic career.

If I am going to be a professor at a university, I wanted to study abroad at some point. In order to have position at a university, I think, having international experiences is crucial. In addition, I am not young anymore, so I wanted to go as soon as possible. (#12)
In addition to having an international research experience, improvement of one’s English was considered crucial to one’s academics. Another professor wished to study abroad to improve his English to help his research and to advance his career as a professor.

I have missed chances to study abroad. When I was in the second year of my undergraduate program, my parents said that I could study abroad, but I did not go because I thought I would travel internationally later once I started to work. So, I just stayed in Japan and enjoyed college life as an undergraduate student. I did end up pursuing a career to travel internationally as I had envisioned. But, I came across situations where I wish I had mastered English earlier so I could have done better research in my career. So, I regretted the fact that I missed the chance to study abroad, and that was the source of my motivation to be a visiting scholar abroad. (#5)

Having international experiences and English skills seemed to be an important resource to advancing careers in some academic fields. The improvement of English ability is also described later in this chapter as another purpose of their visit.

Related to the international experiences as the purpose of visit, the participants whose academic fields were closely connected to the international context reported their visit was to be exposed to the international academic community at the top institutions in the United States.

I have been hoping to do research abroad and wanted to take a sabbatical as soon as possible ever since I graduated from a Japanese university and then moved on to a graduate school. I have been in Japan the entire time studying economics. Since the field of economics is very international and my advisors mostly
received their education abroad, I have been hoping to study in the United States for a long time. Although I was selected as a candidate to visit abroad for research and received funds from the Japanese government upon graduation from my Ph.D. program, I found a faculty job, so I did not go abroad at that time. … I think my dream to study abroad now just came true. (#8)

Another visiting scholar intended to observe the research environment in the United States to gain a better sense of the academic environment and scholarly community.

I had a general hope that I wanted to study abroad when I was in Japan, and I wanted to do it during the first three years after I started to work. … I wanted to observe the top researchers in the United States, see their motivations for their research, and discuss my research project with them to see if there is any difference between Japan and the United States. I wanted to be equipped with the mindset of an international researcher. (#26)

Although there was some variety in the motivation behind their visits, the participants, especially the first-timers, hoped to have experiences of living abroad for their career advancement and professional development through their experience as visiting scholars.

**Improvement of English Language Skills**

Related to their interest in gaining international experience, nine visiting scholars hoped to improve their English language skills, especially their presentation and discussion skills. The scholars who did not have extensive international academic experience emphasized this reason. Fluency in English seemed to be necessary, especially at the international conferences. One visiting scholar realized the need to
improve his English and relevant academic skills when he attended international academic conferences.

In short, I wanted to be able to engage in academic discussions about specific topics in English. I had experiences where I could not translate my thoughts in English quickly, which limited my ability to ask sufficient questions in a timely fashion. When I had a presentation at an international academic conference, I just ended up reading a draft that I had prepared as opposed to speaking extemporaneously. So, I would like to improve my English so that it is a tool for communication rather than an obstacle. The improvement of my communication skills is my final goal of this current visit. (#2)

Another scholar was also motivated to improve his English in order to deliver presentations at international conferences. In particular, he hoped to be able to respond to questions at the academic conferences accurately.

I have many things that I want to achieve during this visit, but one of the central purposes is to improve my English. In particular, I want to be able to respond to the questions at my presentations at the international academic conferences. It is still okay to not to be perfectly fluent, but I want to convey things that I want to tell accurately. (#21)

Similarly, another participant aimed to improve her English so she could deliver a lecture and presentations at academic conferences.

I would like to be able to offer a lecture in English. If I can do that, I will also be able to present at academic conferences in English since conference presentations are easier. … I think if I will be able to give a lecture in my own words in
English, I will be able to present at academic conferences in English more effectively. Although I have given academic presentations, it was not dynamic since I just read my draft. It was not like a presentation a native English speaker gives. So, I would like to improve my English. (#5)

Participants’ daily work as a faculty member at Japanese universities did not necessarily require fluency in English. However, if participants wanted to be actively involved in the international community and academic conferences, participants needed to improve their English.

A few visiting scholars reported that they wanted to improve their skills in teaching in English because their home universities were going to introduce new courses in English. This change was related to a recent governmental initiative to offer courses in English in response to globalization efforts at Japanese universities. Since this governmental initiative was announced at almost the same time as their visiting period to the United States, some participants were already assigned to teach those courses in English after their return.

I have to teach undergraduates in English after I return to Japan. So, I have to brush up my English skills. … It was just recently decided that English-taught classes were to be offered at my home university, so I was assigned to teach it even before my visit to the United States. … Our department was selected by the Japanese governmental project for global education, so I have to do it. (#9)

Some visiting scholars had to improve their English instruction skills during their visit because their home institutions were going to offer courses in English. Their home institutions considered the visit to the United States an opportunity for the scholars to
practice teaching in English. There seemed to be a lack of instructors in Japan who could teach university courses in English, an issue that is also discussed in chapter nine about the challenges participants face after their return to their home university.

Teaching

Although most of the visiting scholars focused on making progress in their research and publication, six visiting scholars intended to observe or to be involved in teaching and instruction at the host university during their visits. These scholars commonly had taught courses at their home institution for several years prior to the visits. An associate professor in the medical field reported that involvement in instruction was the central purpose of his visit at one of the prestigious American institutions.

I am a university professor, and my work includes instruction, research, and clinical work. Now I am at the host university most of the time, and I wanted to observe instruction, which is reported to be well developed here. Then, I also came to conduct clinical research. But my first motivation was to observe and experience the education here first hand. (#12)

Another scholar in the field of engineering was also motivated to observe courses and the curriculum structure at the host university.

I wanted to observe how particular courses are offered. My main interest was that, since the current student population is the generation of the internet; they were not necessarily used to using tools for engineering, such as drivers and saws… So, my interest was to know how university could effectively teach interesting classes to these students. I wanted to see practices at the host university around this issue. (#16)
As referenced in these examples, the visiting scholars who aimed to learn teaching practices at leading institutions to improve teaching at their home university.

In addition to teaching courses at the host university, some visiting scholars were going to audit courses as part of their goal to learn teaching practices during their visits. For these scholars, attending classes as a student was considered beneficial for brushing up on their knowledge in addition to learning instruction practices at a top university in the United States. One mid-career associate professor intended to audit courses to update her knowledge in the field and hoped to improve her teaching after she went back to Japan.

My motivation for the current visit was to have time for me to learn. I have been teaching for ten years as a faculty member at a Japanese university, but I feel like my knowledge has become old. … In addition, I would like to learn new studies and research in the field. Moreover, I would like to observe instruction in the field of public health to learn how to teach, do presentations in English, and write an article in English. (#11)

Participation in graduate-level courses at an American leading institution was considered to be an opportunity for professional development to improve the teaching practices for mid-career professors who had taught courses at a Japanese university for several years. Scholars who reported that the purpose of their visit was related to teaching tended to be from institutions that did not have regular use of research leave.

**Personal and Family-related Reasons**

In addition to professional reasons for visiting the United States, seven participants reported personal and family-related motivation for their visits, particularly
for those whose family members had accompanied them on the visit. Among the objectives related to family members, four participants hoped that their accompanying children and spouses would gain international experience from the visit. One scholar who came with a daughter hoped that his visit in the United States would be not only be beneficial for himself but also for his daughter.

If it is a safe area with multiple cultures and languages, I would like to learn English. I think it is also a good opportunity for my child’s education. … I hope the experience has a good influence on my daughter’s development. (#21)

Another visiting scholar, who had previous experiences to visit the United States, hoped his children would have international exposure.

Well, I studied abroad when I was a student prior to the current visit, so I did not have any resistance coming to the United States. This time, I hope that it will be a good experience for my children. This is my third time to stay in the United States, so now I can arrange most of the procedures quite easily. (#16)

If scholars’ children were of school age, scholars transferred their children to public school to give their children experience learning with American and other international students. Children at the pre-school age also had opportunities to play with other children from different countries.

In addition to providing international experiences for his children, another visiting scholar hoped that the experiences were meaningful for his spouse to understand the nature of his work.

I hope my spouse will have a better sense of what I have been doing as an academic and someone who works with colleagues in other countries. I think it
will be very important to have my wife’s understanding regarding my work in the long run. … Then, she would understand why I often make a phone call at night to discuss my research with the collaborators abroad. Family members’ support is very important to researchers. (#7)

As in this example, some visiting scholars hoped that their children and spouses would be exposed to cross-cultural environments to broaden their perspectives. The family related objective for their visit to the United States was reported by both of the visiting scholars who already had extensive international academic experience themselves prior to the current visit and also those who visited to the United States for their first long-term visit.

**Institutional Reasons**

While all of the participants’ reasons for their visit focused on their personal development, three participants reported also their objectives were institutional. Two visiting scholars were trying to set up an institutional exchange agreement between the universities during their visits.

Another purpose of my visit is to promote student exchange between the host and home university. Actually, I would like to get the vice president of my university to come and visit the host university to discuss the possibility of a university exchange agreement. This visit is objective for myself and also for my home institution. (#16)

Another scholar also sought to develop an institutional exchange agreement.

Another goal [of my visit] is to develop an institutional exchange agreement, though I don't know how much I can do. … Now I am asking my home university’s administration to consider what kind of benefit could be given from
my home university to the host university to develop an institutional exchange agreement. (#13)

Another visiting scholar came under an existing institutional scholar exchange, aimed at developing networks with scholars at the host university, in order to activate the existing exchange agreement.

In addition to conducting research at the host university, another reason was to develop relationships with young American researchers in the field of Japanese studies, which was tasked to me by my home university. I also aim to do this as well. This means that, by developing personal connections with those American scholars, I hope to promote the scholarly exchange between the home and the host universities in the future. (#14)

These three visiting scholars had connections with the top administrators at their home institutions or were assigned an institutional mission regarding the institution-level relationship. An inclusion of objectives related to the institutional level seemed to be relevant to the existing connections with the institutional leaders who intended to utilize visiting scholars for institutional purposes.

A few visiting scholars intended to inform educational policies at their home institution by gaining insight into the administration practices at American top universities. Since American higher education is perceived as high quality worldwide, the practices and policies at top American universities were considered aspirational models. These limited scholars indicated that they had access to the top administration of their home university, which potentially allowed them to provide feedback at the institutional level. For example, one professor, who had been working closely with the
top administrative leaders at his home university, aimed to gather educational policies by learning from the practices at American prestigious universities.

Well, the universities in Japan now face the issue of globalism, and they have to decide how to reform the university. I think the examples are the discussion on the issue of fall entrance and the use of TOEFL in admissions. But, there is no consensus on how to do reforms at either level of my home university and even at the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology…

so, in order for Japanese universities to be able to survive against global competition, in this context, I think we can learn from the cases of top institutions in the United States on the way of the education. Then, I have an objective to do presentations or to suggest to my home university, which I have already started to do. (#13)

As in the case of this example, a few visiting scholars reported that the purpose of their visit is to improve institutional policies, and that they were motivated to provide input to the top administrators at their home institutions. However, the number of visiting scholars who stated these purposes was limited, compared to those who focused on their individual purposes.

**Location and the Objectives of Visits**

The location of host institutions in the United States was often related to participants’ reasons for their visits. The selection of the location for the visit differed for individual scholars. Eight participants were studying topics that were closely related to the United States, and their physical presence allowed the scholars to access resources that could advance their research and publication. The visiting scholars, especially those
in the field of American history, were driven by their motivation to do research closely related to the location in which the host university was located.

Since my focus is American studies, by visiting an American university for a long time, I could deepen my research. My primary reason for visiting was to develop my research. (#23)

For the Japanese scholars in the field of American studies or American history, data collection in the United States was crucial to refresh their knowledge as well as to advance their research. In addition, one visiting scholar in political science was interested in materials that were only available at the library at the host university for his publication.

My research focuses on modern political thoughts, and I need books and documents on both Japan and the United States. There are enormous resources at the libraries at the host university. So, I thought that if I come to this university for a visit, I could do research by using the resources. (#13)

The scholars whose research focus was relevant to the United States often had visited the United States previously. If they had visited their host university or the United States for research previously even for a short period, their past experience seemed to help set clear expectations regarding research materials available in the US.

Some scholars, especially those in the fields of business, economics, and international law, visited a particular American institution because it was considered one of the top academic centers in their fields. In this case, although the topics or themes of their research might not be directly focused on the United States, the presence of leading researchers in the fields made them decide to visit the institution. One visiting scholar in
the field of economics hoped to interact with prominent scholars in the United States and also to observe academics setting trends for their fields.

Well, I would like to know the situation in the United States and to be involved in the frontier of the field in a broad sense. … Probably, it can be quite different by academic fields, but the field of economics has been globalized, which means that the tools that are used in the field are common throughout the world. So, it is similar to science, and if you don’t know the frontiers in the United States, you will be left out gradually, which means that we become like the Galapagos Islands. There is a think-tank in the field of economics, where the top economists gather, and it hosts tons of conferences, and you can literally see the frontier of the field. (#7)

Another visiting scholar in business chose to come to the host university because it was considered to be at the center of the field.

My host university is at the center of my academic field in the world. … There was a famous scholar who had a strong impact on this field and who was based at the host university previously. My host professor is the successor of this professor. So, I think everyone wants to come here if you are in my academic field. (#5)

In these cases the Japanese scholars selected the host institution because they were at the center of their academic field, and the scholars’ objectives were not only to make progress in their own research, but also to develop academic networks. The development of the network is stated later as a separate objective for their visits.
Although most of the participants had decided their destination based on the availability of resources at the libraries or the presence of leading researchers, some professors had open and broad objectives to advance their research during their visits regardless of their location. In these cases, the visiting scholars often had been interested in living and studying in a different country, in addition to having time for their research during their visit to the United States.

Since we can take a sabbatical, and we can choose the place to go during the sabbatical, I wanted to go to an institution abroad, rather than one in Japan. That’s why I came to the institution overseas. Well, this is a period for developing my research, and I am working at a university in a rural area in Japan, but I thought it was not worthwhile spending time in Tokyo (#2).

Another visiting scholar, for whom it did not matter where faculty could engage in their research, hoped to concentrate on his publication during his visit in the United States without other institutional obligations.

Since I wanted to have time for my research, I came to the United States. So, I did not have any particular plan to engage in collaborative research at the beginning. But, once I came here, I found there are many interesting seminars, and attended many of them, which I had not planned to do originally. At first, I came here to just focus on my publication without even seeing other scholars. (#15)

For some participants, the location of their scholarly visit was not bound by location. Among the participants who chose to take their leave abroad, they reported the benefits of leaving Japan were to develop their research in a different country, which might give
them opportunity to have feedback from American colleagues with different perspectives, to have international experiences in a different country, and to put themselves at a physical distance from their home institution in order to concentrate on their research and publication.

The availability of time as a visiting scholar and the destination mattered in their purposes to become visiting scholars in the United States. In the next chapter, participants’ actual activities and experiences during their visit are explored.
Chapter 6. Experiences During Visits

This chapter presents the findings of the second research question: What are the scholars’ academic, social, and personal experiences during their visiting periods? The Japanese visiting scholars reported that they engaged in multiple activities during their visits. As for the activities during the visit, primary activities included: engaging in individual research, conducting collaborative research, attending seminars for scholarly interactions, developing networks, providing lecture talks, teaching courses, auditing courses, improving English, observing cultural differences, becoming involved in social experiences especially for those who came with family members, and engaging in institutional initiatives.

Experiences in this activities varied by scholars’ academic fields, especially between STEM and non-STEM fields. The scholars in the non-STEM fields tended to spend time individually, while researchers in STEM fields worked with colleagues in their labs. Though research activities were central for most of the scholars, the scholars also attended seminars to update their knowledge and developed networks at the host universities. Involvement in teaching and observation of courses often provided opportunities for the scholars’ professional development. The first-timers and scholars who came with family members often found their cultural and social experiences meaningful. The eleven themes regarding the experiences during the visits are discussed in this chapter as follows.
Engaging in Individual Research

All but one participant reported that their main activities during their visits included research and publications. Among them, twenty-four visiting scholars worked on individual research projects or publications during the visit, while eight scholars participated in collaborative research. One visiting scholar who did not report research-related activity visited the United States to learn about teaching and learning techniques of the host institution. This is described later in this chapter.

Daily routines and research-related activities varied according to scholars’ academic fields. The scholars in social sciences tended to spend most of their time individually, while scholars in natural sciences attended labs almost every day for research. Typically, the scholars in non-STEM field found themselves individually at libraries, offices, or home to focus on their publications. One professor in international law reported that his experience was centered on individual research at several places on campus.

One of the main activities during the visit is to work on my research. This is basically to collect resources from literature, books, and documents at my office and libraries, and to write research articles, which is a relatively independent type of work. The benefit of doing this activity in the United States is that the libraries at the host university hold many old documents. (#1)

Although the location where they worked on their research activities differed by individual scholars, scholars in humanities and social sciences mainly worked independently.
During the visits, ten visiting scholars continued working on the publications that they had begun in Japan. They worked on these publications, especially at the beginning of their visits. For most of them, it was difficult to find time at their home institution in Japan because of heavy workloads of teaching and other tasks. One participant, who brought publication projects from Japan, tried to focus on these projects at the beginning of his time as a visiting scholar.

I wanted to write in English in the United States, but I have been busy with my work in Japanese. I am writing a Japanese article that I have been asked to publish prior to my visit, and I am finishing the final part right now. Then, once I finish it, I finally will be able to do my other work. Then, I would like to write something in English if possible. (#22)

Though these scholars might have had no choice about doing these projects because of the given deadlines, the continuation of existing publication projects might be considered a reasonable use of their time, especially right after their arrival when they were still figuring out the resources and opportunities at the host university. In most cases, once the visiting scholars settled and finished their work that they had been working from Japan, they seemed to work on projects or activities that utilized the physical existence at the host university, such as using the resources at libraries or by receiving feedback from American scholars.

**Engaging in Collaborative Research**

Among the participants, eight visiting scholars reported their participation in collaborative research projects during their visits. The number was fewer than those engaged in individual research and publication. The half of them developed collaborative
projects through their existing connections with American scholars. These scholars had already had Western academic experiences, such as having received academic degrees in English speaking countries or having visited American universities as a visiting scholar previously. A few visiting scholars had developed plans to work on collaborative projects before coming as a visiting scholar, and the opportunities for collaboration could be expanded after they actually came to the United States. One visiting scholar, who received a graduate degree in the United Kingdom, had already planned to work on a joint project with American and Japanese colleagues before coming to the United States. This research then found other potential collaborators after she came to the United States.

We already had the idea of the project about the co-edited book before, but we had not decided who would be involved in the project. After I came here, my scholarly network expanded greatly, so I went to talk to various scholars around here, including someone with whom I had contacted only through email previously. This scholar and other newly-met scholars decided to join the book as authors. (#5)

While this scholar’s existing collaboration project was developed after meeting with scholars in the host community in the United States, another participant, who had attended American graduate school for her master’s degree, started a new research collaboration project with American colleague after coming to the United States.

An idea for collaborative research developed from casual conversation with my colleague, who shares an office with other visiting fellows at the host university. This is great. …In my program, there are many international scholars, but the
scholar with whom I started the joint research project is an American scholar who works in African countries. (#11)

In this case, the collaboration opportunity was developed during conversations at a shared office at the host university. Regardless of the timing of the development of collaborative project, a commonality among these participants was that they had extensive academic experience in the Western society prior to the current visit.

In addition to those scholars with previous international academic experiences, four other visiting scholars who were on their first long-term visit in the United States also indicated their participation in collaborative projects during the visit. These four scholars were all in STEM fields. Although they did not have extensive American experience, their labs in the United States had already had connections with other Japanese colleagues. The reason that these visiting scholars found these labs was also through the existing connections between the labs and their other Japanese colleagues. Among the labs of these visiting scholars, all but one had at least one other Japanese researcher as the lab member when the visiting scholar arrived. One visiting scholar participated in a lab where a few members in the lab were Japanese, including the head of the lab.

I am in a lab where four out of eleven people are Japanese, including me, though I also meet many non-Japanese researchers at work since people in other labs often come to my working space. … The head of the lab is Japanese and he knew my boss in Japan. Since the current head has the same engineering background as me, he is very supportive of my research. He said to me that I should not hesitate to
ask him if I need any equipment for my research, and he has been helpful to offer me a great research environment. (#26)

As in this example, the presence of other Japanese researchers in the lab at the host institution seemed to be helpful for a visiting scholar to be included in the lab and also collaborative projects. Moreover, not only Japanese, but also American colleagues who had been working with Japanese researchers also helped to enhance the chances for a new visiting scholar to be in collaborative projects. For example, one visiting scholar, who participated in the lab where the American boss continuously hosted Japanese researchers as his lab members, was also involved in collaborative research even though it was his first long-term visit to the United States.

The boss of the lab is American, but he likes Japan very much. So, there are two Japanese members currently. It seems like Japanese researchers have come to the lab continuously one after another. The boss likes Japan and goes there a few times a year for lectures. (#21)

This lab had a strong connection with Japanese scholars even before the visiting scholar arrived. The head and other members of the lab seemed to have been accustomed to hosting and collaborating with Japanese researchers.

Even though the scholars themselves did not have extensive international academic experiences, they were involved in research collaboration. As a common theme among these cases, the visiting scholars joined a lab that had existing connections with Japanese scholars. The lab members had worked with Japanese researchers previously, or some of the current lab members were Japanese. This was helpful to
reduce cultural and language barriers to start research collaboration with new visiting scholars from Japan.

**Attending Seminars and Meeting for Scholarly Interaction**

The scholars also had chances to see and interact with colleagues in the United States during their visits. The frequency and opportunities to meet other scholars varied according to the field and individual. Though the scholars in social sciences and humanities typically spent time individually, they found opportunities to see other scholars at seminars and classes. Among the eighteen participants who reported the occasional or regular participation in those seminars, seventeen of them were in humanities and social sciences, while one was in medical field. By contrast, most of the participants in STEM fields did not report attending seminars. Rather, they typically spent the time in their labs with their colleagues. This is discussed later in this chapter.

Among the host universities, a few prestigious research institutions offered those seminars frequently. This was likely because these universities tended to have more financial and human resources to offer those seminars. One visiting scholar, who had visited other universities as a visiting scholar, reported that the abundance of high-quality seminars was a unique advantage to visit a few top universities in this area.

Though I went to various places as a visiting scholar before, in those places, there were seminars once a week at most, and the quality was not high. … Here, on the other hand, you can participate in seminars that are the cutting-age of the world. These seminars are offered almost every day by leading scholars in the field, and these top scholars discuss seriously. (#19)
Some participants visited several prominent research universities in the area, and often attended seminars where top scholars and practitioners in the United States gave presentations. If the scholars were comfortable in the use of English language, these seminars also allowed them to discuss with those professionals.

Many participants reported that they attended seminars frequently especially at the beginning of their visits. For these visiting scholars, these seminars worked as places to know other scholars and to be involved in the host community. Especially for the newcomers, the seminars by prestigious scholars and professionals seemed to be attractive. Once the scholars attended several seminars and got used to them, they tended to become selective about the seminars to attend in order to secure the time to work on their own research and writing.

At first, I concentrated on attending seminars or academic conferences almost every day for the first few months. Then, once I figured out what and where these seminars were offered, I started to be settled. Then, on the days that I didn’t have any relevant seminars, I went to my office to work. … Since I got used to the situation, I started to become picky about which seminars to attend. Then, I became selective in attending seminars. In addition, at first, I wanted to observe how they offer seminars and conferences. But, it is true that if you go this kind of seminar too much, you lose the time for your own research. (#4)

While the participants attended seminars as a place to start networking and gain information especially at the beginning, they gradually became strategic about the attendance at the seminars. They later attended fewer seminars and only those that were closely relevant to their research.
Developing Networks

For scholars in non-STEM fields, although seminars were helpful to see other researchers in the host community, the frequent attendance at the seminars did not necessarily mean that they were able to develop a close relationship with other scholars in the United States. Some scholars indicated that the interactions with other scholars and students could be brief and occasional before and after the classes or seminars.

As for the interactions with American scholars and students, it is only when I audit courses and talk a little bit. I also meet other professors at seminars or at monthly lunch meetings in the host universities. There are some professors who give me information about lectures and seminars and invite me. So, I meet some other professors at these lectures and seminars. (#23)

By contrast, if scholars had a shared office with other scholars, or if they had joined a visiting scholar program, they often had interactions with other scholars. For these scholars, the shared office and events for them provided frequent and regular opportunities to meet other colleagues. One scholar, who participated in a program for international visiting scholars, reported that the program arrangement promoted the interactions with other international scholars.

I met some scholars and students at classes, but I am in a visiting scholar program, so there are other visiting scholars from China and South Korea, so I interacted with them most, and became good friends. It seems like the academic systems are similar in China, South Korea, and Japan, so when we audit courses, we talk about the challenge in participating in the course, and talk about that kind of thing. (#24)
The arrangement with visiting scholar programs was particularly helpful to develop networks with other visiting scholars in the same program, although these programs were not be particularly helpful to meet or interact with American colleagues. The support by visiting scholar programs is discussed in the next chapter as well.

In the case of visiting scholars in the natural science and medical fields, they were less independent than those in the social sciences and humanities. These scholars typically needed to go to the lab to use equipment at a lab in order to conduct experiments for research. They usually went to their lab from morning to evening almost every day. Since they spent time in the lab with other scholars at the host university, they typically interacted with other scholars on a daily basis. They also typically had weekly meetings with lab members to discuss their research topics.

I come to the office almost every day. Probably, there are only a few days in a month that I don’t come to the lab. Then, I get along well with other Japanese and scholars from other countries. (#25)

In contrast to the visiting scholars in humanities and social sciences, the scholars in the natural sciences, engineering, or medical fields, mostly conducted their research in the lab, which provided them a chance to see their colleagues at the host university every day. Although the set up of a lab was helpful for the visiting scholars in the STEM fields to develop relationships with their colleagues, there was also variation depending on the lab. One visiting scholar, whose lab at the host university did not have many other researchers, could not interact with colleagues as expected.

As for my ideal situation, I had hoped that there would be one or two colleagues whom I could ask questions about English use in the professional settings or to go
drinking together to talk about sports, but there are not many colleagues in my
current lab, and did not have these chances. (#21)

Though there were differences between labs, in general, visiting scholars who participated in a lab during their visit tended to have frequent opportunities to see and interact with their colleagues at the host university.

**Giving a Lecture**

In addition to listening to and meeting with other scholars at seminars, eight visiting scholars found opportunities to give a talk on their research during their visits at some kind of seminars or classes. The frequency and the location of the opportunities to give talks varied by individual scholars. Those scholars who had previous academic experiences in English speaking countries, or who had American colleagues helping to arrange these opportunities, tended to have presentation opportunities. For example, one visiting scholar who had visited an American university previously, and had a host professor who offered an opportunity for him to be a guest speaker in his class reported as follows.

It was the first time for me to give a lecture for an American audience, and it was a seminar for about three hours. At first, I wondered if I could really do it since I had not had a chance to talk about my own research for three hours even in Japanese. So, I planned and prepared for it. … This arrangement was made when I first met my host professor after my arrival. Since he knew that I was working in the same field, he suggested me to talk at one of his class as a guest lecturer. So, I accepted it because it would be a great experience. (#18)
The opportunities for giving a lecture were not limited in location to only the host university. Three scholars reported that they were invited by their colleagues at other institutions to give a lecture talk in other cities. In these cases, they had existing connections with American colleagues, and the participants were invited during their time in the United States.

I was talking to an American professor who I knew since I was in Japan. I talked about it with him that I would visit the United States. So during my visit, he invited me to give a lecture at his university, as an invited lecture, although it was a very small one, but I got an opportunity like that. (#14)

As in this example, a few scholars were invited by a colleague in a different university located in another city to present their research. In addition to having English fluency, the presence of American colleagues who offered to arrange presentation opportunities seemed be helpful.

**Teaching Courses**

During their time as visiting scholars, some participants engaged in activities related to the education of undergraduate and graduate students, such as through teaching or auditing courses. Compared to the number of participants who engaged in research activities, the number of participants who taught at the host institution was smaller. Only five visiting scholars reported that they were involved in the teaching of courses, hosting seminar series, or advising students at a lab mostly with professors of the host institution on a regular basis. On the other hand, fifteen participants reported that they audited courses for their professional development.
Among the participants who were involved in teaching, two out of five scholars reported that teaching was their main purpose of their visit. These participants were observing and learning teaching practices at the host institution in the United States to inform their home institution. One assistant professor in engineering participated as a mentor for students with other professors and doctoral students at the host university.

During the visit, I work as a mentor or an advisor of students to offer support in a course. … I do not provide lecture in the class in front of the students, but I am responsible for a group of students when we do exercise assignments. I host a weekly meeting with them, and I oversee the progress of students and also see if they have any problems. (#16)

This participant was included in a team of American professors and graduate assistants to teach undergraduate and graduate classes at the host institution. The involvement in a teaching team provided opportunities to not only closely observe the teaching processes, but also interact and discuss with other scholars and students at the host community in the classes frequently.

Although the overall number was small, about the half of these scholars who participated in teaching at the host university had past academic experience in English speaking countries and seemed to be comfortable using English. The other two scholars, on the other hand, who had not have lived or studied in the United States, were scholars in the STEM field. These scholars seemed to know specific terminology of STEM subjects and tools for research, which was commonly used in both Japan and the United States. This might have helped them to avoid their potential language obstacle when they
taught students. Therefore, they had reported less trouble than the scholars in humanities.

By contrast, limited use of English could work as a greater barrier in the social sciences or humanities field to be involved in teaching at the host university. One scholar in social sciences, who was on his first long-term research abroad experience in the United States, did not have confidence in teaching in English at the host institution in the United States, though he was hoping to improve skills in teaching and discussion in English. Instead, he taught an intensive course in Europe for non-native English speakers during his visit as a first step.

I was asked to teach courses in English as a part of Erasmus Mundus program at a university in Poland, and I prepared for it. I wanted to have experiences in teaching in English, but I did not have the confidence to do it in front of native English speaker without any experience. So, it was good opportunity to do it in a country where English is not the first language as the first step. (#2) For this visiting scholar, giving lectures at a university in Europe was considered beneficial to gain experience in teaching in English. The language limitation seemed to be an obstacle to be involved in teaching at the host institution, unless the field was heavily relying on the use of particular skills and specific knowledge in some STEM field. The activities related to English practice is discussed later in this chapter.

In relation to the teaching activities during the visit, five visiting scholars continued to advise or teach students of their seminar or lab at the home university by phone or online while they were in the United States. The continuation of the advising relationship was often with students who were writing their theses or taking a seminar
course with the professor, in which close interactions with each other was expected. Because of the time difference, visiting scholars often did it at night or in the morning.

Through Skype, I advise my graduate students at home university twice a week. One is a lab meeting, and the other one is an individual meeting with each student. During the daytime, I work at the host university, and after I go home, I turn on Skype and talk with Japanese students. (#16)

While the typical style of advising home students was to hold group or individual meetings virtually, one visiting scholar who occasionally taught students at the host university reported that he was planning to have a joint discussion session with both home and host students to provide an opportunity for interactions with each other.

For students at my home university, I teach a seminar course once a week. In my seminar, it is about twelve students, and there about 10 students in the host university that I teach in a seminar, so I decided to host a joint discussion seminar in the next semester. I’ve already decided the topics and the reading materials for them. The discussion will start from 7pm in here, and 8am in Japan. (#13)

Although it was only one professor, this scholar tried to utilize his presence in the United States to host a session with students at both home and host universities during his visit. This scholar was hoping to have this educational opportunity for the students at home and host students by promoting interactions between them.

**Auditing Courses**

While the number of participants that taught at the host university was limited, fifteen participants reported that they audited courses. Auditing courses provided opportunities for their professional development in terms of updating content, practicing
English, and observing the teaching practices and class discussions. The frequency and the degree of participation in auditing courses differed by the individual scholars. In particular, visiting scholars who were on their first long-term visit in the United States tended to audit several courses during their visit. One participant found that attendance to classes was helpful to know what and how American professors taught the course at his home institution.

For the classes that I audit, I have to study and read textbooks, but I really appreciate this learning opportunity. Since my academic field is American history, it is authentic here in the United States, so the content that professor teaches here and the textbooks that they use were different from the ones that we use in Japan. So, I feel great that I could study in the United States by participating in and preparing for the courses. (#24)

Another scholar was especially interested in learning the teaching method regarding a particular skill that was more developed in the United States.

I wanted to learn how to teach a specific practical concept and skill in the field of public health. This concept came to Japan relatively about a decade ago, so it is still new in Japan, though this has been discussed in the United States for a few decades. I audited the courses to teach this skill very thoroughly and practically. I needed to know this, so I audited classes. (#11)

For visiting scholars, participation in courses at host universities seemed to be helpful, not only for learning the content, but also for learning the way in which American professors teach the topic, especially for the first-timer and regarding the fields or concepts that were more discussed or developed in the United States.
On the other hand, there were a few scholars who audited courses on a few occasions, and then stopped to attend courses. One scholar in the field of international law reported that auditing courses was not a meaningful use of time for him because the contents taught at the host university was not necessarily different.

Although I attended courses at first, it might be a better way to say this, but I felt that I did not have to take courses because I got a Ph.D. degree a long time ago, and I have taught courses for 8 years, so even though it is at the graduate school, I did not think it was fruitful to audit courses with other students without asking any questions. It might have been different if I attended at a seminar with a small number of students, but I stopped to audit courses at that moment. (#2)

As in this example, the visiting scholars who did not have extensive international experience typically attended courses for at least a few times. They continued or stopped auditing classes by considering the gains from participation and the use of time for research productivity.

By participating in the teaching at the host university, the scholars often observed the differences in the instruction at the university level. A common difference observed in teaching was the effective use of practical trainings at the host universities in the United States. One visiting scholar in the medical field reported his impression about the close connection between knowledge and practice in the courses through the participation in the teaching at the host institution.

In the United States, at least at my host university, once professors taught in a class, then, students practice it with models and with patients. I think this is reasonable. But in Japan, we have to teach everything first, and after all the
courses were taught, then move into clinical training, so the contents that were
taught in the class and the skills in the actual practice tend to be separated, or
difficult to be connected. (#12)

The participation in the teaching with American professors provided visiting scholars
chances to reflect on the differences in instruction in Japan and the United States.

**Practicing English**

Five out of sixteen participants who came to the United States for the first long-
term visit reported that they were involved in some English practice during their visits.
These scholars either took private lessons or joined ESL classes in the host community
for the improvement of their English language skills. One visiting scholar participated in
a private English lesson once a week.

I wanted to improve English since I am in the United States, so I meet with a
private English tutor for 90 minutes once a week to practice speaking in English.

It has been continued for a year and half. (#2)

Another visiting scholar had practiced English by listening to English on a daily basis by
listening to radio and joining an ESL class in the community.

I have been listening to a radio news program for three months, and now I think I
can dictate about 75%, although listening to some proper nouns and people’s
names are difficult. I think I can understand about 50% of the contents of English,
so it is still difficult. But, I feel my improvement in English, so it is enjoyable to
learn. Also, I think my reading speed has improved because I had to read English
for all the living arrangements, such as electricity, internet, and housing issues,
buying a car, and car insurance. Since I had to read a lot of English documents
for these arrangements, I got used to reading English. In addition, I also attend ESL classes for parents, when my son also attends ESL classes. (#5)

For visiting scholars, not only the attendance at private or group English lessons, but their daily use of English seemed to be helpful in the improvement of the language skills. Another participant reported the improvement of English after spending a few months in the United States.

I don't know when exactly, but after a few months passed, I felt that it was easier to listen to English. As for the speaking, I took private lessons and audited some courses, and my resistance to speak reduced, but still it is difficult to make someone understood my English speech. (#22)

Including this scholar, several participants recognized the improvement of their English language skills once they had spent some time in the United States. As discussed in the themes regarding auditing courses, participating in courses offered at the host university was helpful for the improvement of English in addition to observing the instruction. English fluency is considered a resource in communicating with American scholars, and the improvement of English skills seemed to be an important issue, especially for the first-timers.

**Observing Cultural Experiences**

First-timers and scholars with family members typically reported cultural and social experiences as a meaningful part of their visit. As stated in the previous section, five scholars reported that they participated in English language programs during their visits. Their participation in language class was also informative as a cultural experience.
One scholar participated in a language class with immigrants in the community who were from a different group of people than who the scholar typically met at the university.

Now, I go to ESL school in the community and the school for the parents, with my son. This class is offered for parents while their kids are in school, and I joined the class with my wife, and with other immigrant parents. I was surprised that they talk a lot by just connecting words they know, though their English grammar is not necessarily correct. (#5)

For this visiting scholar, the experiences in ESL classes provided chances to learn English and to meet people in the community by communicating with immigrants in the language classes. The interactions for language practice often gave opportunities for the visiting scholars to learn American society and culture outside the academic community.

In addition to the language classes, the first-timers often noticed differences between the United States and Japan vividly through their living experience in the United States. One of the common differences that the Japanese scholars observed was the close connection between theory and practice in the United States. One of the first-timers found that the relationship between academia and society in the United States seemed to be close and complementary to each other.

The exchanges between academia and the government or industry are promoted more in the United States. Practitioners, such as important journalists and diplomats, come to talk at universities often in the United States, which is inspiring and informative. … In the United States, the wisdom of practitioners is systematically accumulated as knowledge at universities, which I think is a
strength of American academics. These practitioners might become a faculty member next year, or vice versa. (#2)

Related to the close connection between the academic knowledge and society, another visiting scholar found a more strategic perspective in American academia than in Japan, such as in the selection of research topics and approaches.

Compared to Japanese universities, American academic society has a strategic view. In other words, researchers do not just research something neutral, but have some clear objectives from an American point of view. By contrast, in the field of area studies in Japan, when scholars try to research on a particular country, they just do research without a strategic perspective, although this has also strength. In Japan, when researchers or universities do research on other countries, scholars who like the country typically conduct the research, but they might be lacking a critical perspective on the research object. (#15)

These first long-term visitors often observed the close relationship between academic knowledge and application in the society in the United States. These scholars often found that knowing societal and cultural differences positive learning experience during their visits.

**Involving in Social Experiences with Family Members**

In addition to the first timers, the visiting scholars who brought their children to the United States often reported their social experience in the local community. Eleven participants came with their children to the current visit. The visiting scholars whose children were at the age to attend schools typically reported that they had interactions with other parents through the connection with their kids’ schools. For example, one
visiting scholar reported that his involvement in his children’s education was meaningful for him to know the situation of public schools in the local area and to meet other parents in the community.

I have to be involved in many events of my children’s school, since the schools are one of the central communities for local people. The community is very international, and there are children from many other countries. We interact with each other, we go to some trips together, so I increased the chance to be involved in the community through my kids’ school, which is very interesting as an experience. I take my children to school every day, so I meet other parents every day, which is very different from Japan. (#24)

The visiting scholars typically met other parents when they took their children to and from local public schools and attended some other events. These scholars often found parents to be involved in the education at public schools more frequently and heavily in the host community than compared to their experience in Japan. In addition to the cultural and systematic differences between Japan and the United States, these scholars seemed to have had more time to be involved in their children’s schooling during their visits.

As another social experience regarding the education of their children, these scholars found the quality of public education at the host community often satisfactory. Indeed, most of the scholars who brought their kids to the United States, chose the location of their housing based on the good reputation of the quality of public education. The issue of the selection of housing is also discussed in the next chapter. Some areas where this study was conducted seemed to be known for the quality of the public
education system. One visiting scholar, whose daughter went to a public kindergarten, was surprised about the frequent and helpful communication from the school to the parents.

One of my children joined a local kindergarten, and she has been there for about two months. At first she had language issues, but small kids get used to the environment quickly. I’ve heard that this area has quality public schooling, and I think it cannot be compared to Japan. … I receive a daily report about my daughter from a teacher at the kindergarten through email with some message about the follow up advice about the care at home. They also offer to have discussions about our concerns about my daughter if any. This kind of service was not expected in Japan, especially at the public kindergarten. (#13)

Although this might not be generalizable to the scholars who visited a different area, the participants this study often found the quality of the public education for their children during the visit to be high.

For the visiting scholars who brought their children, the experiences outside the university were often developed through their kids’ community. The educational and social experiences at the public school of their kids often served as a way to know other aspects of the society in the local area.

**Working for Institutional Relations**

Although it was not common for most of the participants, three participants reported their involvement in activities related to institutional initiatives during their visits. They engaged in individual activities, in addition to the institutional relations. One visiting scholar arranged a meeting between the institutional leaders of his host and
the home universities as well as attended to some visitors from his home university during his visit.

We would like to develop an institutional exchange agreement between the home and the host university, and I have arranged a meeting when the leadership team from my home university came to the United States. In addition, there are several professors who came from Japan, so I attended to those people. … In addition, when ten undergraduate students came to visit the host university, I arranged the schedule and guided them during their visits. (#16)

This visiting scholar was frequently involved in the institutional relationship through attending to and hosting other visitors from his home university to promote the interactions at the institutional level. In addition, another scholar, who initially did not plan to be involved in any activities regarding institutional relations, happened to find an opportunity that might be beneficial for the institutions.

Through my network with American families at my son’s school, I happened to meet a person who works as a financial manager at a prestigious American university. So, for example, it might be possible to invite this person to my home university to have a lecture regarding the financial management at the university, or something like that. I am now making a suggestion regarding this project to the university leaders and deans. … So, this kind of institutional exchange might be possible, through the opportunity as a visiting scholar. … I did not expect this kind of opportunity to emerge through the interactions as a father in my son’s community. Although this was just a coincidence, it would never have been realized unless I came as a visiting scholar. (#17)
At the beginning of his visit, this visiting scholar did not expect that his presence as a visiting scholar could be developed as a project at the institutional level. Then, he realized the potential use of an opportunity as visiting scholars to inform and develop some kind of institutional relationships. Typically, visiting scholars’ activities were mostly centered on their individual research and professional development, and the use of institutional initiatives was relatively limited. However, there seemed to be a potential use of visiting scholars that exceeds the individual level.

This chapter presented the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars during their visits through the eleven themes. The following chapter discusses the challenges and support and other contextual and personal factors that influence a scholar’s visit at discussed by different stages of transition.
Chapter 7. Issues upon Leaving the Home University

In chapters seven through ten, research question three and four are explored together with some stages and timings within the period of transition. The research questions are: what are the sources of challenges and support for Japanese visiting scholars, and how do Japanese visiting scholars perceive that personal and contextual factors affect their transition in different periods of their transition? From the interview data, the backgrounds of participants and contexts of their experiences were often related to their challenges and sources of support. Therefore, these two research questions, which asked about challenges, support, and other personal and contextual factors that influenced transition, were examined together.

As the first chapter to examine these two research questions, chapter seven discusses the challenges, support, and other factors affecting the transition which were especially salient upon their departure from their home institution. There are eight themes of issues regarding the home institution that emerged: institutional differences regarding research leave policies, lack of time for scholars and their colleagues, lack of institutional support on sabbatical leaves, financial issues, lack of procedural support, process of finding host university, opportunity for professional development, and interest in international experiences. These key contextual and personal factors as well as the sources of challenges and support during the stage are presented below.

Institutional Difference in the Availability of a Research Leave

During the stage that the participants moved out from the home institution, they had to find an opportunity to take a leave of absence for research from the home university. Although the participants shared their personal and professional interest in
living abroad, some participants experienced challenges in taking the research leave. In particular, the availability of research leave policies at the home university varied and influenced the degrees of difficulties in leaving the home university temporarily for research. This was also linked to the institutional atmosphere where it promoted or hindered taking research leave.

Among the participants, ten scholars reported that they could take a research leave once every several years regularly without particular challenges. Their home institutions tended to be research-focused ones with relatively sufficient financial and human resources. At the institutions, the scholars typically had to work for several years before taking the research leave and to wait for their own turn, although they still appreciated the opportunity in general. At these universities, the schedule regarding who would take the research leave seemed to be decided ahead of time. At the earliest, professors knew that they would go abroad for research a few years before their trip.

At my home institution, before taking the research leave, you have to work at least for five years. … Actually, I was able to apply for the opportunity in the second or the third year after I started to work in order to show my motivation to take the research leave among the colleagues at the department. Then, I was notified around the third year. So, I knew that I would be able to take the leave two years later at that time. The department needed to arrange the curriculum and the substitute teachers for my courses, so everyone in the department knew about the schedule of the leave from two years ago. While I am out, some other full-time professors would take the half of my courses, and an adjunct instructor could
substitute the other half. … I believe that other full-time professor also thinks that this is like a give and take. (#8)

To arrange the schedule of research leave several years prior to the visit was beneficial not only for the scholars to prepare for their leaves, but also for their department to plan ahead for the absence of these professors in arranging the potential work division. At these institutions, since the professors took research leaves in turn, they seemed to be supportive and used to covering other colleagues’ work during their research leaves.

**Lack of Time for Scholars and Their Colleagues**

In contrast, the rest of the participants came from universities that did not have regular use of a research leave policy. Among them, there were some universities that had a policy of research leave, but the policy presented some challenges in the actual use. At these institutions, the pressure of daily work seemed to be an obstacle for the professors to take leave. One participant observed the situation that the application process of the research leave was not competitive because other professors seemed to be too busy to apply for it, and there were not many applicants for several years.

Well, my university sends about two scholars abroad in a year. But, there were few people who would like to apply for it, and I could apply for it anytime from a few years ago to be selected. My colleagues encouraged me to take the leave because the position was open for several years. But now that I am abroad, they started to complain to me about their workload to cover my absence. (#24)

In addition to the busy schedule, in order to actually take the research leave, support from their colleagues in the department seemed to be crucial. Another associate professor, whose home institution had a policy of sabbatical, reported the challenge in taking the
research leave due to the busy work and the relationship with other professors in the same department.

As a policy at my home institution, in theory, we can take sabbatical leave once every six years, but we cannot easily take it since we have institutional work and courses to teach. During the sabbatical, we have to find other professors to cover our work, and if the arrangement was made successfully, we could take the leave, but many professors find it difficult. (#16)

The arrangement of work division with other colleagues seemed to be challenging for many visiting scholars. When the home universities did not have systematized institutional support for the research leave, the scholars had to deal with the arrangement personally to make the research leave possible.

Another challenge for taking the research leave at their home institution was that participants had to manage their work while they were away. At universities with regular use of a sabbatical policy, the visiting scholars were often able to find someone who could substitute the courses or to hire an adjunct lecturer to cover their courses. However, for most of the participants, there was no institutional arrangement regarding the substitution of work during their leave. In these cases, they had to work before and after their period as visiting scholars to substitute their own work by themselves.

Well, since I came to the United States in the fall semester as a visiting scholar, I was told to teach the course in the spring semester before the visit, so I taught my fall course during the spring semester, and I will teach my spring course during the next fall semester after I returned. It is painstaking. (#15)
The lack of an institutional system of work substitution and atmosphere to cover the work of colleagues on the research leave often challenged the participants.

While the pressure of daily work was reported as an obstacle for visiting scholars, in order to take research leave, participating in some time-consuming institutional and departmental work seemed to be helpful for receiving support from their colleagues. One scholar reported that working hard on institutional work for several years prior to the visit helped him to apply for the position of research leave.

Fortunately, I was just working on departmental admissions, which is considered as the hardest institutional work for faculty members at my home university. So, I thought it was good timing to apply for the research leave. Moreover, there was also no other applicant at that time. (#17)

At another university, where the use of sabbatical leave was more common, there was an institutional practice to help decide who could take the leave at his home department, based on the contribution to institutional work.

We have a point system, in which professors receive points by doing institutional or departmental work at the home university. If you have more points, you are likely to be accepted if you apply for the research leave. This policy is only at my department at my home institution. I tried hard to work for the institution and department to receive points. Although there are colleagues that had many points, but they did not apply for the research leave. So, I was fortunate to be able to take the leave. (#5)

Although this policy was reported only by one professor, this kind of clear system regarding research leave might be helpful for scholars and their colleagues to strive for
and prepare for research leave. As in these examples, working on a difficult role on the institutional work often increase the possibility of taking research leave officially or unofficially, depending on the institution. As for the compensation for the busy work for the institution, the scholars seemed to receive support from their colleagues easily.

**Lack of Institutional Support for Sabbatical Leaves**

At several universities where the regular use of sabbatical was not available, some participants felt that their home universities did not promote the use of research leave opportunities at the institutional level. Some participants indicated that the research leave policies were not clearly communicated to the faculty members at their home institution. One associate professor reported that the application process was not competitive since other young colleagues were not informed about the research leave policy, in addition to another procedural problem in the actual use.

At my home university, there were no other applicants for the research leave in my department, and I felt that especially young professors were not aware of the availability of those opportunities. The amount of financial support and the period of the research leave were not clear. In addition, the deadline was really short. It is something like, once the announcement was made, the applicants had to find the host university in one week. Although this is recognized as a problem at my home institution, there were professors who gave up taking the research leave because of this procedural issue. In addition, this might be specific as a Japanese cultural issue, but if you take a leave, other colleagues could complain about it. Other colleagues might think that you want to escape from the busy
work. … Then, especially young faculty members are not easy to take the research leave because of the pressure. (#6)

The lack of institutional support through the policy and atmosphere for promoting the use of research leave could be a challenge for some to become visiting scholars. This situation contrasts sharply to some other institutions with regular use of research leave, at which the university decided the candidate a few years prior to be able to make the arrangement.

The lack of understanding of the value of research leaves for the advancement of research and publication at many Japanese universities was not only challenging for individual scholars: it could also potentially hinder scientific production as a whole in Japan. At these institutions, since the research activities were not highly valued and faculty members were already busy with teaching and institutional work, many colleagues felt uncomfortable taking the research leave. One professor worried about the situation at his home university, where the use of research leave was not encouraged.

The policy of sabbatical is not available at all at my home university. It is allowed maybe once in a lifetime, and I think this is causing a crucial challenge to Japanese scientific production. … In Japan, everyone just works hard and hard, it might be only for humanities and social sciences, but the sabbatical is only allowed once in a career, or something like that. But if we continue with this situation, the scientific productivity will be way behind compared to other countries with a regular use of sabbatical. … So, my hope is to have an institutional atmosphere where universities allow and promote the faculty
members to take research leave. Otherwise, the academic productivity in Japan will fall behind other countries easily. (#18)

This scholar’s opinion was that the lack of institutional support for research leave, combined with the amount of work and challenge in receiving support from colleagues, could be potentially disadvantageous to the progress of academic production in Japan.

Finally, there were other institutions that did not have a research leave policy at all. The research leave policy seemed to be different for scholars in the medical fields, compared to the ones in other fields. Three scholars who worked for medical universities in Japan reported that the institution specially approved their research leaves. At these medical schools, some senior colleagues who wanted to visit abroad for research had to quit their jobs because they were not allowed to use the research leave or were not comfortable using the policy. One assistant professor reported that she was able to take a research leave with the help of her boss.

Well, it was possible for my boss to fire me and hire another person during my absence for two years. Currently, it seems like someone is working as an adjunct associate professor temporarily. After the increase in the capacity of graduate schools in Japan recently, there are more people who want to find a position at a university, so I saw my senior colleagues who went abroad, and when they returned to Japan, there were no positions for them at their universities, and they started to work as physicians at local hospitals. So, I am really thankful to my boss who allowed me to keep my position while I am away. (#25)

In contrast to the other fields, the medical schools in Japan seemed to have a different trend in policy arrangement. They seemed to be lacking a systematic research leave
policy. This might be because the scholars in medical fields were often physicians, who might be able to fund themselves from their savings to visit abroad for research. Although they might not be able to find academic positions at a Japanese university later once they quit their job to visit abroad, it would still possible for them to work as a physician. This might have been affected to the current situation of the research leave policy at medical schools different from others. Including the cases of medical schools, unless the university had regular use of a sabbatical policy, the participants faced some challenges taking the leave, especially due to the workload and relationship with other colleagues.

Financial Issues

Although the participants might have experienced a challenge in finding a position to become a visiting scholar, all of them reported that they received financial assistance from their home institutions for their visits. The breakdown of the funding varied by individual. Only a few participants indicated that they received sufficient financial support from their home institution. These limited scholars were receiving a special research allowance in addition to their salary. This additional funding was usually granted to a few selected scholars at the home institution. In those cases, they typically worked hard on institutional work before they received the opportunity as described in the previous theme.

While a few visiting scholars were satisfied with the financial support, it seemed to be more common for the participants to receive only a basic or partial salary during their visit. In cases where the financial support from the home institution was not sufficient, the scholars tried to find other financial resources. Ten participants reported
that they received some kind of financial support other than their home institution, including four scholars who received governmental fellowships, three researchers who received fellowships from private organizations, two scholars who received partial funding from the host institutions. Five other participants reported that they were partially financing themselves from their own personal savings. One professor who was going to stay in the United States for two years was granted a salary only for one year from the home university, and planned to apply for some funding opportunities other than his home university.

My department at the home university permits me to take sabbatical for two years, but my home university only provides salary for the first year, so I have to apply for other funding opportunities, but there are not many choices. … If the university allows for professors to take the research leave for two years, they should consider the funding for the second year, but most of other departments at my home university did not allow the research leave for the second year at all, so I cannot request this issue loudly. (#13)

Although the funding from the host university was sometimes not enough, the participants still chose to become visiting scholars. They typically tried to receive fellowships or research funds or used their savings to cover the expenses.

Receiving some other fellowships or scholarships was not only helpful in financing their expenses but also in seeking approval to take a research leave from their home institution, especially where the use of sabbatical was uncommon. This was related to the challenge of institutional policy and atmosphere described in the previous theme. One professor whose home university typically only permits sabbatical once in a person’s
career applied for a prestigious scholarship in order to increase the possibility of taking the research leave from his home institution.

The main issue is not the financial support, but the atmosphere that Japanese universities do not promote scholars to take research leave abroad. When I met my colleague who received the same scholarship to visit the United States for three months, we talked about how we wanted to have the name of the scholarship since it helps our home universities to allow us to take our research leave abroad. (#18)

At some universities where the use of the research leave was not common, receiving a prestigious fellowship seemed to be helpful in convincing the home university to allow the scholars to take the research leave.

Although the participants could be financed partially by fellowships or their own savings, the availability of financial support could be a factor for the participants to actually become visiting scholars. One participant reported that, even though he was interested in going to visit abroad, the institutional support was necessary for him to actually have this experience.

I think whether you would come to the United States depends on individuals. I was not ordered to come here. I would say that if I were not interested in living abroad, I would not come. But, if my home institution did not have a policy to support my visit, I don’t think I would come. If my home institution did not have some kind of support policy for the faculty members to visit abroad, including financial assistance, I think it would be difficult for me to take the actual step to visit abroad. (#21)
Even for a motivated scholar, a lack of financial and institutional support could be an obstacle to seek the opportunity to become a visiting scholar. The availability of research leave policy with financial support seems to be an important factor for the participants to be able to become visiting scholars.

Discontinuation of financial support from the Japanese government seemed to be discouraging other Japanese scholars to become visiting scholars. A few visiting scholars who came from public universities reported the influence of the discontinuation of financial support from the government for overseas research at national universities. The change of the policy seemed to be the cause of decline of the number of Japanese visiting scholars especially at the public universities.

The MEXT used to offer financial support for professors to conduct research abroad. But recently, this policy was abandoned in the political reform to reduce the governmental expenses. This seems to have contributed to decreasing the number of professors who go abroad for research. Many of my colleagues do not go abroad since there is no financial support. For me, I have to pay rent for my apartments in Japan and the United States, and it is financially hard, but I think I will be able to get experiences that are more than what I pay, so I rather pay for it.

(#16)

The recent policy change to stop the financial assistance from the Japanese government for research leave at national universities seemed to have potentially contributed to the decrease of the number of visiting scholars from Japan. Other scholars seemed to have been discouraged to take research leave because of the lack of financial support.
Lack of Logistical Support

While all the participants received financial support from their home universities, there seemed to be a lack of support from the home universities for non-financial arrangements. Some professors, especially the first-timers, reported the lack of institutional support in preparing for their visits was challenging. Although most of the participants received financial support and permission to take the leave from their home institutions, their institutions did not provide any other help or information regarding other arrangements, such as how to search for potential host institutions and housing. The scholars who were visiting the United States for their first long-term visit tended to report this challenge.

As one of the challenges to become a visiting scholar, the home institution did not do anything. So, I had to do everything by myself, including the arrangement about the housing and the schools of my kids. No one gave information about these issues. So, I contacted the education committee in the host community in the United States by myself, and took my kids to some American public schools directly. When I went there, I found out we had some problems, which was hard. But, no one helped me. Though my home institution provided financial support, they did not have any other instructions regarding the set up of the life. It is challenging, though I can say it was a good learning experience to handle those problems. (#24)

These scholars often compared their situations with visitors from other Japanese organizations such as government agencies or private companies that sent their workers abroad more frequently and consecutively. In these organizations, the information
regarding apartments and children’s schooling had been accumulated and passed to the newer colleagues both at the institutional and personal level. Some of these organizations even provided orientations for their employees regarding setting up life in the U.S. for a smooth transition. This kind of support was not common for visiting scholars.

Another procedural issue at the home university, which potentially could influence the reduction of the overall number of Japanese visiting scholars, is the current institutional policies for research leaves that do not reflect the contemporary family situation in Japan. Although the participants somehow managed this issue, they reported this as an obstacle for their colleagues who might want to take research leaves abroad. The current policy arrangement, which assumes the Japanese traditional family organization – a breadwinner, a housewife, and children - might not be convenient for new types of family organizations, such as when the husband and wife both have full-time jobs. In these cases, they also have to make arrangements, such as one spouse quitting the job or taking a temporary leave from the work place, which causes some issues. In this study it was revealed that some of the spouses of the participants had actually quit their jobs to come to the United States with the participants, while others were able to take temporary leaves. One participant whose wife quit her job to go to the United States reported that it could be a challenge to visit abroad for other colleagues.

It is common recently to take sabbatical at the home university. It is because there are many families in which both husband and wife both work full time. So, my wife quit her job for my research leave, and she came with me, but in those cases that the husband and wife are both working, then they would come alone or to take the leave in Japan, especially if you have children. (#7)
The recent increase in double income families challenged the traditional policy arrangement, which assumed a family with a housewife who could easily accompany their husbands during their time as visiting scholars. This social context seemed to have led to the increase of domestic research leave in Japan, instead of visiting other countries for research. One visiting scholar reported the advantage of being single to becoming a visiting scholar.

Well, I think that being single is the most important background that led me to become a visiting scholar. If scholars had family members, I thought it might be almost impossible for them to become a visiting scholar. I thought this by observing other scholars with family members. … I think it is very difficult to take family members to another country and conduct research. Since I am single, I could travel for research without a financial issue. In addition, if I had to take care of my family members, I don't think I could conduct focused research because I am at the library at 1am or 2am frequently. (#6)

In addition, scholars with children need to consider their children’s schooling while they were abroad. The school arrangement was also reported as a common challenge in the set up of life in the U.S., which is discussed in the next chapter. In order to support the research leave, in addition to the financial arrangement, considering the familial situation also seemed to be important.

**Process of Finding the Host University**

During the moving out stage, the visiting scholars had to find host universities for their visits. In the process to find a potential host university, the use of an existing connection with scholars at an American university was a common approach. Twelve
participants reported that they contacted American colleagues to see if they could host the participants. They often had developed the connections with American colleagues at academic conferences or seminars prior to the visit. One visiting scholar contacted two American colleagues whom she met at a conference and seminar in the field in Japan.

At first, I asked a professor at the host university, whom I had met at an academic conference in Japan. She came as a keynote speaker to the conference, and I was also a speaker in her session from the Japanese side. So, I sent an email to her first. Then, I found out that she was going to take a sabbatical this year, and I asked another colleague whom I had met at another seminar in Japan, and … finally I was able to find two professors who recommended me to be a visiting scholar at the host university, and the host university accepted me. (#9)

The existing connections with American scholars were used as a resource when participants tried to find a place to visit for their research. Although not all the participants were able to find a host university from their own existing connections, the participants typically made an attempt first to contact American colleagues who they had met previously.

As another approach to find the host university, thirteen participants indicated that they used networks Japanese colleagues or senior colleagues. Among them, seven scholars only relied on indirect connections, and six other scholars tried to use both of their own and colleagues’ connections to find a host university. One visiting scholar who could not find a host university from his own contacts finally found the potential host university through his Japanese colleague’s connection.
Although I tried to find an American professor who would host me as a visiting scholar by myself, I could not find one. I asked two American researchers, whom I had known previously as a possibility of accepting me as a visiting scholar, but both declined me. So, I asked for my senior colleague in Japan to help me with this process. My former advisor in Japan knew an American scholar, and contacted to this scholar through his connection. Then, he agreed to host me at the university. … So, I happened to find a place to visit, so, I think the key was whether you have a reliable connection or not. (#10)

Regardless if it was direct or indirect connections, the availability of strong and good networks with American scholars seems to be key to finding a host university for the international visiting scholars.

The visiting scholars who had previous American academic experience reported less difficulty in finding a host university. These scholars tended to have connections with American professors from their former academic visits. In addition, they seemed to know the strategy of how they should approach American professors to become visiting scholars. One visiting scholar had set up an interview to meet a professor at the host university, which was not a typical approach.

At first I thought about visiting a university where I graduated previously, but they did not have an enough office space for me. So, I asked many other colleagues, and tried to approach another university. But, my approach was unique, I think. I did not apply through the administrative office, but I contacted some professors since this is much quicker as long as the space was open. I made an appointment with a host professor, and I visited him to have an interview. I
discussed my motivation to visit here in the meeting. This was from my previous experience at American universities that once the professors say yes, the administrative decisions will be fine. So, I approached through an unofficial route, which is not written anywhere, though later I also went through the official administrative process. (#7)

For the scholars who had studied in the United States before, in addition to having connections with colleagues at American universities, they knew the effective way to approach American scholars about becoming visiting scholars. Another visiting scholar who had American academic experience directly made a phone call to the dean of the department to inquire about being accepted as a visiting scholar.

I sent applications to several universities, but I also got a letter of acceptance from my alma mater for just in case. Since I knew several American faculty members there, they were saying that I could visit there anytime. However, I wanted to visit another institution, where I did not have any connection. So, I called the dean directly, and introduced myself on the phone, and then I received approval from that university quickly. So, it literally took me five minutes to find my host university. (#6)

In addition to their English fluency, the scholars with American educational experience seemed to have an advantage in finding the host university. They knew some alternative and efficient ways to contact the host university from their previous academic experience in the United States.

Other than personal connections with American colleagues and previous American academic experiences, some other visiting scholars found their host
universities because of an existing scholarly exchange framework. In these cases, the scholars did not have a choice on the host university because the terms of the exchange agreement specified the place to visit. Among them, two visiting scholars indicated that the presence of an institutional agreement between home and host universities influenced them to find the host institution as a place to visit.

Since there is an institutional exchange agreement between the research institute at the host university and my home university, I was sent to the host university based on this agreement. … Since this agreement was made about five or six years ago, my home university has sent one scholar a year. (#14)

In addition to the institutional exchange, a few other visiting scholars were awarded fellowships or scholarships that were connected to a particular research center or a lab for their recipient. An assistant professor in the medical field who was awarded a fellowship position reported that she came to one of the leading research centers of her field because of the fellowship.

If you apply for this fellowship and if accepted, you will be able to come to this program automatically, so the fellowship and the host institution were connected. (#25)

For these cases, organizations or institutions provided funding for visiting scholars to promote scholarly exchange. Although the visiting scholars who found the host university through institutional exchange program did not have a choice of their place to visit, they found the host university without any trouble.

As another way to find the host university, four participants of this study applied to programs specifically designed for international visiting scholars. Though these
programs typically require fees for the application and enrollment, they offer some support and events for the visiting scholars in this program. In addition, the programs seemed to be helpful for participants who did not have particular connections with American scholars prior to the visits.

I think visiting scholars usually find their host universities since they previously knew some American colleagues. But, I could not find my place to visit though I wrote emails to several American scholars. I was declined by some of them, and I did not receive any responses from others, or something like that. Then when I was looking for some information, I found this program for international visiting scholars and decided to apply for this. (#24)

Another visiting professor who did not have any connections with American academics applied to a different visiting scholar program since it was offered at the university where she wanted to visit.

Since I did not have any connections with American professors, and this program did not require any recommendation letters, I thought I should give it a try. Although I did not know anything about this program, and I did not hear about this program from my advisor, since it was offered at the host university, I applied to this program. (#8)

Although the information of programs on international visiting scholars might not be always well known, these programs worked as a platform for visiting scholars who did not have any connections to American colleagues to find a place to visit. The services and events offered to these visiting scholar programs are discussed in the next chapter.
Although some visiting scholars faced challenges in finding the host university, they managed to find a place to visit which mostly matched their academic interests. However, among all the participants, one visiting scholar reported a particular challenge in finding the host university. He did not have any previous American academic experience or direct connections with American professors of the field.

I applied for several universities, but never heard back. … So, I had a hard time finding my host university. From the personal connection with another Japanese scholar, I found an American professor who was in a slightly different field who showed an interest in accepting me, so I contacted this professor. Then I was able to receive the permission, but I did not have enough information about the United States, and in addition, I was very busy before I left my home university, so I did not have enough time to prepare and think about this, so I decided to come to this institution. (#22)

Although he was able to find a host university finally through the connection of his colleague, he later found that the academic field of the host department and the host professor did not exactly match his field, and experienced challenges after his arrival. This is explained in the next chapter. Though this instance might be not a typical case, in general the lack of information about American universities and existing connections with American scholars might cause problems in finding and spending time at the host university.

**Visiting Scholars as Positive Opportunity for Professional Development**

Although this does not directly related to the challenge upon their departure, as a personal and contextual background to influence the transition, all the participants
anticipated a period of transition to come to the United States as visiting scholars. They appreciated the opportunity to leave their role as faculty members at the home institutions temporarily and to becoming visiting scholars at the host universities. The positive view on the opportunity to be visiting scholars affected their experiences before and even after becoming visiting scholars by serving as a psychological resource to go through the transition.

One of the common reasons why they saw this opportunity positively was that it would be beneficial for their research productivity and professional development since they would have time to engage in the related activities without major interruptions. One participant commented that he appreciated becoming a visiting scholar because he would be able to use time for his own research.

Since I do not have a teaching obligation while I am a visiting scholar, I can use my time for research, which is a great advantage for my academic career, and also I am very delighted about this opportunity. (#14)

Since the participants tended to be too busy with non-research work at their home universities, they looked forward to becoming visiting scholars to engage in activities that could be beneficial for their professional careers. In addition to having time for research, the opportunity as visiting scholars was also perceived as beneficial for updating their knowledge and improving their teaching.

As for the teaching, we teach almost the same thing every year, so it becomes very constant. In addition, the work is busy. So, I think I needed to make a refreshing change for stepping up my teaching. In addition, for my research, since my field is American history, it is also different from being Japan and
coming to the United States. In this sense, I wanted to come across new perspectives and new materials for research during the visit. (#24)

The time as visiting scholars was considered to be meaningful not only for research but also teaching and other professional work as faculty members, especially when the participants’ academic fields were relevant to the United States.

Although having time to focus on research was considered as beneficial and crucial for an academic profession, the opportunity to become a visiting scholar was limited to some institutions in Japan. One professor emphasized the need for taking a leave of absence in order to do research, though these opportunities were not offered at many other universities due to the scarce human and financial resources.

Once in a while, if I do not have this kind of time as research leave, I don’t have time to do what I am supposed to do as a scholar. There are only a few days that I can spend my time for writing all day long because usually I have other daily work to do. So, I think I need a year like this to take a time to be able to engage in research, though the institutions that really need this kind of policy do not have it since the universities that are working hard to survive tend to have limited resources and are not possible for their faculty members to take a leave, such as at my former university. (#3)

Since the policy of research leave to visit other countries were limited to faculty members at some resourceful institutions in Japan, the opportunity was considered special and precious for the scholars.
Interest in International Experiences as a Personal Factor

As another personal factor influenced the transition, in addition to the benefit for their research and professional development, many participants were interested in, or at least did not have a resistance to, living abroad professionally or personally. This also influenced participants’ positive perception of the opportunity to be visiting scholars. Nineteen participants indicated that they were personally or professionally interested in living abroad. The rest were mostly scholars who had already had extensive international academic experiences. One visiting scholar, who already had an academic experience in the United States, knew the positive environment for research there, and wanted to visit again.

I wanted to visit abroad, since I knew various positive aspects of American universities. I went to the United States about 15 years ago as an exchange student. This was a long time ago, but I have a good memory. I was really amazed by the resources for learning at an American university, and I thought it was a great educational environment. Since then, I had an image that the universities in the United States have a supportive environment for research. (#4)

While this visiting scholar had a positive impression of American higher education, some other participants had a good experience with America from their childhood. One visiting scholar, who had lived in the United States when she was young, was looking for another chance to visit the United States.

I am used to going abroad, so I did not feel any obstacle to do it. Rather, I want to visit other countries, which influenced me to visit abroad again. I came to the United States when I was a child for 10 months since my father was also a visiting
scholar. I had a great memory from that time. So, this also influenced me, I think.

So, I wanted my son to have the same experience this time. (#11)

Another visiting scholar stated that she was interested in living abroad personally, though she did not have opportunity thus far in her life. Since her research interest was also relevant to the international comparative perspective, both of her personal and professional motivation influenced her to anticipate her experience as a visiting scholar.

Well, I am hoping to have a perspective of international comparison in my research on economics. It has been difficult to visit abroad to do my research because some of my data are not allowed to be brought into other countries. … In my case, since I have not visited abroad for research before, I have been hoping to do it. This influenced me to become a visiting scholar. I am not like the scholars who wanted to come again to the United States because they have already came to the United States. I have been interested in the life in a different country, and it was not particular to the United States, but I was interested in people in other countries to see how they live and how they engage in economic activities. (#8)

As in these examples, one of the common factors for the participants was that they were interested in having international or U.S. experiences, regardless of whether they had previous U.S. or international experiences. This background influenced them to aspire to have an opportunity as a visiting scholar, in addition to the benefits on their research progress and professional development.

As discussed above, this chapter examined the common issues, support, and other factors mainly before visiting scholars left their home universities. In the next chapter,
the visiting scholars’ experiences during the stages of moving in and moving through are explored.
Chapter 8. Non-academic Issues at the Host University

This chapter mainly focuses on non-academic issues and challenges for the first-timers that were particularly salient during the time after their arrival at the host university as visiting scholars. This chapter also includes a discussion regarding the personal, contextual, and other key factors that influenced the experience during the transition in addition to challenges and support for visiting scholars. The academic issues that scholars encountered during their time at the host institutions are discussed in the next chapter. The non-academic issues included challenges in finding housing, family related arrangements, and medical insurance. The issues for the first-timers, who came to visit the United States on their first long-term visit, were related to English language difficulties and the cultural differences. These themes are discussed in detail as follows.

Challenges in Finding Housing and Setting Up of Life in a New Community

Right after arriving in the United States, visiting scholars often reported challenges in the search for an apartment and the setting up of life in a new community, rather than academic issues. In particular, the scholars who came to the United States for their first time long-term visit, the arrangement of housing seemed to be a concern. One participant wished to have more support in finding housing, even though the host university provided housing information online.

Though the host university provides information on the housing for visiting scholars, the norm was that you have to make your own arrangement. So, I did not know where and what I should contact, and who I should ask questions. I wish we could have more housing support. (#4)
The procedure to find apartments seemed to be unclear especially for scholars who were not used to the United States. In addition, even scholars with some previous American experiences, since all visiting scholars had to find a place to live for their visits, support in the search for an apartment was relevant and crucial to all of them.

In finding an apartment, some contextual factors seemed to influence the challenges especially for the population of the visiting scholars. Unlike other types of expatriates from government offices or companies, even when visiting scholars came from the same university in Japan, they did not always visit the same host university, due to differences in their fields and research topics. In addition, the timing of their visits was irregular, compared to governmental offices and companies, which tended to send visitors one after another. One participant reported the challenge regarding the lack of networks of visiting scholars among academics, especially non-STEM fields.

I became friends with a person who works for the Japanese self-defense force who is also studying in the United States. He said that there were one or two workers from the organization who come to study in the United States every year, so they have a network within the organization. The medical doctors also seemed to have a network with each other, since they also tend to visit abroad. By contrast, visiting scholars in the social sciences and humanities had little network, almost nothing. (#24)

There seemed to be no systematic mechanism to accumulate information regarding academic visiting scholars, especially in the social sciences field, comparing to other fields and occupations that send more visiting scholars abroad.
Well, I think we are an irregular case, where we do not succeed the position of the former visiting scholars from the same home institution, such as from the government offices where they send their officers regularly once the former one returned.

Visiting scholars from universities tended to be disconnected from each other, which made it difficult to pass on apartments and even information from the previous visitor to the next one systematically.

As another contextual factor that contributed to the challenge in finding housing, several visiting scholars brought up the issue of timing. Since the Japanese academic year starts in April, many visiting scholars from Japan tended to move between the end of March to the beginning of April. In the United States, April is in the middle of the spring semester, and the mobility of students and scholars is low at that time. Therefore, this made the apartment search difficult.

I experienced a challenge in finding an apartment since there were not many available apartments in April because American local people do not move around that time of year. So, there were not many vacant rooms. I don't know if this was challenging for finding a place for a family. Apartments for families were expensive in this area, and there were not many choices at that time. The place I finally found seemed to become available since another Japanese visitor had left at that time. (#14)

Although several participants came to the United States at different times, such as September or January when the American academic semester typically starts, other participants who moved at the Japanese academic calendar tended to experience a
challenge in finding accommodations. The timing issue is also discussed later in this chapter.

Considering these general challenges, the participants used different approaches to finding apartments. All but two participants reported that they found their apartment prior to their visit. These two participants, who came to the United States before finding an apartment, had previous academic experience in the United States. They stayed at hotels until they found an apartment, and visited real estate agencies. One of them reported that he took some time until he found an apartment, while the other smoothly found one in a few days.

Other scholars typically searched for their apartments from a distance. Four participants reported that they contacted several real estate agencies in the area for housing information. These participants found the internet useful for communicating and finding information on the arrangement of housing and setting up life without visiting the location.

I used the internet for all the preparation for the set up of life since there are websites to give information on furniture and housing, and also there are many Japanese real estate agencies that provide services online. So, I was able to arrange almost everything, except for something that I could not do through the internet, such as the interview for my son’s public school. (#17)

In addition to the scholars who relied on real estate agencies, four participants, who visited the same university, used the housing service offered at the host university.
There is a website at the host university that posts housing information for scholars and students. We could search apartments on the site with pictures, and this service is really important. (#15)

Although not all host universities provided the same kind of services, this particular institution had developed the service probably because they hosted many visitors.

A few visiting scholars were able to find an apartment when they came to the United States before they arrived for their academic visit. Three participants visited the region on short business trips before they came as visiting scholars. While one of them simply looked around the area and did not find an apartment, two of them were able to find their apartments quite smoothly through their visit to the region.

I did not prepare anything specifically, but I was able to come to the United States for other research, and I was able to find an apartment at that time. … So, I already found an apartment before my visit, although I stayed at a hotel at the beginning until the apartment became available. (#3)

Including the actual visit to the area in the United States, the participants used various approach to find apartments. Although all the participants were able to find apartments, issues regarding housing frequently came up as a challenge for visiting scholars.

Family Adjustment and Arrangement

During the experience in the United States, the presence of family members who came with the participants was reported as both a source of support and a challenge in the transition of visiting scholars. Five participants reported concerns regarding the family members’ adjustment to the life in the United States. This was especially relevant if the family members did not have international experience previously.
One of the concerns after my arrival was my husband. I have been told many times that he had never thought about studying abroad in his life. This was his first time to live in another country, although he came to visit other countries to see me when I was studying abroad and working on a project abroad for a short time. But, it seemed to be different if we lived in a different country. He was stressed about the procedures at banks, restaurants, and the tipping culture. So, I was stressed to see my husband was stressed. … Though after three months, he got used to the environment, and after six months, he takes care of household chores and our son. So, now I am really comfortable. (#11)

In this case, as time passed, the scholar’s husband got used to the United States, and shifted from a source of challenge to a source of support. By contrast, when the spouse of visiting scholars had studied abroad previously, they tended to be helpful in moving into the transition, such as in the arrangement of housing and schooling of children.

My wife had studied abroad previously, and she did all the complicated arrangement of the schooling of my daughter. My daughter was nervous right after we came to the United States until we settled, but the help of my wife was very helpful. … If I had to do this procedure by myself, it would have been very hard. (#14)

When the participants came with their spouse, they could be a source of support in arranging the set up of life and schooling of their kids.

Another common issue for the scholars who came with family members was the arrangement of public school and pre-school of their children. Four visiting scholars reported some challenges in the arrangement of the schooling of their children. At the
area of the research was conducted, the quality of the public school depended on the location of the residence. Since schooling issues were also closely related to housing issues, the participants faced challenge in managing both gathering school information and finding apartments in the region.

Depending on the location of your residence, the quality of the public school seemed to be totally different. In particular, while the quality of the public school of the city where my host university is located is not good, the quality of the public school of the city of my residence is good. Many children of professors and scholars of the universities around this area go to public schools in the city of my apartment, so it is very international. So, the school is good for English education for international kids as well. The selection of the location of my housing was challenging, by taking into consideration the situation of public school systems. (#24)

In order to arrange the schooling, having accurate information was crucial. Another visiting scholar asked her host professor for information about areas that had good public schooling.

I asked my host professor regarding where the best place for public schools is. I asked my host professor, and he told me there are many Japanese and his own children also went there, so I decided to have my son go there, and I asked some real estate agencies about apartments in that area, and then they had this place, so I found this place. (#11)
Since the information regarding the situation of public schools was difficult to access, to know someone who was knowledgeable about the quality of public schools around the area seemed to be an advantage in deciding where to live.

The challenge regarding the children’s education was slightly different for scholars whose children were younger than elementary school level. One visiting scholar with a child at the pre-school age found it difficult finding a day-care center. In this area, applications for a quality day care-center were competitive, and additionally required paying expensive fees.

So, it is challenging to become a visiting scholar with children, but my experience of studying abroad in the United States has been helpful for me to arrange things. I knew about the health care system. Other than that, the issue of my daughter’s schooling was challenging. … I have applied for day-care centers at more than 10 places since I knew that they have a waiting list to be admitted. They even require to pay $50 to be on the waiting list, and then they did not give us any information even when I contacted them through email. (#7)

Depending on the age of children, the visiting scholars had to manage the arrangement that they thought would be the best option for them by considering the information and cost.

**Challenges in Medical Insurance and Health Care**

As for another non-academic issue, visiting scholars often reported challenges in medical insurance coverage, although this issue could be brought up throughout their visits, not just after their arrival. Depending on the institution, the availability of medical insurance programs for visiting scholars was varied. In most cases, scholars had options
to either participate in the host university’s medical insurance, which tended to be very expensive, or to find alternative plans, or to join a Japanese insurance plan for overseas long-term trips. In addition, the actual procedure of receiving medical treatment and the issue of payment was complicated to them. One visiting scholars who did not join American medical insurance that covered dental care had to see a dentist in the United States. He later found that the Japanese medical insurance did not cover most of the cost.

I had a toothache after I came to the United States. It cost me about $3,600 to take care of my cavity. If you receive the same treatment, you have to only pay the amount of $300 in Japan. Then, if you want to reimburse from the Japanese health care system, it will count as the Japanese costs, so I just was able to be reimbursed about $300. So, mostly I had to pay from my pocket. I thought I should have treated my cavity before my visiting period, but learned now. (#26)

Although there were differences by the host university, while most scholars were concerned with the issue of medical insurance, one visiting scholar was able to join a reasonable medical insurance program for visiting scholars.

Everyone feels challenged about the medical insurance, although I am not having the issue. … I was lucky that when I applied to the program for international visiting scholars, I was able to join a good medical insurance program with a discount. Although I had this coverage, I hear from other visiting scholars at different universities that they have difficulty. … So they tell their kids not to get a cavity. Then their kids had to treat it in the US, and paid several thousand dollars for it. (#26)
Although there were differences according to the host universities, visiting scholars were commonly concerned about medical issues including insurance and treatment. These issues were also relevant to the scholars who came with family members, especially with children, who might need medical care unexpectedly.

In addition to the issue of medical insurance coverage, another visiting scholar expressed hesitation in going to see a doctor in the United States because of the concern of communicating with doctors in English about their symptoms.

Regardless if I have medical insurance or not, I don’t want to go to see a doctor here anyway. I am not comfortable with my English expression about my condition. … So, I try to go to the gym and to walk to manage my health condition. Then, I actually had to stay at home for more than 10 days because I was sick, I took medicine that I brought from Japan, and I just stayed at home to recover. (#2)

If the scholars were not comfortable communicating in English, an appointment with an American doctor could be intimidating. The combination of medical insurance coverage issues and medically related procedures was a challenge for many visiting scholars.

**The Use of English**

A common challenge for Japanese visiting scholars, especially who did not have previous experience of long-term academic visits in English speaking countries, was the use of English. Out of the twelve participants who reported issues, only one scholar had previous academic experience in the United States. Among them, eight scholars addressed the challenge in the use of English in academic discussion, especially in expressing their own opinions or comments and in listening and following discussions.
One scholar reported that although she was fine with reading documents in English for her research, participating in discussion was challenging.

There is no problem for me to go to archives and conduct document analysis in English. But, when I am in a class, and try to join the academic discussion, I feel my lack of English ability. I think it is because this is my first long-term research visit abroad, and still I had been lacking that kind of experience. (#9)

The speaking and listening skills in English, which was necessary for academic communication, seemed to be more challenging than using English for reading and writing for individual research.

As for the challenge in English discussions with native speakers, eight visiting scholars reported that although they used English at their home universities for academic communication, they still found it difficult to participate in discussion at the host universities in the United States. Some scholars reported that the use of English had been standardized at academic conferences and publication in journal articles in some academic fields in Japan. Although the scholars in those fields often used English in Japan, one participant reported that he could not keep up with the pace of the discussion and could not comprehend the accent of native English speakers easily.

In my field, the academic conference is held in English, though the use of English is a formality and incomplete. Mostly, for the last five years, if we submit a presentation to an academic conference, we should present it in English, and receive questions in English. Then, I think that the English conversation with Japanese people is easier since we can easily understand the Japanese accents.
But, once a native speaker joins the conversation, I cannot follow the discussion at all. (#21)

Even scholars who had used academic English found academic communications with native speakers at the host universities challenging. In addition, for some visiting scholars, the use of English in casual conversations was difficult.

I still cannot understand colloquial English. In that sense, I should have experienced the United States when I was young like a high school student. If I had studied abroad during high school, I might have been able to communicate like a native speaker, but at my age, I will never able to reach that level. (#2)

In addition, the challenge in English was also experienced outside the university.

Well, I am good at understanding English at the host university, though I could not understand people at stores because of their accents. When I went shopping at a store, I was not able to understand if the cashier was asking if I needed a bag or not. In addition, at the beginning of my visit, when I ate out, I could not get the right order easily, so it was a challenge for me. (#5)

Although the use of English in some academic fields in Japan might have prepared some scholars to communicate in English, they still realized the lack of fluency in English once they came to the United States and communicated with native English speakers.

In addition to being a first-timer, there were several other factors that seemed to play roles in serving as assets or liabilities in going through transition. First, the scholars’ professional knowledge and expertise as professors was helpful for them to understand the content of academic discussion in English. One scholar reported that she could
comprehend the context of the discussion because of her academic expertise, but she recognized her lack of discussion skills in English.

I think the first issue is English. If other scholars and students are discussing something in the field of my profession in a class, I can understand the content, but if I am asked to give some opinions, it’s difficult for me to make comments immediately. I feel the difficulty regarding my English language use. (#3)

As in this example, scholars’ past experience as academics was helpful in listening and understanding the content of the discussion even for the first-timer, though it seemed not to assist their discussion and skills in speaking. In addition, in some STEM fields, where the use of a particular skill set was important, the expertise in those skills worked as an asset by showing the procedure, rather than explaining in English.

For example, when we have a conference, I think it is difficult for me to logically convince someone in English. But, fortunately, my work is a technical thing, so I can show how to do something, rather than telling it in English. (#12)

Though their professional knowledge and skills in the fields seemed to assist in communication with English speakers, the lack of English fluency was still perceived as a barrier for them.

I think if the topic of the talk is close to my professional field, I can mostly understand, but if I cannot understand some important jargon for about 5%, I don't understand the whole picture. So, after the seminar when I reflect on the content, sometimes, I could not figure out about the theme of the seminar. … But, I think my level of English understanding is different from the level of graduate or Ph.D. students who studied in the United States. So, if I don't understand about half of
the content in English, I make comments based on the half that I had understood.

(#15)

Although the experiences as academics with professional knowledge and skills worked as a resource to assist the English communication of the participants, the language barrier, especially speaking and listening skills, seemed to be difficult to overcome in a short period of time.

As another factor that affected the level of challenge in English and academic communication, many participants reported that their English became better with the passage of time. The participants mostly faced the English language challenges in the beginning of their period as a visiting scholar. One visiting scholar, who started to engage in a new research topic during her visit, found that she gradually began to communicate and learn in English.

At first, after I just came to the lab, I did not know anything about the new field. So I worked hard since I was learning new things. After about three months, I had a presentation about my topic since the lab members took turns to do the presentation, and my turn just came about after three months. Since this was a new field for me, and I also have English problems, I received a lot of critical feedback, so I worked hard again. Then, after six months, I did not receive critical feedbacks, so… (#25)

In the case of this visiting scholar, since she was learning a new field, her existing knowledge and expertise were not directly helpful to overcome the English difficulty. Although she had to work hard especially at the beginning of her stay, she tried hard and then gradually experienced fewer challenges. As with this participant, the passage of
time in the United States often resulted in improving scholars’ English language abilities and to decrease the level of challenge.

**Cultural Differences**

Six visiting scholars stated challenges regarding cultural differences. This was especially the case for scholars who came for the first long-term visit in the United States. One of the common challenges in cultural issues was asking for help if they needed it. In most cases, once the scholars asked for help, support was likely to be offered, and the issues were resolved. However, if they did not ask for assistance, the support seemed to have never been offered automatically. This seemed to be different from the cultural expectation in Japan that help is automatically offered. Once the scholars figured the cultural norm in the United States, they no longer felt this to be a problem. One visiting scholar reported the general difference in service at stores.

As for the services at some stores, if you don’t tell, it is likely that the problems won’t be solved, but if you tell it, the problem seems to be addressed. So, when you face some problems, and if you are just waiting for someone to help you, nobody provides you support. But, if you tell about the issue to people, they will give you some service. So, this is different from Japanese culture. I feel like that.

(#10)

In Japan, available services are typically offered without requesting them. Therefore, the participants tended to accept what they were officially offered, and did not think that there was room to negotiate when they found some unsatisfactory situations.

The difference in cultural norms was also reported at the university setting. A few participants reported similar challenges in auditing courses at the host universities.
They did not receive clear information regarding the possibility of auditing classes during their visits. They eventually figured out how to audit classes by asking professors, other scholars, or staff. One scholar, who hoped to audit some courses, did not receive information about it from the university office. Instead, he asked other visiting scholars about the procedure, and contacted American professors to receive permission to audit classes.

The offices of American universities do not provide much support, such as giving information regarding auditing courses. Then, I asked some other international visiting scholars and figured that out. I think this is not only about the service for international visiting scholars, but it is probably American culture in general. Unless you ask questions or ask for help, they don’t tell you. I realized it after a while, and I think others might also face the same issue…. In summary, if you don’t do it by yourself, no one will tell you, so I asked how other scholars who audited courses, and since I am not a student who takes courses for credit, I did not have to register. So, I contacted professors directly and then went too observe their classes. Professors mostly accepted me to audit their courses. Sometimes, they even welcomed me to be in the course, which is good. (#24)

In order to participate in some of their expected opportunities to be in the United States, showing initiative and having a positive attitude seemed to be important. This is also discussed later in this chapter regarding opportunities for interaction. Beyond the process of auditing courses, another participant found some optional services after he negotiated for assistance.
Well, some optional things will not be given unless you ask for it. … If you know what you want to do clearly, someone will tell you where you should go and ask. When I had to set up the settings for my computer at the host university, at the office, I was asked to update or renew the security software, although I had software installed, but seemed to expire soon or something like that. Then, I had to delete all my existing security software, and they were able to install new security software, although this was a little complicated. Even when the host university has some services, unless I ask, they will not tell you that they would provide you with security software since this is an optional service. But once you ask for it, the service will be provided. (#2)

When the scholars experienced unmet expectations or needs about services, once the participants requested it, the issues seemed to be resolved. The lack of expectations in negotiating their needs at the host universities seemed to confuse some scholars who did not have experiences living in the U.S. previously.

As for cultural differences, it seemed to be helpful for scholars to have appropriate knowledge and expectations about American universities and culture. One visiting scholar, who formed expectations about being a visiting scholar from discussions with her colleagues before her visit, was able to assume that she had to actively seek information or request what she wanted to do during her visit.

In my case, I was able to look for information about what and where I can do things during visit by myself, but among my colleagues who came as visiting scholars, some of them say that they don't know what to do. So, for these people, some services might be needed from the department to support them, such as by
tutors or some assistant. So, I think that unless visiting scholars expect that they have to figure out what they do by themselves when they come to the United States, they will face difficulties. … So, it often happen that the host professor who invited them would not provide support, and the office also does not provide extra support, although visiting scholars expect that kind of assistance. So, it might be helpful to have an explanation about the services as visiting scholars at the beginning. Since I heard from my colleagues that I had to do everything by myself, I did not find the situation challenging. But, there seems to be other visiting scholars who expected to be invited to many opportunities, and they were just waiting for them, but they don't know what to do, so. The information regarding typical approaches for visiting scholars might be helpful for those people. (#4)

Especially for the first-timers, to have appropriate expectations regarding American culture and status as visiting scholars, such as the necessity of taking the initiative to seek information, services, and opportunities, seemed to be crucial in being successful in the host community in the United States. Former visiting scholars or American colleagues could be helpful potential sources to gain appropriate expectations.

In addition, having past academic experiences in the United States was an asset for scholars in responding to cultural difficulties. The participants with American academic experience seemed to have expectations that the support might not be offered unless they requested it. They also effectively envisioned how to utilize their time as visiting scholars at the host universities. One participant who received education at an
American university had the expectation that the host university would not provide hand-to-hand support for him.

Well, the host university is a very large university, so I thought the university would not take care individual scholars much, so I don't have any complaint at all. (#6)

Another participant, who received a graduate degree in the United States, also stated the issue of the necessity of negotiation. He also realized that his experience as a graduate student in the United States was helpful to expect the cultural difference during the current visit.

I think that Japanese professors tend to be reserved and non-aggressive. So, if they are told that they should not participate in the class, they will naturally obey without negotiating the actual possibility. Well, if you do not seek the opportunity actively to create your own route, you cannot break the rule. In the United States, the rules are made to be challenged, though this might be an exaggeration, but you have to initiate things. I feel like there are many other Japanese colleagues that they could not understand that kind of culture during their visits in the past. So, I think this might be challenging if they had not spent time in the United States as a student. (#7)

Having proper cultural expectations seemed be a key to navigate their academic life effectively at the host universities. These cultural understanding could be brought by hearing from someone who knew about the differences or scholars’ own past experiences at American society or universities.
Challenges, support, and other contextual and personal factors after scholars’ arrival to the host universities were discussed in this chapter. The participants often faced challenges in non-academic issues before they were able to engage in academic activities. In the next chapter, the sources of challenges and support in addition to other key factors while they were at the host universities are explored.
Chapter 9. Academic Issues at the Host University

This chapter focuses on the academic issues that were raised from visiting scholars during their experiences at the host university in the United States. This chapter discusses not only the sources of challenges and support, but also other contextual and personal factors that affected their transition experience at the host universities. As discussed in the last chapter, the themes right after their arrival were mainly centered on non-academic issues and issues related specifically to first-timers. Once scholars established their living arrangements in the United States, academic related issues were typically addressed. As for academic-related issues, the overall satisfaction of services and academic resources, the issue of cost, challenge in finding interaction opportunities, office arrangements, visiting scholar programs, and the issue of timing and period as visiting scholars are discussed in the following chapter.

Services and Academic Resources

While the participants reported some challenges in housing and setting up life in a new community, as well as English and cultural issues for some first-timers, they were mostly satisfied with the services and academic environment for visiting scholars at the host universities. Seventeen participants stated that they were positive about their services and statuses as visiting scholars in general. The services included both administrative assistance from the departmental and institutional offices, and academic resources available at libraries and online with the assistance from professional staff and librarians.

I did not have any particular inconvenience, and was able to focus on research in a great environment. If I were asked from the host university to give any feedback
on their service, I cannot think of anything to be improved. I think the host
university provided me everything I needed. I don't have any complaint. (#1)

As in this example, most of the visiting scholars found the research environment at the
host universities quite positive. The participants’ anticipation regarding their
opportunities to become visiting scholars, which was described in the last chapter, might
have also affected their view about the services and academic environment during their
visit satisfactory.

In addition to the general positive impressions about the services at the host
institutions, six scholars particularly commented on the administrative services such as at
the offices for international scholars and the programs at the host university were helpful.
One scholar who visited one of the institutions that routinely hosts many international
visiting scholars in the United States found the support by administrative staff and the
program coordinator satisfactory.

I am amazed by the host institution. Since they host many international visiting
scholars every year, their procedure for visiting scholars has been organized. The
staff at the office for international scholars understands the common issues and
challenges for international visiting scholars. As for the set up of life, the
coordinator of my visiting scholar program gave me information step by step what
I have to do and what I can do at the host university with a set format. So, I
thought that this is the strength of hosting many visiting scholar every year for
long time. (#2)
Although there seemed to be some institutional differences, the staff at the host universities, especially at universities which accept many international visiting scholars, was well-organized and systematic.

The participants also positively commented on the academic and research environment and facility at the host university. Among them, four scholars in non-STEM field reported that resources and services at libraries were satisfactory. Three of them were at the same host university, which was one of the prestigious institutions in the United States and hosts many international visiting scholar. One of them found that the services offered at university libraries were helpful.

The staff at the libraries can also buy some books for me if I request, and help me scan documents, and there is a helpful librarian who understands the Japanese language. … I can also use the database of the host university as much as I want. So, I can download journals. Then, I can borrow books as the same period with other faculty members until the end of semester, and I have a place to keep these books at one of the libraries. So, I am really satisfied with the service. (#3)

Another scholar who visited a different university also reported the positive support from a librarian to find potential materials for research.

The people at the host university are really supportive. … When I visited an archive of a library at the host university, I asked a librarian about resources for my research topic. Then, the librarian suggested some potential documents for my research in addition to the materials that I requested. So, it was good start. In addition, I felt that the use of online resources is more developed and helpful at universities in the United States. (#23)
The presence of professional librarians at the libraries seemed to be helpful for finding relevant materials for research, especially for the scholars in humanities and social sciences. As in these examples, the use of online technologies and experienced librarians were advantage at the libraries at the host universities. The participants generally satisfied with these academic services, although some scholars who came to the United States for the first long-term visit, might have experienced cultural challenge initially, as explained in the last chapter.

**Issue of Cost**

Another factor that seems to have affected the positive view on the academic resources and services was the issue of the cost to become visiting scholars. While some visiting scholars paid fees for the host universities to be admitted as visiting scholars, others did not have to pay for it. Since the initial interview questions did not include particular questions regarding the issue of costs, the exact amount of fees that they had to pay was beyond of the scope of this study. However, the fees to become visiting scholars varied by institutions, departments, and programs.

Four visiting scholars reported positively about the services and academic environment even though they did not have to pay a fee to become a visiting scholar, other than necessary expenses for visa processes.

As for the host university, basically, I am allowed to use libraries and other facilities as much as I want, so I was grateful for that. In particular, I have not paid to the host university for any fees. Then, I can have an ID and use library, so this is very helpful system. I thought that the host university was so generous.

…So, I thought there were fewer chances for interactions with other scholars, but
I don't think it was a big problem. I did not pay anything, and I am allowed to use this research environment, which is really helpful. (#10)

Another visiting scholar, who also did not pay for the extra fees, were grateful about his situation since there were more and more universities that required fees to be admitted as visiting scholars.

I think other visiting scholars seemed to be challenged, because there are more and more universities that require fees for visiting scholars in both the United Kingdom and the United States. At my host university, some schools and departments require fees to become visiting scholars, but my research center does not require it. I did not think that I could be able to a visiting scholar at this university without paying a fee, so it was really lucky. … Recently, universities often require fees or some mandatory contributions for visiting scholars. In fact, we are using the resources including manpower, so I don't know how this could be possible. … Well, this might be because they have a lot of monetary resources as a university. (#5)

Since these scholars did not have to pay for the fees to become a visiting scholar, unlike students who have to pay for tuition to receive service, they did not expect receiving substantial services from the host institution. This also affected their overall satisfaction of the availability of services as visiting scholars.

On the other hand, there were scholars who paid some fees to be admitted in a program for a visiting scholar. They typically received some extra support, such as information after their arrival and special events and requirements in the program during their visits through a part of visiting scholar programs. The scholars who joined those
programs tended to be satisfied with the services that they were able to receive, which is discussed later in this chapter as visiting scholar programs.

**Challenge in Interactions with Other Scholars**

While the participants mostly satisfied with their academic environment and support from the office and staff at the host university, opportunities to interact with other scholars and students have posed a challenge to some visiting scholars. Eleven participants indicated that they wished they had more interactions during this visit, or they hoped to have more interactions if they have another chance to visit. Among them, the scholars in social sciences and humanities who were not in a visiting scholar program tended to report this challenge. The typical research and publication style in these fields was often centered on the individualistic approach. One visiting scholar mentioned that the temporary presence at the university seemed to be challenging to be included in some research projects together in the community host university.

Well, visitors are outsiders, to some extent. We are considered as guests, completely. So, I don’t think it is bad, and I had expected it, but I think it is also interesting if I were able to be part of some projects at the host university. I was unsure if I should actively seek the opportunities to be involved in some projects or things at the host community. (#18)

As a visiting scholar, this participant hesitated to aggressively initiate or seek collaborative opportunities with scholars at the host community. As a consequence, the participant could not find those chances. In addition to the involvement in the host community, another visiting scholar reported a challenge in meeting and developing personal networks with other international visiting scholars during their visit.
I wanted to have more connections with other visiting scholars, since mostly I was independent, so there was no system to promote interactions with other scholars. Well, it might be no way to solve, since most of the visiting scholars who came to this research center are in humanities and social sciences, so their work tended to be independent, and individual, so, some just come to the library and home, so there were not many chances to meet. I did not have interactions with them.

(#14)

As discussed in the chapter six, the scholars in non-STEM fields seemed to spend time individually, and lacked the opportunities for interactions with other scholars during their visits. Without an arrangement to promote interactions, the scholars in these fields tended to be secluded themselves while they were at the host university. Given that the many visiting scholars intended to develop networks with American and international colleagues as presented in the chapter five, services and opportunities for networking might be provided more to support the needs of international visiting scholars.

Although a lack of the opportunities for scholarly interactions challenged some participants, several existing arrangements at the host community seemed to be helpful to respond to this issue of scholars. At some of the host universities, especially at prestigious institutions, seminars and symposiums with top scholars and practitioners were frequently offered, which was also discussed in the chapter six. Eight participants reported that they attended at these seminars. The interactions at seminars were found to be insightful and productive for some visiting scholars from Japan.

In Japan, researchers often work on their publication project individually in their office, while scholars in the United States have more opportunities to discuss their
research with other scholars at lunch meetings or seminars. These seminars are beneficial for improving their research, which is adding a strong advantage of the academic environment in the United States. Through the use of seminars and meetings, the opportunities for collaboration are greatly promoted in the United States. In Japan, academic conferences or research seminars are mostly considered as places to present the work that had been completed. So, it is limited to have feedback of others in the process of the research in Japanese case. I thought it could be improved in Japan as a research environment. (#1)

The seminars often provided food or drinks, which was also perceived as an important tool to encourage casual and candid academic discussions among scholars. Another visiting scholar also pointed out that the design of the campus was also considered to promote interactions with enough space for chatting with other scholars at tables and chairs, in addition to the interaction opportunities with other scholars at the seminars.

There are cafes and places to chat at many places in the buildings on campus. The number of scholars that I can talk about my research is so many, and I can receive their feedback really quickly, so I am really grateful for that, which is different from Japanese situation. (#4)

At American universities, especially at the top research institutions, seminars and other spaces on campus played a role as a place to promote interactions and discussions among scholars, which potentially beneficial to improve their research by receiving insights from other scholars.

As another system to promote interaction with visiting scholars at the host community, though it was dependent on the institutions that visiting scholars were hosted,
one of the host universities that accepted many international visiting scholars provided a graduate student to each visiting scholar as a supporter. Some of the participants found the service helpful in exchanging information and interacting with them.

There was a system at the home university to assign one graduate student to attend a visiting scholar. In my case, my graduate student also happened to attend the same seminar together, so we went to eat food after the seminar together. In my case, he was in the same seminar by chance, so I talked with him a lot, and he helped me a lot. I heard some other visiting scholars did not use the graduate student tutor as much, but in my case, his research topic was on Japan. So, we talked not only about his research topic, but also about Japan in general since he was also interested in knowing it. (#14)

Although not all the visiting scholars used the graduate student tutors, in some cases, while the visiting scholars could find opportunities of interactions with those graduate students, the student also potentially benefited from meeting visiting scholars, who shared a research interest.

As a factor to affect the opportunity for interaction, visiting scholars’ active attitude seemed to be helpful to be included in the host community. Fifteen scholars reported that they were open for new opportunities and actively involved in the community. One visiting scholar, who used to travel abroad, had cross-cultural communication skills that helped him to be adapt to the host environment.

I traveled abroad with a backpack when I was a student. So, I am used to talking with people in other countries, and I was easily adapted to the current environment as well. … The professor who hosted me in the United States said in
the beginning that his ability to talk and be involved in the community is perfect, although he need to be improved other aspects. (#26)

In addition to the international travel experiences and cross-cultural skills, past academic experiences at American universities also tended to be active. As discussed regarding cultural differences issue earlier in this chapter, the scholars with American academic background seemed to know the importance of being active at American university. Another participant, who had visited the United States as a visiting scholar previously, was intentionally active in creating opportunities to engage in the host community academically.

Well, it is important to be active. Since there is no obligation to anything at the host university, we have to initiate, for example, to plan some study group for undergraduates at the host university, to write academic articles or to host conferences with scholars at the host university, or to present some research findings at the host university. Otherwise, there will be nothing happening. So, I tried to be active, like I have been always. So, I will not be able to leave a remarkable achievement through the visit. (#13)

In addition, in order to actively use the time as a visiting scholar, another participant looked for information prior to her visit, and actively reached out to the people who she wanted to meet. She had also previous international academic experiences prior to the current visit.

So, I went to talk to some scholars who I wanted to meet for developing my network and receiving their perspectives on my research. I did this quite actively since I did not want to regret. After I came here, I contacted people who I wanted
to meet one by one. … I prepared as much as possible before the time as a visiting scholar, and after coming here, I did not wait until someone invites me, but I looked up information and participated events. If I go those events or seminars, I could see various people. I think it is the most important attitude. (#4)

Active attitudes seemed to be helpful to increase the opportunities for interaction with other scholars during their visit. The scholars who were able to actively seek opportunities were mostly ones who had academic experiences in the United States or other Western countries. The issue of interaction opportunities was somewhat relevant to the cultural challenge that discussed as a different theme. When visiting scholars were familiar with the idea that being active and open to seek opportunities was crucial during their visit at American universities, they seemed to be able to behave strategically to develop opportunities for interactions with less difficulty.

**Issues of Office Space**

As another aspect that affect the experiences of visiting scholars was the availability and arrangement of an office space. The office space was not only important for visiting scholars to engage in their research, and to be included in the community and to provide the opportunity to promote interactions with other scholars. Among the scholars in the social sciences and humanities fields, only three participants had individual office space at the host university. They were scholars who had American or Western academic experience previously, and had already somewhat recognized by their research achievement prior to their visits.

My host university provided me an office and two assistant staff. … My case is kind of an exception, and my status as a visiting scholar was different from
typical ones that apply by writing a letter. Rather, I had to go through the screening process from the faculty members at the host university with my international academic achievement on the international journals and conferences, and went through a formal procedure to be accepted as a faculty member. (#1)

Although it was not common, a few visiting scholars who had international recognition in their fields were able to have an individual office at the host university, and even the support of staff at the department.

Other than these scholars, participants in the social sciences and humanities were typically given a shared office with other scholars or did not have those spaces at all at the host university. These scholars, who did not have individual office at the host university, tended to spent time at libraries or at their home. One visiting scholar who had a shared office with other scholar commented that the space was not sufficient for doing her work.

Well, we have an office, but it is for all the visiting scholars and small. So, I can put some stuff or print something, but it is not a space that I can study in. Another visiting scholar who shared an office with other visiting scholars found a challenge in using the office since they had to compete the limited desk space with other scholars.

There are about four desks in the office, and we had more scholars than the desks. For example, there are about ten visiting scholars who were going to share these four desks. So, I cannot leave my stuff or a computer at the desk. So, I have to come early morning to secure the place, but I rather go to a different place. (#4)
For most of the scholars in the social sciences and humanities, the lack of space caused a challenge for them to find place to engage in research at the host university. The lack of office also considered as a challenge to be included in the community and potentially reduced the chances to communicate with colleagues at the host university.

By contrast, the scholars in STEM fields typically participated in a lab or a shared office space with other scholars. As discussed in the chapter six, the scholars in STEM fields tended to have frequent interactions with other scholars at the labs, compared to those in non-STEM fields. Although the labs seemed to work as a resource for the scholars to be part of the host community, they still found a challenge in meeting scholars outside their own labs. One visiting scholar reported a lack of opportunities to interact with scholars in other labs at the host university.

Since the host university is very de-centralized as an organization, each professor is very independent, and they do not interact with each other much, which was surprising to me after I came here. I don't have any interactions with the scholars in the labs next door, although I have interactions with other professors who are in the teaching team for a course. … So, the department also recognizes the lack of interaction across labs as a problem, and hosts a lunch for faculty members once a week from about two years ago. I attended the lunch in the fall semester, but the members who come to this meeting were limited and the same. (#16)

Other than hosting a meeting, in order to respond to the issue of interactions across labs, the arrangement of the shared office was designed to promote across-lab exchanges at the same university. One visiting scholar was assigned to use an office with other American
postdocs who are in different labs at the host university, which was helpful to know other scholars in the host community.

We don’t have an individual office. We share an office with other scholars and postdocs, though they are not in the same lab. … So, this is unique to this university, but try to promote the interactions across fields, scholars in different fields share the office. (#17)

In order to increase the interaction among scholars in other labs, sharing an office with other scholars in the community was employed at the host community, which was also helpful for visiting scholars to be included in the host community by knowing other researchers in different labs.

Even though some participants reported challenges in the interactions with scholars in other labs at American universities, one participant found that it was easier for him to go into other labs at the host university, compared to the situation in Japan.

I found that it was easier to borrow research equipment at the next lab at the host university, which I found beneficial for research environment. I think the boundary between the different labs were loose in the United States. In Japan, it is more like a vertical society, where we don’t know what the next lab is doing, and difficult to go to the different lab, but I liked the American way that was less like that. (#20)

The interactions with other scholars in different labs seemed to be beneficial for promoting collaboration and innovation. Despite some reported challenges in interacting with scholars outside their own labs, the research environment for collaboration with
scholars across different labs seemed to be more encouraged in the United States than in Japan.

**Visiting Scholar Programs**

Even though the participants in the social sciences and humanities tended to spend time by themselves, the scholars who had joined visiting scholar programs found more of those opportunities to interact with other scholars. As written in the chapter seven, these programs were helpful when scholars to find a host university especially when they did not have any existing connections with American scholars. The programs seemed to be also helpful in promoting interactions with other scholars. One visiting scholar commented that he found it helpful to join events in the visiting scholar program to know other visiting scholars, especially from different countries.

I think the program for international visiting scholar was very helpful. They provided support, and hosted many events and seminars for visiting scholars. Also, it allowed interactions with visiting scholars from other countries. (#24)

Another participant who participated in a different program found that it was helpful to join the program because they arrange some meetings, seminars, and also introduces some graduate students who might share their interests.

Well, I often hear that visiting scholars have to make the connections after they visited. Of course, it is required, but I heard the cases that in some cases, they stop coming to the university without seeing or interacting with others, and I did not want to be like that, so after I came here, since I was part of the visiting scholar program, I have to attend at least one event, so, there are something that I have to do, so, it makes easier for me to meet others. … For example, they
introduce some graduate students if they have share some interests as much as possible. (#9)

Although different programs offered different opportunities, these programs commonly provided events or seminars for the fellows of the programs frequently. If there was no visiting scholar program, they have to find their networks, opportunities, and seminars by themselves. These visiting scholar programs seemed to be especially helpful for those who came to the United States for the first research leave, and those who did not have particular connections with other colleagues in the United States.

While the scholars who joined visiting scholar programs tended to be positive about their statuses, they could be frustrated about the statuses and services because they paid fees to become visiting scholars. One scholar who paid for a fee to become a visiting scholar slightly complained about the service, although he generally found positive research environment at the host university. He was disappointed about the discontinuation of the relationship with and service at the host university once the period is finished.

In my case, I have a bio on the website of the program of the host university. …

The fellows of this program are required to attend seminars and do some requirements. … But, once I finish the period as a visiting scholar, although my program said that I would be allowed to go into the libraries at the host university and do research, but other past fellows were told at the library that there was no policy like that since you were visiting scholar, once the term is over, your are not allowed to use the service any more. But, I think I am different from other visiting scholars who just came here to do their own research. My perspective is
that I had paid for the fees and had an official relationship with the host university as an associate fellow. But, I don't know how the host university views us. It is unclear or flexible. So, I hope the host university to commit to me fully…. Even after I finished my term as a visiting scholar, I want them to view me as a previous stuff or an alumnus and allow me to continue using some resources even with some limitation, rather than a guest. (#2)

While the participants mostly satisfied with their services and academic environment during their visit, their perspective on the available services and the status could be more demanding and critical since they had paid fees.

**Issues of Timing and Scheduling**

As another challenge for some visiting scholars, the timing and period as a visiting scholar came up as an issue. The period of visiting scholars and their timing to come to the United States varied by individuals, although all of them stayed in the United States temporary and relatively short time. Seven visiting scholars reported the challenge regarding the timing and period. In Japan, the new academic year starts April and October, which does not match American academic calendar. Several participants took their research leave from the end of March or September, because it was the timing for them to easily leave. If they arrive in the United States in April or October, they found that it is middle of semester and sometimes challenging for the smooth transition. For example, one professor missed the timing to join orientation on campus.

I think the timing that I came was not good. It was already October, so all the orientations finished already. So, I did not know anything. I did not know if I could use library, and I asked to the librarians and figured out by myself, which
was an issue. However, this is not a problem of the host university, but the home university, which did not allow me to leave at other timing. (#6)

Another scholar, who came to the United States in April, faced challenge in auditing classes because it was already middle of the semester.

After I came here, since I came according to Japanese academic calendar, I could not take any courses because it’s already April. Then, once it became May, it was exam week, so I had no class to audit at that time, other than some seminars. So, I basically worked on a few publication projects, which I brought from Japan during the period. … I told this situation to my home department to be improved, and it will be changed in a few years, and the scholars could depart in September.

I also suggested to my home department to extend the period from one year to two years. … If you take a leave for two years at once, you have to wait for fourteen years to have another opportunity to take a leave, though. (#3)

She reported that the home university would accommodate the suggestion in the near future to make the use of the research leave policy more meaningful.

While these scholars preferred to visit the United States when the new semester starts in the United States, one professor came with his child intentionally left the school with Japanese academic calendar.

At first I thought to come to the United States from September, but I thought about my child’s schooling in Japan, and return to Japan by April was better for it. So, this was not efficient for me, but thought about the balance, and decided to come in the end of March. (#7)
Although most of the visiting scholars found it challenging to come to the United States with the Japanese academic calendar, as an exception, visiting scholars with children might prefer to be aligning with the Japanese academic calendar because of their children’s schooling issue. While some Japanese universities seemed to allow some flexibility in the timing when the scholars could take a leave, others only allowed the timing that was convenient for their institution.

As discussed above, this chapter explored the challenge, support, and other factors that influenced the academic-related experience at the host university. In the next chapter, the expected challenges and issues upon their return to the home university in Japan are explored.
Chapter 10. Expected Challenges after Returning Home

This chapter presents themes regarding the expected challenges and other factors that influence the participants’ transition upon their return to their home institution. It is important to note that since all but three participants were still in the United States at the time of the interviews, the challenges and concerns after their return presented in this chapter are expectations, rather than the actual ones.

In addition, a limitation concerning the expected challenges and issues after their return was the variation of the time period until their actual return to Japan. Some participants sat for interviews early in their sojourn in the United States, which might make it difficult for them to clearly imagine the potential challenges upon their return. By contrast, there were three participants who already finished the visiting periods and went back to their home institutions at the time of interview, although they had not spent time more than a month after their return.

In this chapter, six themes regarding the expected challenges are discussed: a lack of time and resources at the home universities, a lack of atmosphere for promoting research at the home universities, an introduction of American practices at the institutional level, an introduction of American teaching approaches at the individual level, a challenge in the improvement of international visiting scholars policies, and teaching courses in English at the home university.

A Lack of Time and Resources for Research

Seven visiting scholars reported the lack of time and resources for research at their home universities as an expected challenge upon their return. As described in chapter six and chapter eight, these scholars looked forward to the opportunity to become
visiting scholars because they were able to use their time for research and professional
development in the United States. Therefore, after their period as visiting scholars
finished, they planned to the same busy schedule at Japanese universities as they had
before. One visiting scholar commented on the challenge regarding the limitation of time
for engaging in research after his return.

    I think a challenge will be the time constraint. Even if I were able to develop
    some collaborative research projects with professors at the American universities,
    the limitation of time would become an issue. The pace of my research progress
    will become very slow once I go back to Japan. This challenge is expected, or a
    even certainty for me. (#17)

As described in the previous chapters, the participants’ time tended to be taken up by
non-research tasks at Japanese universities. Their return to their home universities would
also result in reducing time for them to be able to engage in research. In addition to time
limitations, once they leave the host university, losing access to the materials and human
resources that were accessible at the host universities was also reported as a predicted
challenge for their research progress.

    Well, at the host university, the facilities, such as the library resources, are very
    satisfactory, and it is impossible to request the same level in Japan. So, here, you
    can download any academic articles online easily, and the place to stock those
    articles is also sufficiently organized. If I try to continue using this kind of
    resources and services in Japan, I have to pay the cost by myself, so this will be a
    challenge. (#8)
Another visiting scholar also commented on the lack of physical presence as a challenge in accessing resources and connecting with scholars at the host university, though she would be able to contact American scholars whom she knew from the current visit more easily than before.

So, the challenge will be, I cannot meet other famous scholars around here whenever I want to meet. Well, in addition, the database of the library at the host university has been very useful, but I will not be able to access it after my period as a visiting scholar finishes, so without the ID of the host university, I cannot access these resources. … Although I cannot meet these people easily, and I cannot make presentations about my research at the host university once I go back to Japan, since I have been meeting many scholars frequently here, I think can contact them through email easily now. If the emails are from someone who they don't know, they might not respond, but I think they will respond to me since we know each other well. So, I will send my paper drafts to them asking for feedback, although it would take a longer time than actually seeing them since it is through email. (#5)

Once the period as visiting scholar finished, participants would lose access to the resources that were available at the host university. As for the human contacts, if the scholars were able to develop solid networks with American colleagues during their visits, they might be able to continue utilizing the connections even after they returned to their home university.

In addition to the lack of easy access to the resources at the host university, the scarcity of human and financial resources at the home institution was also predicted to be
challenging by several visiting scholars. Although a few scholars who found seminars and meetings helpful in advancing their research and promoting scholarly interactions at the host community in the United States, when they considered increasing those opportunities at their home institutions, limitations of personal and monetary resources would be an obstacle.

In addition to the lack of financial resources, if we plan a lunch meeting in Japan, professors have to plan and prepare for it. In the United States, students and staff would do everything, and professors would just provide confirmation. … The advantage of the American way is that if students plan the events, it is helpful for faculty members to know the needs of students well by knowing who they want to invite to the seminars or meetings. … But, in Japan, if we try to bring the student-led approach, it is difficult due to the current Japanese system. (#1)

In addition to the limitation of physical resources, the differences in the university practices regarding opportunities for student involvement in event- and program-planning in Japan seemed to be a challenge to introduce these opportunities at Japanese universities. Another visiting scholar, who had been hosting seminars in several different fields at his home institution in Japan prior to his visit, hoped to have more institutional support to offer these opportunities.

I have been hosting a seminar with professors in the fields of policy issues, such as sociology, political sciences, and economics voluntarily at my home university, without any relevance to official university organization. I felt the importance of these interdisciplinary seminars more and more after my current visit to the host
university. Although I hope my home university officially supports this with some financial and human resources, there has been no support at all. (#15)

Although some visiting scholars found positive practices for scholarly exchange at the university community, when they considered bringing them back to the home country, the lack of time and resources at their home universities was often expected to be a problem. Since this issue would require an institutional commitment to respond, the individual scholars did not expect the situation would change easily.

A Lack of Atmosphere for Promoting Research

Some participants expected a challenge in a lack of academic culture and institutional atmosphere to support research activities at their home universities. At the host universities in the United States, which were mostly large research universities, many professors mainly spent time on research. By contrast, at universities in Japan, research was not always considered to be the central activity for faculty members. One visiting scholar in the medical field reported a challenge in having support on research activities from his colleagues at his home university.

At my host institution, everyone spends time on research from morning to night. Research is the first priority, and that’s it. So, for them, their work is to do research, so they are making all the effort for research. But, if I go back to my home university, there is no one who makes all the effort for research. In Japan, especially at private institutions, the scholars, who also conduct clinical work as physicians, tend to undervalue the research activities. I can understand their mindset. So, the importance of research has to be understood by these people first. We need to change their perspectives. (#21)
At some universities in Japan, especially at non-research focused institutions, research activities tended to be one of the many tasks of faculty members. The lack of supportive atmosphere for promoting research would be a challenge for visiting scholars who hoped to continue engaging in research activities at their home universities, in addition to the limitation of time and resources.

Another positive aspect of American academic culture that was missing at Japanese universities was an organic system to promote scholarly interactions to give feedback on research and improve their research. These interactions often took place at seminars and meetings, and even during casual chats with colleagues at the host universities. One visiting scholar commented that the lack of this academic culture at his home university was expected as a challenge and disadvantage for the improvement of research articles.

In the United States, once we write an academic paper, we show the paper to colleagues to receive critical comments for improvement. Then, based on the feedback, we gain some new insights to further revise the paper. Through this process, after a few years later, we submit to a refereed journal. Although the process before submitting journal is important, in Japan, it is totally missing. Even at the research center at my home university, where many faculty members received academic degrees in the United States or Western countries, they will not give me critical and insightful comments for improving my paper. They will just give me a simple comment like “this is a very unique view like you.” I am not asking that kind of useless feedback. (#19)
As in this example, although receiving comments on a draft of research paper was a crucial step for enhancing the quality of research work, the process was not the norm at Japanese universities. The lack of the mechanism to improve research through peer feedback was a challenge in the Japanese cultural and academic practices.

**A Limitation in Influencing on Institutional Changes**

Although some participants found some practices at the host institution beneficial, they indicated a challenge in introducing those practices at their home universities. In addition to the lack of resources and academic culture that was discussed above, ten participants predicted a limitation of individual scholars’ influence on their home institutions. One visiting scholar expected that her home institution would not expect to receive suggestions from visiting scholars because it was not the purpose of sending visiting scholars.

So, I am not expected to give suggestions for my home institution. I hope to be able to suggest something meaningful, but this is not the purpose of my visit as a visiting scholar, although some other scholars might suggest something in order to improve their own environment. … Of course, I would like to contribute to improving my home university, but in reality, since it is a large university, an individual faculty member does not have any impact at all. It is not easy to change the organization since it all depends who is going to be the president or provost, or the history of each department and politics behind the different departments. It is also difficult to change the curriculum. Once I become senior faculty member, and if I am involved in institutional decision-making, I might be
able to do something, but it also depends on the student population, though I am going to keep it in my mind. (#3)

The power of individual scholars on institutional decisions seemed to be limited, especially when they were in the early to mid-career and those who were not necessarily assigned institutional missions to their visit. Another visiting scholar also reported a challenge in making a difference at his home institution because of the inflexible regulation of the Japanese government.

I don't think I will be able to influence something at the institutional level. So, what I can do is that I will continue expressing my opinion regarding the importance of securing time for research for professors at my personal level, but I don't think the situation is going to change easily. Moreover, if Japanese universities want to change, the Japanese government needs to change. So, it is going to be very large scale, and what I can do is limited. After I came to the United States, I reflected on some problems in the Japanese higher education, and I felt a sense of crisis. Not only do Japanese universities not have enough money, but also there are many professors who work in a very demanding environment.

But, I am not hopeful that the situation will change in the future. (#6)

By observing the positive academic environment at leading research institutions in the United States, visiting scholars often gained some insights for better practices. However, in order to introduce changes in Japanese higher education, it would inevitably include decisions at the institutional and the governmental level, which exceeded the level that individual scholars could make an impact on easily.
By contrast, regarding the issue of institutional change, two visiting scholars reported that their institutions might be able to listen to the scholars’ insights and suggestions based on their observations of American higher education. At these institutions, the leaders were motivated to initiate institutional reform and ideas from American universities seemed to be appreciated in order to inform their change.

It is not easily done, but my home university is now under the reformation of the curriculum. In addition, the president recently changed. With this new leadership, the home university now has an atmosphere where they would be ready for an institutional reform including the drastic curriculum change. So if I will be able to make important and useful suggestions, the university would be able to change for the better. (#16)

The availability of institutional leaders who would welcome ideas for institutional reform seemed to be a key for individual scholars to be able to contribute to the potential improvement of the institutions. Another visiting scholar also reported the institutional leaders’ support had been helpful for him to work for institutional relations during his visit.

The current provost for international affairs of my home university received a Ph.D. from an American university. … So, he provides a supportive environment for professors to engage in international related affairs and exchanges. … So, the current institutional situation is not challenging. … I have been working for the former provost for international affairs, and I have been close to him. … While I was working with him, I was involved in institutional affairs on
internationalization and governmental initiatives. So, I had chances to think about these issues more than other professors at my home university. (#13)

In addition to a enhanced atmosphere for the institutional change, access to the leadership team of the university seemed to be key for individual visiting scholars to inform the institutional decision for reform, based on their insights from American universities. Although it seemed to be limited to a few institutions, the availability of support from institutional leaders at the home university seemed to be a factor to reduce the challenge on providing suggestions at the institutional level.

**Expected Resistance from Colleagues in Introducing Changes**

In addition, in bringing back some American academic practices, the relationships with and involvement of other colleagues at home university seemed to be issues. In addition to some academic practices which were systematically embedded in the culture and institution, it would be challenging to work with colleagues who used to work with their traditional Japanese style and would resist introducing some changes. Therefore, some suggestions would be not only meaningless, but also potentially damage the relationship with other colleagues at scholars’ home institutions. In responding to this issue, one visiting scholar refused to suggest any changes.

In Japan, we cannot set a seminar on weekdays, and we usually host seminars on Saturdays or Sundays since there is an atmosphere that research should be done on weekends. Then, we don't have time to take a break on weekends. But, if I were to introduce a practice from the United States, such as setting up seminars on weekdays, my colleagues would not want to hear that because it is not realistic. I might be too cautious about the relationship with other colleagues, but I cannot
introduce any changes from the observation of the American situation because this is a systematic problem. (#14)

As in this example, one potential strategy was to remain silent if American practices seemed not to be easily realizable at Japanese universities. Another participant indicated a strategy to communicate some potential insights from American university at the grass root level to receive understanding from colleagues one by one. Then, he would gradually create an atmosphere where everyone will not object.

It is very difficult to develop an atmosphere where everyone does not complain. If you hurry, then the resistance from other colleagues would be great, and it becomes impossible to make changes. So, if it is really important and necessary, you should do it slowly. … It is not a good approach to just say the right thing at a faculty meeting. You have to negotiate personally first to receive agreement one by one. I think this decision-making system will not change. But, by using the traditional decision making system, I would like to improve the home university gradually. (#5)

Although visiting scholars often observed some American academic practices that might be helpful in improving the practices at the home institution, to make an effective suggestion to their home universities seemed to be not easy because of the existing academic tradition and context at the host universities in Japan. Not only were the issues related to institutional reform typically outside of their main task of visiting scholars, but also the systematic and cultural context of Japan and the United States made it difficult to introduce those changes by individual scholars.
Using American Teaching Approaches

While some visiting scholars expected challenges in making suggestions at the institutional level based on their insights from American universities, many visiting scholars reported their intention to introduce some teaching practices that they found beneficial for students at their home institution at the individual level. In introducing American approaches in teaching Japanese university students, eleven participants reported an expected challenge in the attitudes of students. In the United States, it was often the case that class discussion was actively promoted, while in Japan, lectures and passive learning are more traditional. One visiting scholar reported the difference in the learning style even before the students entered universities.

To change students’ perspective for learning is very difficult because they were not trained to express their opinions for the entrance examination. … So, it is difficult to demand them to express their opinion or to discuss suddenly at the university. I have been trying to do, but it has been difficult. So, by considering the Japanese context, how to take the good practices of American university education will be the challenge. … The issue starts from junior high school and high school, so this is an issue in society, not just at universities. (#24)

An introduction of discussion might be challenging for students because expressing their opinions had not been trained at university, nor also at primary and secondary education in Japan. Another visiting scholar, who intended to introduce a case method at her own medical university, also expected a challenge in assigning readings before classes since it was different from the traditional learning style at Japanese universities.
Presentation of cases will be an effective instruction approach to learn deeply and concretely through the stories of the cases. So, regardless of the country, it is one of the best ways for learning, but if I try to introduce the case method, I have to think how many readings I would assign to students, and how I should promote discussion in the class. The reading assignments and discussion are not common for medical students, so it would be a challenge. Students usually just come to the class and learn there, and review the content later. Reading assignments have been introduced to some classes, but not in all classes. Students know about it, but they are not used to it yet. (#11)

Although some visiting scholars found teaching approaches such as assigning readings and discussing them in the classroom at American universities to be effective, since it had not been common at the home universities, the scholars expected a challenge in introducing these practices in Japan.

In addition, some visiting scholars observed a difference in students’ seriousness in learning between the host and home universities. Visiting scholars who taught in Japanese universities found that student attitudes toward learning were more serious at the host universities in the United States. Although the difference in the institutional level between the host and home universities might have made a difference in student attitudes, motivating and engaging students in learning was an issue for Japanese universities in general.

Of course, there is a difference in the level of students between the host and the home universities, and I cannot compare these two institutions. But, in general, students at American universities, not only at the host institution, study hard, or I
would say, the system of higher education requires American students to work hard in order to graduate. So, it will not work if we just require the same thing for the Japanese students, so I have to think how to do it gradually. I am thinking how to do it, and the appropriate approach, currently. (#14)

The difference in student attitudes was an expected challenge in introducing American educational approaches to Japanese universities. In addition, one scholar, who had introduced a rigorous course as in the United States at his home university based on his previous US academic experiences, had experienced a dropping number of students in his class.

I wonder how to make the students to learn as seriously as the students in the host university. I would like to learn how to do that, and I would like to do it at my home university. But, the problem is that students can drop out from the challenging courses and move to easier ones. Many students registered for my course at first, but once the students knew that it was not an easy course, the number of students gradually decreased. ...So, this cannot be done just by myself, but all the professors have to move to the same direction together. (#7)

Scholars considered the lack of motivation for learning a challenge at Japanese universities. In order to respond to this challenge, individual scholars’ effort seemed not to be enough. A systematic approach would be necessary to recreate Japanese universities as a place to promote student learning.

**Lack of Resources for Teaching**

Another expected challenge upon returning to the home institutions was the lack of incentives and resources for teaching at Japanese universities. Seven participants
brought up this issue. One of the teaching practices that a visiting scholar found positive at American institutions was allowing students to set their own goals in the class, and faculty members’ responses to the needs of each student accordingly. This approach seemed to be difficult at Japanese universities due to the limitation in resources.

In Japan, we educate students to reach the same level at the end, while in the United States, …individual students set their own goal, and then they aim to achieve their own goals. Therefore, the content they offer in the class are full of variety. … This can be possible because there are enough professors and staff. It is difficult to do it in Japan with just one professor. (#16)

The lack of resources at the home universities in Japan not only limited research related activities, but also limited the introduction of effective and flexible teaching approaches that were practices at American universities.

In addition, another expected challenge regarding teaching practice was the introduction of the use of teaching assistants in classes. Although a few visiting scholars found the use of teaching assistant beneficial in creating a better teaching environment at American universities, the use of teaching assistants had not been a traditional approach at Japanese universities, and the lack of graduate students who could be teaching assistants seemed to be a challenge at Japanese universities. One visiting scholar who observed the effective use of teaching assistants at the host university and predicted a challenge because of the lack of both graduate students and monetary resources in his situation.

At American universities, in large classes, teaching assistants lead small group discussions in the classes by dividing the students into some groups, in addition to
giving lectures to students. I think this system is effective. I think Japanese universities should use the approach, but it seemed difficult to actually do it by considering my own situation. I might be able to do it in a small class, but I don't have a graduate student, and it is difficult to find students who will be able to be qualified for the work as teaching assistants, so, once I am in a position where I could have graduate students, I would like to think about doing it. (#14)

Although another visiting scholar found it helpful to have graduate students work as teaching assistants at American universities, the resources at her home institution did not allow the use of teaching assistants.

If I had a graduate teaching fellow, I would divide my class into two groups, and the assistant and I would lead the discussion of the each group. At my home university, there are few graduate students, and the level of the students is not high. So, it is difficult. (#23)

The use of graduate students for teaching assistants was common at American universities. It would be helpful not only to enrich the leaning for students, but also potentially be beneficial to improve the teaching skills among graduate students by working as teaching assistants. However, in introducing this practice at Japanese universities, the lack of potential graduate students who could work as teaching assistants, in addition to the system to finance these students, was expected as a systematic challenge.

**Current International Visiting Scholar Policies at Japanese Universities**

From their own experiences as visiting scholars, six participants reported the lack of sufficient support in accepting international visiting scholars at their home institution
as a potential challenge. This would be an obstacle when they would like to invite international visiting scholars to their home universities. These scholars often compared the services and support for visiting scholars at the host and home universities through their actual experiences as visiting scholars.

Although our home institution accepts some visiting scholars from abroad, I felt that the support services for them are not sufficient at all. So, at least, I would like to help them personally if I host a scholar even though my home university might not able to offer support institutionally. I hope that more and more visiting scholars would come to my home university. (#5)

The system for accepting international visiting scholars seemed not to be well organized at Japanese universities. Another visiting scholar pointed out that, due to the lack of institutional support in the process of accepting the scholar at his home university, the professors who hosted visiting scholars needed to make sure the logistical arrangements by themselves.

For example, if one professor comes to my home university as a visiting scholar, then if I am the host professor, I have to go to the immigration office to process it. … So, professors have to go to the immigration office with all the documents, which should be managed institutional office. (#13)

At some institutions, the absence of an office to handle the issues for international visiting scholars would impose a burden for the hosting professors. Another visiting scholar mentioned his past experience that he had to find an apartment for inviting an international visiting scholar due to the lack of institutional support service.
I have accepted two international visiting scholars at my home university, but as an institution, the support is not organized well. This becomes all the responsibility of the hosting faculty member. I had to find an apartment for the visiting scholar, since the office did not help, so I hope to host international visiting scholars without handling these administrative arrangements like at the host university in the United States. For example, the host university has a homepage to post the housing information, so at least you can refer to the service. (#15)

The lack of institutional systems in accepting international visiting scholars was an expected challenge at scholars’ home institutions in promoting the international exchange of visiting scholars. As discussed in the previous chapter, since their experiences as visiting scholars and the institutional support at the host universities was mostly sufficient, these scholars had increased their awareness about the necessity of improving the system to systematically host international visiting scholars at their home universities.

Four participants reported a lack of institutional strategic perspective on the policy of sending visiting scholars from home universities as another issue. Although they thought it might be possible to add some institutional purposes for visiting scholars, they predicted resistance from colleagues in actually introducing the change, in addition to scholars’ limited influence on institutional decisions, as discussed above. One visiting scholar, who came up with an idea of assigning visiting scholars to audit courses to observe and experience the practices at American universities, predicted the potential resistance.
I think visiting scholars should take at least one course while they are abroad, though I don't say they have to earn credits. I think professors would criticize this idea since this will restrict their time, but if we don't assign some institutional missions, we cannot pursue the benefit of sending visiting scholars at the institutional level. So, if they are assigned to take one course, they would be able to know many things about American universities from the educational practices. (#7)

Since the current visiting scholar policies were mainly for individual and research purposes, there is a lack of a systematic approach to utilize their experience at the institutional level. However, the current policy arrangement with a focus on individual scholars might be more favorable for visiting scholars who want to make progress in their own research activities. Another professor also reported his opinion about the use of visiting scholars for institutional purposes.

If visiting scholars have a perspective that they are holding the sign of their home institution, they might consider the benefit to their home institution by their observation at the host institution, though many scholars would not be happy to have institutional work during their visits. But, if you are receiving salary from the home institution, and if you have a Japanese cultural notion that your institution supported your visit financially, then, you might think about your potential influence at the institutional level more. … This might also help others understand the use of visiting scholars internally. (#17)

Through the physical presence at American universities, visiting scholars could be a potential resource to gain ideas for improving their home universities, especially at
universities where the use of research leave was not promoted. However, this might be unwelcomed by individual scholars who mainly would like to engage in their own research during their visits.

**Teaching in English at the Home Universities**

At several Japanese universities the use of English as a means of instruction was implemented recently as a part of governmental initiatives. Four participants planned to teach some of their courses at the home university in English after their return. This was expected to be a challenge, especially for the scholars who were not comfortable in the use of English. Since the faculty members that could teach in English seemed to be limited in Japan, these scholars with recent visits to the United States were considered to be resources to conduct classes in English at the home universities. One participant reported her concern regarding conducting classes in English right after she came back to her home university.

One of the challenges is the course that I had to teach in English after I go back to the home university. I cannot speak English fluently yet, so I think I will sometimes need to stop. … If I prepare a draft for the class, I think it will be still difficult for students, so I have to think about that. At some seminars at the host university, there were presenters who basically read the draft, but I thought it was difficult to listen to. If they had presentation slides or some handouts, it would help me understand, but… (#9)

Teaching in English after their return could be a burden for visiting scholars who had not taught in English previously. On the other hand, another visiting scholar, who was also
assigned to teach a seminar course in English, seemed to be less concerned about the
decision because of his and his colleagues’ previous international academic experiences.

This year, the number of courses taught in English increased enormously. So, it
was one of the strategies to improve the university rank in the world university
rankings. So, I am going to teach in English, though I recognize some challenges.
Because of the lack of professors who could teach in English, the burden would
be concentrated on a few professors who could actually do that. But, in my
department, the professors in the international policy or Western political
thoughts often received their Ph.D. degrees in Western countries. So, for these
people, offering courses in English would not be a problem. There was no
complaint regarding the introduction of teaching courses in English among my
colleagues. (#13)

Having had past academic experiences in the English speaking countries seemed to work
as a resource for offering courses in English, though a lack of instructors who were fluent
in English would potentially increase the workload of a limited number of professors who
could teach in English in Japan. Another visiting scholar, who was able to speak English
fluently, was assigned to teach courses in English at the home university during his visit
without being asked permission.

While I am here in the United States, my host university started to develop a new
program in English. This was a new program for international students. Then,
the department nominated me as one of the professors without asking my
approval. This extra work will not be reflected in my salary at all. … This was a
little bit frustrating that they did not ask my consensus during my sabbatical. (#6)
The pressure to teach university courses in English because of the governmental initiative seemed to concentrate the work on a limited number of professors, especially due to the lack of professors who could teach in English in Japan.

Another visiting scholar, who was not going to teach in English, viewed the governmental initiative to teach some university courses in English critically.

Recently, some Japanese universities started to teach some courses English. But, I think it is nonsense that Japanese professors should teach Japanese students in English, and that university administrators should master English. I think this policy has many problems. If students cannot discuss even in Japanese, how come we could let them speak and discuss in English. Rather, I think it is better to practice discussion in Japanese. (#24)

In addition to the potential challenge for professors who had to teach university courses in English, the implementation of the recent Japanese governmental initiative was questioned. Although the scholars were typically skeptical about the initiative to offer courses in English, the scholars with English ability often had to be involved in these projects at their home universities upon their return.

In chapters five through ten, the challenges, support, and other personal and contextual factors that affected scholars’ transitions were explored. In the next chapter, conclusions and implications are discussed.
Chapter 11: Analysis of Findings

This chapter presents an analysis of the findings to the research questions. The research questions were: (1) why Japanese visiting scholars visited universities in the United States, (2) what are their academic, social, and personal experiences during their visiting periods, (3) what are the sources of challenges and support for Japanese visiting scholars, (4) how do Japanese visiting scholars perceive that personal and contextual factors affect their transition in different periods of their transition? The key findings regarding these four questions were presented in chapters five to ten.

The purpose of this chapter is to revisit the findings presented in the previous chapters in order to present an analysis by referring to other studies. There are two parts in this chapter. In the first part of this chapter, a discussion of the insights from the existing literature is provided on the first three questions: the purposes of visits, the activities during the visits, challenges, and support. Then, the second part of this chapter discusses research question four through the lens of Schlossberg’s transition model to examine the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars. This latter section describes the presented findings by using Schlossberg’s concepts of three stages of transition (moving in, moving through, and moving out) and four S’s (situation, self, support, and strategy) as the resources of transition to better understand their experiences.

Purposes of Visits

In the first part of this chapter, the first research question, which addresses the Japanese visiting scholars’ purposes of their visits, is discussed. As presented in chapter five, the seven themes emerged as their purposes: engagement in research and publication, development of networks, experiences of international academic and social life,
improvement of English language abilities, teaching and observing courses, international experiences for family members, engagement in institutional relations, and the location of their visits related to their purposes. The visiting scholars intended to engage in these activities by using the time available during their visits.

In the findings of existing studies, English language learning was also reported by Zhao (2008) as one of the purposes for the visits of Chinese visiting scholars, and push and pull factors for student mobility (de Wit, 2008). In the findings reported in the current study, the first-timers in particular reported issues regarding the English language, compared to others who had previously visited the United States. As Altbach and colleagues (2010) discuss, the use of English seems to be a necessity for academic professions, as a mode of scientific communication. The temporary visits as visiting scholars were considered a way for Japanese scholars to improve their English language skills. Through their visits, many visiting scholars reported improvement in their English language skills, although they still perceived their need for improvement.

Other motivations for scholars to visit the United States have been addressed in previous studies. Though Altbach (2004) pointed out that access to an advanced facility is a pull factor to western countries for scholars, it was not mentioned by the Japanese visiting scholars as the reasons for their visits, especially among the scholars in STEM fields. Since push and pull factors have primarily been used to explain mobility from the third countries, it might not be as relevant to Japan as a developed country. A participant in a STEM field reported that the research instruments in Japan seem to be equivalent to the ones in the United States. English improvement and participation in an international
academic community, which could not be easily done in Japan, were more emphasized as their purposes of the visits.

Prestige and academic excellence, as de Wit (2008) describes in the push and pull factors for student mobility, was somewhat relevant to the Japanese visiting scholars depending on their academic fields. In some fields where the United States plays a leading role, such as business and economics, prestige and academic excellence seemed to be a pull factor for Japanese scholars. The presence of resources and leading scholars also seemed to be a pull factor for scholars in American history and other areas related to the United States. In these fields, there seemed to be center-periphery dynamics.

**Activities during the Visits**

The second research question of this study explored the experiences and activities during the Japanese visiting scholars’ visits. Through the current study, several themes emerged. As presented in chapter six, the main themes regarding their activities included: the individual and collaborative research as the most central among all, attending seminars, networking, presenting their works, teaching and auditing courses, practicing English language, observing cultural differences, and involvement in institutional initiatives. Their activities mostly aligned with their purposes of visits.

The Open Doors report (IIE, 2013b) stated that research activities were the main function of international scholars compared to teaching and other functions for international scholars, although this report did not provide details other than these three categories. The centrality of research activities among international scholars in the IIE report was consistent with the finding of the current study. Moreover, the current study uncovered the contents and types of research activities that the Japanese visiting scholars
engaged in during their visits. While some scholars tried to work on new themes or to develop new research skills during their visits, others also planned to continue working on projects that they brought from Japan.

As for the opportunities for collaborative research, the Japanese visiting scholars who had previous academic experiences in the United States or had existing connections with American colleagues directly or indirectly tended to be involved in collaborative research. This was also consistent with the previous studies that discussed that collaborative projects often develop after the actual personal interactions (Jeong et al., 2011; Numprasertchai & Igel, 2005). These previous networks were often developed at international academic conferences, through the networks of senior colleagues, or through previous international academic experiences. This highlights the importance of repeated interactions with international colleagues in the engagement in collaborative research.

Repetitive circular and shuttle mobility through visiting scholars seemed to be a beneficial way to engage in continued networks with international colleagues. In contrast to the first-timers, who often found focused on learning English and on cultural experiences during their visits, the repeaters seemed to have different levels of engagement, such as being involved in collaboration or engagement in teaching activities, and institutional relations. These repeaters seemed to serve as a form of brain-circulation by providing benefits for both sending and receiving countries through their activities as visiting scholars. In addition to the repeaters, the scholars who had existing connections through their own colleagues also reported similar interactive engagements. The development and continued engagement in the existing scholarly networks through
visiting scholars seemed to be an important potential resource for the advancement of scholarly works at both host and home universities.

Although the use of international visiting scholars was included as one of the strategies of internationalization (Knight, 2004), few of the participants reported their engagement in any institutional missions. The current arrangement of research leave policies tended to have an individual focus, such as scholars engaging in their own research projects, developing particular research and teaching skills, or developing scholarly networks at the individual level. In addition, there seemed to be a lack of a system to gather the experiences of those individual sojourns at the institutional level. The experiences of academic visiting scholars were disconnected from each other, compared with company workers or government officials whose employers send employees regularly. Therefore, the provision of administrative support at the home university or at the government organization might be helpful in the future.

As for the host universities, although providing seminars and visiting scholar programs gave some opportunities for interactions between the scholars and the host faculty members, the utilization of international visiting scholars as resources for internationalization could be pursued more, considering the reported lack of interaction opportunities among visiting scholars and colleagues at the host universities. In order to consider the use of international visiting scholars at the institutional level strategically, the commitment at the institutional leaders at both host and home universities is crucial.

**Sources of Challenge**

The third research question focused on the sources of challenge and support for the Japanese visiting scholars. In chapters seven through ten, the challenges and support
were discussed with some stages during their transition, in relation to other factors of the
transition. The main challenges presented were issues at host universities, finding
opportunities to take research leave at the home university due to scholars’ busy
schedules, lack of institutional and departmental support, financial management, and
finding host universities. After their arrival, the scholars’ challenges included setting up
of life in a new community, making arrangements for family members, issues of medical
insurance, language and cultural issues for the first-times, finding opportunities for
interactions with colleagues at the host university, office space arrangements, and timings
and scheduling. In addition, the challenges expected upon their return to home were: a
lack of time, resources, and atmosphere for research, the use of American approaches in
academic practices and teaching, a lack of resources in teaching, and current visiting
scholar policies.

One of the common challenges for Japanese visiting scholars at their home
universities was the arrangement regarding research leave for faculty members.
Although the Japanese government recently has focused on the internationalization of
higher education through several initiatives, such as Global 30 and Global 30 Plus (e.g.,
IIE, 2012b; MEXT, 2012a), these initiatives focused on the international exchanges of
students. International initiatives for faculty members seemed to be largely ignored by
these initiatives. This study revealed that institutional arrangements mostly influenced
the level of support and challenge regarding research leave. The lack of governmental
support for scholarly exchanges needs to receive attention in the initiative for the
internationalization of higher education in Japan.
The lack of interactions with colleagues at the host universities for the Japanese visiting scholars is a common challenge for other types of international scholars, such as foreign-born faculty members (Thomas & Johnson, 2004), and Chinese visiting scholars (Zheng & Berry, 1991). Although Zheng and Berry (1991) discussed the psychological struggle of Chinese visiting scholars who visited Canada, the participants of the current study did not report any particular psychological adjustment difficulties, although they had hoped have more interactions. Rather, the Japanese visiting scholars reported an overall satisfaction with their experiences due to the time and academic resources available during their visits.

The visiting scholars expected some potential challenges returning to their home universities. The main expected challenge was the lack of resources and atmosphere for research, in comparison to the host universities in the United States. The host universities were often prestigious research universities in the United States which probably were more likely to be equipped with the characteristics of world-class universities, such as a concentration of talent, abundant resources, and favorable governance (Salmi, 2009). The expected challenge regarding Japanese universities seemed to be the lack of this type of environment compared to the host universities in the United States.

**Sources of Support**

As for the sources of support, institutional support was a key in making the experiences of the individual participants different. For example, at their home universities, the availability of opportunities to become visiting scholars, financial assistance, and work substitutions varied by institutional arrangements. At the host university, the academic services at libraries and offices and visiting scholar programs
was perceived as satisfactory institutional support. The availability of colleagues, both Japanese and American, also served as resource for the Japanese visiting scholars. In addition, scholars’ own past academic experiences in the United States or English-speaking countries seemed to be personal support sources. These sources of support are discussed later in this chapter with other personal and contextual factors that affected the transition through the framework of Schlossberg’s transition theory.

Previous studies provide some ideas to help reduce the adjustment difficulty of international scholars at the host university. Offering orientation programs for international faculty members regarding American academic culture and norms of interactions with students is suggested to help them get involved in the community (Thomas & Johnson, 2004). The provision of orientation programs for international members of the university seems to be particularly effective at an early stage of their transition (Trice, 2004). There is also a study on the experience of Chinese visiting scholars, which reported that they face adjustment problems right after they arrive in the new environment (Zheng & Berry, 1991). This highlights the importance of the timing of providing effective support for international scholars who are in transition. The availability of support services as described here can be examined in the study of international visiting scholars.

Providing training for American key university faculty and staff members to enhance awareness about cross-cultural misunderstandings is another potential way to address the issue of improving the experiences of international populations on campuses (Chapdelaine & Alexitch, 2004; Trice, 2004). Offering formal and informal support through mentoring programs also seems to be helpful for international faculty members
in reducing their socialization difficulties and helping them develop networks in the community (Collins, 2008; Thomas & Johnson, 2004). Although these ideas seem like they would be helpful, the support needs among international visiting scholars, with special attention to their temporary status, is also an important area for further research.

**Schlossberg’s Transition Model: Personal and Contextual Factors**

The second part of this chapter provides a discussion with the use of transition model regarding to the research question four. This study used Schlossberg’s adult transition model (e.g., Anderson et al., 2011) as a theoretical framework to examine the experiences of visiting scholars. As discussed in chapter two regarding the theoretical framework, the three stages of transition included moving in, moving through, and moving out, and four key resources of transitions, the four S’s, included situation, self, support, and strategy. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars through the lens of the transition model. This examination allows us to understand the stages of transition for the process as Japanese visiting scholars and to explore the differences in key resources for the transition by the different stages within the transition.

In the following section, a brief summary of the concepts from the transition model, namely the three stages and four resources of transition, is provided first. Then, the transitional experiences of Japanese visiting scholars are examined with the use of Schlossberg’s four S’s (situation, self, support, and strategy) and by the stages of transition. The stages are moving out from the home universities, moving in to the host university, moving through the host university, and moving out from the host university.
Then, the resources especially important for the transition of Japanese visiting scholars are discussed.

**Three Stages of Transition and Four S’s**

Schlossberg and colleagues (Anderson et al., 2011) conceptualized the process of transition as three stages: moving in, moving through, and moving out. During the stage of moving in, individuals figure out the new environment by getting to know the systems, cultures, and norms. The stage of moving through is the period when individuals adjust to the new environment. During the period of moving out, individuals leave the current environment to a new environment. The final moving out stage also overlaps with the moving in stage of a new transition. The experiences of Japanese visiting scholars, who temporarily leave their home universities in Japan, visit universities in the United States, and then move back to their home universities, can be viewed as a process of transition. Their processes can be viewed as multiple stages: moving out from the home university, moving in to the host university, moving through the host university, and moving out from the host university.

Schlossberg and colleagues (Anderson et al., 2011) identify four key resources for transition as four S’s: situation, support, self, and strategy. The situation includes factors such as trigger, timing, control, role change, duration, and previous experience; the factor of self includes personal characteristics; the support can be offered from colleagues, friends, family, and institution; the strategy includes taking a direct action, withholding an action, and seeking information (Anderson et al., 2011). In the following section, the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars are examined through these four resources for transition by the different stages within the transition.
Moving out from the Home Universities

The time period when the Japanese visiting scholars were leaving their home universities is considered the moving out stage from Japanese universities to universities in the United States. Although this period could be understood as a part of the moving in stage of a new transition, the current study viewed this stage as moving out in order to differentiate the issues after the scholars actually arrived in the new environment. In this dissertation, the themes during this moving out stage were mainly discussed in the chapter seven.

Schlossberg and colleagues explain that there are the two types of transitions: anticipated and unanticipated transitions, or voluntarily or involuntary transitions (Anderson et al., 2011). During the moving out stage from their home institutions, all the Japanese visiting scholars anticipated their transition to become visiting scholars and looked forward to having time for professional development and international experiences in the United States. In addition, all but one participant voluntarily sought out the opportunities. The one scholar was offered an opportunity to become a visiting scholar from his institution. Though he had not searched for the opportunity himself, he appreciated the opportunity and immediately accepted the offer. As Schlossberg and colleagues describe, anticipated and voluntary transitions seemed to be less challenging since the individuals can prepare for the transitions (Anderson et al., 2011). In the case of Japanese visiting scholars, they were motivated and positive about their anticipated transition. They seemed to be able to prepare for the transition psychologically, although not all of them had time to prepare for their physical arrangements, such as the set up of life and academic-related preparation before their departure due to their busy schedules.
In the following, several key factors from the four S’s that were salient during this period are discussed.

**Situation.** Several factors of Schlossberg’s four S’s were present during the stage when they left their home universities. As a factor in the *situation*, Schlossberg and colleagues explain that a change of the roles before and after the transition affects the experience of transition (Anderson et al., 2011). The Japanese visiting scholars experienced their role change from full-time faculty members at Japanese universities to visiting scholars at American universities. They viewed this change as positive since they were relatively busy with non-research related tasks at their home institutions. Once they became visiting scholars, they would be able to use their time for research and other professional development activities in the United States. The participants all viewed their role change as a favorable situation for them.

Schlossberg and colleagues describe that having experienced previous similar transitions is considered to be a resource for transition as the *situation*. During the transition of Japanese visiting scholars, their previous experiences served as a resource when they tried to find their host universities in the United States. If the visiting scholars had visited the United States as visiting scholars or students, they knew the American academic systems and culture, which seemed to be helpful for them to approach the host institution effectively when they were looking for a place to visit. In addition, the past experiences in the United States or English speaking countries also prepared for them in terms of language fluency, which also seemed to serve as a resource. The factor of previous similar experiences was also salient during the different stages in the transition, which is discussed later.
Self. The visiting scholars’ interest in international experiences influenced their transition as a factor of self. Most of the participants reported their own personal curiosity in wanting to have international academic experiences to broaden their perspectives. In addition, for some scholars, having an international experience was considered to be an advantage in advancing their careers. Their personal and professional interest in living and studying in the United States served as a psychological resource to motivate them for going through the transition as international visiting scholars. For example, when visiting scholars experienced some challenges and difficulties due to their English limitations and the cultural differences, they seemed to consider those experiences also as learning opportunities.

Support. One of the key factors affected the visiting scholars during this stage was support from the home institutions. Institutional support was relevant in terms of the availability of research leave policies and financial and administrative assistance. The availability of research leave policies varied among the home institutions. If the home universities had regular use of research leaves, the institutional support served as an asset for participants in becoming a visiting scholar. When the home universities did not have regular use of those policies, it was a burden to the scholars. Related to the issue of policy, the sufficiency of financial and administrative assistance also influenced their transition either as an asset or a liability for their transition. At most of the institutions, the lack of institutional support for administrative assistance was considered as liability for going through the transition. American universities sometimes provided institutional support by offering visiting scholar programs, which seemed to be a resource for visiting scholars who did not have particular connections with American colleagues.
Another key factor from Schlossberg’s concept was the support from colleagues, the presence or absence of which could be considered either an asset or a liability. At their home institutions, the presence of colleagues who provided encouragement and understanding for the visiting scholars to seek the opportunity served as an important asset. Support from colleagues outside of their home institutions seemed to be also helpful in receiving useful information regarding the sabbatical leaves or the American academic situations. Support from colleagues in the United States or having connections with American colleagues also served as an asset, especially when the visiting scholars tried to find the host universities. By contrast, the absence of support from colleagues was an obstacle for the participants in seeking the opportunities for taking research leaves or to finding host universities. Supportive colleagues tended to have previous international academic experiences as visiting scholars or students themselves. They seemed to understand the value of those opportunities to become international visiting scholars.

**Strategy.** The visiting scholars also utilized some strategy to respond to issues during the moving out stage. One of the strategies was to take a direct action at the home university to seek the opportunity to become visiting scholars. Another strategy was to work hard for the home institutions prior to the research leaves in order to reduce the obstacles of taking research leave. In addition, visiting scholars sought information, such as through knowledgeable colleagues, which was considered a strategic approach during the moving out stage.
Moving in to the Host Universities

For the population of Japanese visiting scholars, the moving in stage was the time when they arrived in the United States and when they started establishing life in the United States. Interviews with this study’s participants showed that the two stages of moving in and moving out overlapped slightly. There are two potential explanations regarding this issue, primarily due to limitations of the sample. First, this study included participants with varying lengths of time spent in the United States. They ranged from scholars who spent less than two months in the U.S. to those who spent two years. In order to increase the sample size, I included these participants. However, the interview was conducted at different times during participants’ varied stays, and this might have made it difficult to examine the differences between the two stages. The second potential reason for the overlap of two stages is the shortness of the period of their visit as visiting scholars. Among the participants, the longest period of visit was for two years; however, there were sixteen scholars who spent less than one year in the United States. The relative brevity of their visits might have prevented them to be fully adjusted to the new environment, which consequently might have obscured the differences of two stages between moving in and moving through.

Even with these potential sampling limitations, the themes during the moving in stage seemed to be mostly centered on the non-academic arrangements and issues particularly relevant to the first-timers. Some of these non-academic issues continued during the moving through stage. Upon the arrival in the United States, all the visiting scholars faced issues of setting up their living arrangements in the new environment. In addition, the first-timers often encountered challenges regarding the use of English and
cultural differences, especially at the beginning of period as visiting scholars in the United States. In the following, the salient factors from Schlossberg’s four S’s during the moving in stage are addressed.

**Situation.** Among Schlossberg’s situational factors, for the Japanese visiting scholars, previous experiences in the United States worked as an important resource during this stage of moving in. Unlike the first-timers, the scholars with previous American experiences were knowledgeable about and used to the cultural expectations and societal situations in the United States, in addition to having English language abilities. These cultural experiences and language skills served as assets for them to experience the transition to the American environment as visiting scholars. The English fluency seemed to be also a resource in communicating their needs and thoughts effectively in the United States.

**Support.** During the stage of moving in to the American society, the availability of institutional support from the host university played a role as either an asset or a liability for visiting scholars. The areas of institutional support included information and services regarding housing, setting up life, medical insurance, and cultural and language issues. A lack of institutional support in these aspects especially challenged the first-timers, especially at the beginning of their visit in the United States.

Another potential source of support was family members who came with the visiting scholars. The presence of family members could serve as both an asset and a liability. When a family member had previous American experiences or English language abilities, they tended to serve as a resource for visiting scholars’ transition, for example in assisting with their living arrangements. On the other hand, if the family
members were not used to American society or international experiences, they might have encountered some issues in adjustment, which could be a liability for the visiting scholars.

The visiting scholars often received support from colleagues, especially from colleagues who were knowledgeable about American academic experiences. The availability of these colleagues served as an asset in having appropriate expectations about American society and services at the host universities. Although the first-timers were often confused regarding American cultural expectation on the necessity of asking for help or communicating needs, having colleagues who could provide advice on these issues in a way made up for the first-timers’ lack of previous American experiences.

**Strategy.** As one strategy, the passage of time solved some issues for first-timers especially regarding the cultural differences and language difficulties during the moving in stage. In the existing studies, the passage of time was reported as a factor to increase the level of adjustment among foreign teaching assistants (Manrique & Manrique, 1999) and international graduate students (Trice, 2004). The visiting scholars got used to the cultural expectations and the use of English as time passed in the United States. In addition, as a strategy during this period, visiting scholars also sought information and help from others, such as at offices or from colleagues, in order to respond to their needs during the moving in stage.

**Moving through the Host Universities**

Schlossberg and colleagues describe that the moving in stage as the period when individuals get acclimated to the new environment and then try to explore the new environment (Anderson et al., 2011). As discussed above, although the moving through
stages for visiting scholars somewhat overlapped with the moving in stage, the issues during the moving through stage for visiting scholars centered on their academic issues at the host institutions. The themes that were relevant during the stage of moving through were mainly discussed in chapter nine. Once they settled down in the United States after making all the living arrangements, the visiting scholars focused on academic-related activities at the host universities during the moving through stage. The key factors from Schlossberg’s four S’s that were salient from this stage are explored in the following.

**Situation.** Past academic experiences in the United States or English speaking countries served as a situational factor to assist in the effective use of time during the stage of moving through. The visiting scholars who were familiar with the academic environment of American universities were able to interact with American colleagues effectively during their period as visiting scholars. They seemed to have more chances to present or discuss their research topics during their visits and able to receive feedback from others. As another factor among the situation, the duration and timing as visiting scholars was a liability for some visiting scholars’ transitions. The difference in the academic calendar between Japan and the United States was identified as an obstacle in the effective use of time as visiting scholars.

**Support.** During the moving through stage, the availability of academic support from the host university was considered an asset for visiting scholars. The visiting scholars were often satisfied with the library resources and academic services at the host universities in advancing their research. By contrast, the scholars often found a lack of institutional support in promoting scholarly exchanges among colleagues, which seemed to be a liability in this stage. As another aspect of institutional support, the office
arrangements for visiting scholars served as either an asset or a liability. Limited or lacking office space at the host university for visiting scholars could limit their chances to be involved in the department of the host universities. By contrast, the labs for scholars in STEM fields seemed to work as an asset for them to interact with their colleagues frequently in the same labs. The availability of offices and events through international visiting scholar programs also served as an asset for moving through the transition, especially for those scholars who did not have past American experiences or existing connections with American scholars.

**Self/Strategy.** *Self* and *strategic* factors that affected the academic experience during the moving through stage was participants’ positive attitudes to meet people and attend to events. The visiting scholars who were naturally friendly and open tended to seek opportunities to meet new people for developing networks and having experiences for academic enrichment. The importance of openness was a factor for a better adjustment in the study on Chinese visiting scholars (Zhao, 2008). In addition, some visiting scholars were strategically diligent in being involved in those opportunities during their visits. These scholars seemed to be aware that the importance of taking initiative in the United in order to access opportunities. The American cultural expectations could be gained through their own past experiences or from colleagues who shared information. When the scholars had realistic expectations about American society and the academic community through their past experiences or from their colleagues, they tended to be able to take action accordingly as a strategy during their visits.
Moving out from the Host Universities

The moving out stage is the time when individuals leave the current context and move to a new environment (Anderson et al., 2011). For the population of Japanese visiting scholars, the moving out stage corresponds to the period when they leave the American universities for Japan. Regarding the stage of moving out from the host universities, there is an important limitation in the analysis due to a sampling issue. All but three participants were still in the United States at the time of interviews. Therefore, most of them had not actually experienced the transition back to their home universities at the time of the interview. The three participants who had returned to the home university had only spent a short time in Japan after their return. Therefore, the reported issues regarding this stage were mostly the scholars’ expectations. They might find different challenges when they actually spent some time at the home universities after their return. With this limitation in mind, the key factors from the Schlossberg’s four S’s are discussed as follows.

Situation. The visiting scholars experienced or expected a role change during the moving out stage upon returning to their home universities in Japan. A role change was included as one of the factors of Schlossberg’s situation (Anderson et al., 2011). During this stage, they would experience a role change from visiting scholars in the United States to full-time professors in Japan. The visiting scholars reported a mixture of anticipated and unanticipated expectations regarding their transition to their home universities. Although they frequently reported expected challenges upon their return, such as the lack of resources and atmosphere valuing research at their home universities, some of them
were motivated to introduce some insights gained at American institutions for the improvement of home institutions or their individual teaching practices.

**Support.** The support from the home institutions seemed to be mainly considered a liability during this stage. The lack of institutional resources for research, including financial and human resources, was predicted to be an obstacle in their transition back to home institutions when they hoped to continue engaging in research. In addition, although the availability of support from institutional leaders and colleagues would be a key for introducing some insights for improving the home institutions, for many cases, the lack of those institutional leaders or colleagues was a liability in the transition. As another institutional factor, insufficient international visiting scholar services for both sending and receiving visiting scholars was considered a liability in the future international scholarly exchange. Another factor that would influence these expected challenges regarding the institutional support was the regulation of the Japanese government. This also seemed to serve as a potential liability in introducing changes at the institutional level.

**Strategy.** The visiting scholars also reported some potential strategies in responding to the expected challenges during the stage when they return to Japan. An inhibition of action could be one approach when the scholars projected resistance from the colleagues for providing insights from American academic practices. Another strategy was to take an action gradually by seeking support from their colleagues one by one. The use of seeking help from institutional leaders who could be supportive of introducing institutional change could be another strategy.
**Other factors.** Since most of the participants had not experienced the transition back to their home university at the time of the interviews, the information regarding personal factors that could affect the transition of this stage could not be examined. By contrast, larger contextual factors came up as potential factors that would affect their transition to Japanese universities, including the cultural and academic system in Japan. As for cultural and academic context, the atmosphere that promotes research activities seemed to be lacking at Japanese universities. The differences in academic culture functioned as a liability for Japanese visiting scholars upon returning to their home institutions. In addition, the infrequent use of discussions as a teaching method in Japanese universities was also a cultural and academic difference. This seemed to be a potential liability for returned visiting scholars who wanted to introduce some American academic practices in the Japanese context.

**Key Factors for the Transition of Japanese Visiting Scholars.** As discussed above, multiple factors from Schlossberg’s four S’s influenced the experience of transition among the Japanese visiting scholars. Among these factors, there were three factors that I would like to highlight: previous American academic experiences as a situational factor, support from Japanese and American colleagues, and support from both home and host institutions. Then, another factor I would like to discuss is the factor of academic and cultural context, which was present especially in the findings on expected challenges upon returning. Although the cultural factors were not specifically discussed in Schlossberg’s model, these factors also seemed to be potential liabilities in the transition of visiting scholars.
First, having had past academic experiences in the United States or English-speaking countries was frequently cited as an important resource for visiting scholars’ transition throughout the different stages. The scholars who had previous experiences were effective in finding host universities, setting up their lives in the United States, and engaging in the academic activities at the host universities. Their previous American experiences were resourceful in several ways. First, the scholars were familiar with culture and universities in the United States. They knew effective ways to approach American colleagues, to find opportunities, and to negotiate their needs at the host universities. Second, they tended to have existing connections with American colleagues which were developed through their previous visits. Third, their English fluency was less problematic. The first-timers, on the other hand, had to respond to issues which arose with the combination of different resources.

Second, the support from colleagues was another important resource for visiting scholars. This was relevant for both scholars with previous American academic experiences and also those who did not have those experiences. The connections and support from American colleagues, which was often developed prior to the visits, served as an important asset to help find the host universities. The development and maintenance of international scholarly networks seemed to be imperative, not only when scholars tried to find potential universities to visit, but also in participating in collaborative research projects during their visits. In addition, support from Japanese colleagues seemed to be also a key factor as both a liability and an asset. Having supportive colleagues at their home institutions seemed to be crucial to finding the opportunity to take research leave. In addition, when the visiting scholars themselves did
not have previous academic experiences in the United States, the availability of colleagues who had those experiences and were knowledgeable about the American environment would serve as an important resource. In addition, support from colleagues who had connections with American colleagues was also an asset for the potential visiting scholars.

The third key factor from Schlossberg’s four S’s was the availability of institutional support. This issue involves both the host and home universities. Support from the home universities in the form of research leave policies affected the experiences of visiting scholars differently. A lack research leave policies was a great liability for the potential visiting scholars in seeking the opportunities. Development of an institutional arrangement for work substitution during the research leave and of an institutional atmosphere that encourages the use of research leaves would be an asset, although this was often missing at Japanese universities. In addition, having research leave policies set in place, the practicality and effectiveness of the use of these policies needs to be considered. An examination of the sufficiency of the amount of financial support, a consideration of the family situation, and a provision of administrative assistance from the institutional level could be a beneficial investment. In addition, accumulating and evaluating the information from past visiting scholars from the institutions seemed to be helpful in improving institutional support for future visiting scholars.

Institutional support from American universities was also a key factor during the experiences for visiting scholars. While the availability of academic support seemed to have been important and satisfactory, more support could be provided for promoting the interactions among scholars. The need for support was especially relevant for the first-
timers who did not know the norms of American universities and society, and who did not have any particular existing connections with American colleagues. As an important example of a framework in offering institutional support for visiting scholars, international visiting scholar programs served as an important source of support in finding the hosting institutions, in connecting with other scholars, and in hosting events for visiting scholars. The practices of those programs could be examined more in the future.

Finally, another factor that seemed to be present in the transition of international visiting scholars were the cultural and academic contexts of the two countries. The cultural factor was not necessarily highlighted in Schlossberg’s transition model. However, it seemed to be a factor affecting the experiences and the challenge for visiting scholars. Visiting scholars brought up the lack of atmosphere and systems to promote scholarly exchanges at Japanese universities, which is a potential liability for the visiting scholars when they hoped to continue engaging in research activities in Japan after they returned. In addition, the visiting scholars often found the use of discussions and reading assignments as a method of university instruction in the United States to be highly effective, although the traditional educational contexts and a lack of training in discussion in Japan was considered a liability in introducing American teaching approaches in the Japanese contexts. These cultural and systematic issues were a larger contextual factor than the individuals and institutions, which would make it difficult to respond to it easily.

Regarding the issue of cultural experiences and practices, it’s also necessary to consider the fact that culture in the United States is pluralistic. The United States is multi-cultural society compared to the Japanese society. The cultural experiences in the
United States could vary largely depending on the geographic area and community in which people are located. The academic systems and culture that the Japanese visiting scholars observed was an elitist one in the American society, since the scholars mostly visited resourceful and prestigious universities in the United States. Although this is just a single aspect of American society, the visiting scholars seemed to develop their positive image of American academic and social experiences based primarily on their visit to the top universities. Additionally, scholars’ positive academic experiences might be also influenced by the fact that they were not involved in institutional and administrative issues at American universities because of their temporary statuses, which limited their exposure to some of the challenges and difficulties that American universities face.

Summary

This chapter discussed the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars through the framework of Schlossberg’s transition model. Schlossberg’s three stages of transition and four S’s were mostly applicable and helpful in examining the transitional experiences of Japanese visiting scholars. The first stage within the transition for the Japanese visiting scholars was moving out from the home university, when scholars tried to find the opportunity to take a research leave and find a host university. The second stage was moving in to the host university in the United States. During this stage, the scholars mostly dealt with non-academic issues regarding the housing and setting up of their lives in a new environment. The third stage was moving through, when the scholars primarily engaged in the academic-related activities they had planned to pursue in the United States. The final stage was moving out from the host university. The scholars were leaving American universities and returning to the home university during this stage. There are
several limitation of this study. For one, the moving in and moving through stages were somewhat overlapped, probably due to the variance of the timing of the interviews. The second limitation regarded moving out from the host university: most of the participants were still in the United States and had not experienced the actual experience of returning to the home university.

Some factors from the Schlossberg’s four S’s were present, but slightly varied through the stages of transition. During the first stage, the factors of situation, such as a role change and past experiences were addressed. The support from the home institutions and colleagues served as an asset or liability. An interest in international experiences as a factor of self, and strategies of taking a direct action and seeking information also influenced the transition of visiting scholars. During the moving in stage, as a situational factor, past American experiences served as a resource. The support from the host institutions, family members, and colleagues also served as an asset or a liability. As a strategy, passage of time and information seeking served as resources for responding to the transition. When the visiting scholars moved through the academic environment at the host university, the factors of situation, such as previous American experiences and the duration of the transition could work as an asset or a liability. The support from the home institutions affected the transition in many ways, such as academic support at libraries and offices, opportunities for interactions, and office arrangements. The support provided either a resource or a challenge. The visiting scholar programs provided institutional support and seemed to be an asset, especially for the first-timers. As a self and strategic factor, taking initiative seemed to work as an asset in the stage. During the final stage of moving out from the host university, the scholars’ role change was a
situational factor during the transition. The lack of support in research activities and resources at Japanese universities seemed to be a liability. The availability of institutional leaders and colleagues could be a source of support or a challenge. The current institutional policy arrangement for the exchanges of visiting scholar seemed to be a challenge. And finally, cultural and systematic factors were expected to be liabilities in the moving out stage for visiting scholars.

In this chapter, three key factors that affected the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars were also highlighted: previous American experiences, support from Japanese and American colleagues, and support from the home and host institutions. Cultural and academic contexts between the two countries also served as an important factor that would potentially affect the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars, though Schlossberg’s transition model did not focus on this.

This chapter examined the transition of Japanese visiting scholars from the framework of Schlossberg’s transition model. In the next chapter, the summary of research findings and discussion, limitation, recommendations, and conclusion are presented.
Chapter 12. Conclusion

The purpose of this dissertation was to understand Japanese visiting scholars’ purposes of their visits to American universities, to examine their activities during their visits, to explore their sources of challenges and support, and to investigate personal and contextual factors influenced transition during the different stages within transition. The four research questions of this study were:

1. Why do Japanese visiting scholars visit universities in the United States?
2. What are their academic, social, and personal experiences during their visiting periods?
3. What are the sources of challenges and support for Japanese visiting scholars?
4. How do Japanese visiting scholars perceive that personal and contextual factors affect their transition in different periods of their transition?

This chapter presents summary of findings, implications and recommendations, limitations, areas for future studies, and conclusions.

Summary of the Findings

The first research question asked the reasons why the visiting scholars came to the universities in the United States. The themes regarding the purposes of their visits were presented in chapter five. The Japanese scholars mostly came to the United States for professional and individual purposes. They intended to engage in research activities, and the types of research activities included both cultivation of new research themes and continuation of existing publication projects. While the participants mainly aimed to work on their research individually, several scholars intended to engage in collaborative research by relying on their existing connections with American scholars prior to the visit.
Other than research, the Japanese visiting scholars were also motivated to have interactions with other scholars in the United States and to use their time and presence in the United States to develop networks with them. In addition, those scholars visiting the United States for the first time reported their objectives of having an experience of living and studying abroad, and improving their English language skills. Several scholars intended to be involved in teaching-related activities. In addition to professional reasons, the scholars also often had family-related reasons, such as a desire for their family members to have international experiences. While most purposes were individual-oriented, a few visiting scholars also reported institutional purposes, such as to engage in developing institutional relationships with the host universities in the United States.

The second research question examined the experiences of the scholars during the visit in the United States. The findings showed that they were mainly engaging in individual research and collaborative research. The scholars in STEM fields showed a different trend in the ways they spent their time as compared to scholars in non-STEM fields. While non-STEM scholars tended to spend their time individually, STEM scholars commuted to their labs almost every day and saw their colleagues. Research collaboration was mainly limited to the scholars who already had existing indirect or direct connections with American colleagues.

Other than research activities, the scholars often attended seminars and meetings, developed networks, and gave lecture talks. Some scholars engaged in teaching related activities, such as instructing courses at the host universities or auditing courses. The visiting scholars who came to the United States for their first long-term visit reported that their observation of cultural differences and English practices was an important part of
their experiences. The scholars who came with family members had chances to be involved in social experiences, especially through the network of their children’s schools. While most of the scholars focused on individual professional activities, a few visiting scholars engaged in working on institutional relationships.

The third research question focused on the challenge and support during the scholars’ transitions. As presented in chapters seven through ten, the types of challenges varied by the timing within the transition. The common issues faced at the home institutions included the lack of regular use of research leave policies at some institutions, management of work with colleagues, institutional atmosphere, financial issues, a lack of logistical support from the home universities, and finding a host university. The scholars mostly managed by themselves or received support from their colleagues to respond these issues.

After the scholars’ arrival in the United States, the common challenges were mainly non-academic issues. Finding an apartment was often challenging, especially for scholars who came with family members and who did not have previous US experience. Family-related issues, such as family members’ adjustment and school arrangement were also a concern. Another non-academic issue was a concern regarding medical insurance and health care. The first-timers often found the use of English and cultural differences, especially regarding the arrangement of services, as challenges at the beginning of their visits.

Once they settled in the new environment in the United States, scholars’ main concerns were centered on academic issues. The scholars were for the most part satisfied that the academic resources and services at the host university were supportive for their
research progress. Related to this satisfaction, some visiting scholars, especially those who did not have to pay for extra fees to become a visiting scholar, appreciated the opportunity to utilize academic resources at the host universities. On the other hand, the visiting scholars often found it challenging to develop networks with American colleagues, though seminars, shared offices, and visiting scholar programs served as sources for support regarding this issue. The difference in academic calendars between Japan and the United States was a challenge in the productive use of scholars’ time. The shortness of the period as visiting scholars was also a potential obstacle to engage in some projects.

When scholars predicted the challenges they expected to encounter upon their return to their home institutions, several themes came up. The lack of time and resources as well as the lack of supportive atmosphere for research were expected as challenges in the progress of research once they returned. Although some visiting scholars recognized American academic practices as positive and insightful, an introduction of those American academic practices at the institutional level was considered a challenge because their roles as visiting scholars were not designed to inform their institutional practices. It also seems to be difficult to receive support from colleagues. While at the individual level, many scholars intended to use American instruction methods, such as discussions and reading assignments, the scholars expected that the lack of resource for teaching and the attitudes of Japanese students would be a challenge due to the cultural differences and their comparatively low motivation for learning at universities. The visiting scholars also found the current visiting scholar policies at their home universities were challenging for both sending and receiving visiting scholars. Finally, some
participants raised issues regarding teaching courses in English at their home universities. English language abilities as well as the institutional context seemed to be challenges.

The fourth research question concerned the contextual and personal factors that affected scholars’ transition at different timing within the transition. Examined together with research question three in chapters five through ten, and discussed in chapter eleven with the use of Schlossberg’s framework (e.g., Anderson, et al., 2011), several contextual and personal factors affected the transition. During the stage before they left the home institutions, scholars’ positive views on becoming visiting scholars, due to the opportunity for professional development and their interest in international experiences, served as a psychological resource to prepare for and go through the transition. The availability of research leave policies and the sufficiency of institutional financial support were institutional factors that affected scholars’ transitions. Having supportive colleagues was a key in taking research leave and finding the host universities. Previous academic experience in American or Western countries, existing connections with American colleagues, and frameworks of scholarly exchange and visiting scholar programs also worked as resources in finding the host universities.

After the arrival in the United States, in responding to non-academic issues, several factors played roles in the scholars’ transition. Scholars with past American experiences and fluency in English found these to be resources in searching for apartments, setting up life in a new community, and making medical insurance arrangements. In addition, since there was a lack of systematic networks among academic visiting scholars, personal connections with former visitors or colleagues who were familiar with American situation served as an asset. Another factor which
influenced scholars’ transition was whether family members was accompanied them on the visit, and family members could be both an asset and a liability for the transition. English language issues and cultural differences were more challenging for first-timers than others with previous American experiences.

Personal and contextual factors that influenced academic experiences at the host university after the visiting scholars settled included institutional differences that influenced scholars’ experiences differently. The institutional differences included an issue of cost to become visiting scholars, the availability of office space at the host university, and the participation in visiting scholar programs. Regarding interactions with other colleagues at the host universities, an active and open attitude was a personal factor that helped to increase those opportunities. The scholars with past American experiences who knew the importance of being active were more effective at the host universities. The timing and period as visiting scholars was generally a liability due to the difference of academic calendars between two countries and the shortness of the visiting period.

The personal and contextual factors predicted to affect the experiences after the scholars returned to the their home universities were chiefly at the institutional and cultural levels. The lack of resources and atmosphere for research was an expected challenge at the institutional level. As an academic cultural difference, the passive attitude of Japanese students for education was predicted to be a challenge at the home universities in Japan in introducing reading assignments or discussion approach. The introduction of American approaches for teaching and institutional arrangement was an
expected challenge, especially combined with the absence of institutional support on these reforms from leaders and colleagues.

Implications: International Visiting Scholars as Brain Circulation

This study focused on international visiting scholars’ circular moves as a form of brain circulation. Although there is a reported increase in scholar mobility through short-term circulation (Ackers & Gill, 2008; Okólski, 2006; OECD, 2008; Williams et al., 2004), this type of mobility had been largely unexamined. This study offered a new understanding regarding scholar mobility through the moves of international visiting scholars, especially from Japan. In the current study, the utilization of existing connections, which were developed through their own international academic experiences or through other colleagues, seemed to be effective in the reengagement of networks during the period as visiting scholars. Therefore, governmental and institutional policy arrangements to promote repetitive or shuttle mobility to engage in the utilization of existing networks is important.

While the engagement in existing connections is emphasized, at the same time, an effort to develop an initial network is also imperative. These initial contacts could be developed at international academic conferences or through experiences as international students or international visiting scholars. For scholars who would like to continue engaging in the international academic community, the first international academic experiences should be arranged in their early career stage, and then the scholars need to be provided with a framework to continuously engage in the networks later throughout their academic careers. This institutional or governmental support is not only important for Japanese scholars, who recently are lacking governmental financial support for their
international research leaves, but also meaningful for visiting scholars from other countries, who might have governmental support in visiting abroad.

Although brain circulation assumes the potential benefits of both sending and receiving countries (OECD, 2004; Regts, 2007; Saxenian, 2002, 2005), there seemed to be some challenges regarding the current situation of Japanese visiting scholars to fully utilize their potential benefits from international temporary moves due to the lack of structure. The current study showed that the Japanese visiting scholars mainly used their personal networks or past experiences that were accumulated individually as resources for transition, rather than their institutional or governmental arrangements. The lack of institutional or organizational systems to gather these individual visiting scholars’ experiences, networks, and procedural information is disadvantageous to the effective use of opportunities as visiting scholars. There seemed to be a better institutional support system at some companies and government offices that send many visiting fellows abroad, and universities could provide a similar service by gaining some insights from these organizations to improve the administrative assistance and to gather the personal and individual networks as institutional resources for future visiting scholars.

In addition, despite enhanced attention regarding internationalization in Japanese higher education, currently there seems to be many obstacles that could prevent the potential Japanese visiting scholars to take research leaves, such as the lack of institutional atmosphere to promote the use of research leaves. In this study, the individual scholars’ own motivation and support from colleagues mainly served as a source to overcome these obstacles. However, should the scholarly mobility through international visiting scholars be only heavily relied on their individual motivation and
resources? The gap between the individual scholars’ ideation for an academic visit abroad and the institutional atmosphere regarding the use of international scholars needs further examination. It seems that a perceived potential benefit of the experiences as visiting scholars is understood to be mainly for individual purposes, which might potentially prevent the universities to allocate resources toward the mobility of visiting scholars. The lack of institutional support and strategic perspectives on the use of international visiting scholars needs to be addressed, and should be situated in the larger discussion of institutional internationalization initiatives.

As for the implications for American higher education, although the academic prestige and resources at those leading research universities in the United States seemed to be a great advantage to pull international scholars, some gaps between the visiting scholars’ ideal and actual situations were reported. In particular, the current study showed that more opportunities for interactions could be provided in order to enrich the experiences of both the visiting scholars and scholars at the host universities. From the interview findings, the visiting scholars’ temporary presence in the United States does not automatically result in the occurrence of meaningful interactions, especially for those scholars in non-STEM fields and first-time visiting scholars without family members. Although Knight (2004) identified international visiting scholars as an approach for internationalization, due to the lack of a system to integrate them as a resource at the host university, the reality showed an underutilization of this population as a resource for internationalization in American universities. Currently, the effort for developing networks also heavily relies on the individual visiting scholars. Though they are international members of the host community, they seemed to be segregated unless they
were repeaters who knew how to be involved in the host universities. An institutional approach to creating some mechanisms for interactions could be sought in the future.

In addition, the effort to increase the interactions could be approached by the faculty and students at the American host universities. They need to recognize some advantage or merit in interactions with visiting scholars, including the enhancement of international awareness, the creative and insightful ideas that can be inspired through the interactions, and the future potential opportunities for research collaborations. One potential way to respond to this issue is to enhance the awareness among the American scholars regarding the importance of these interactions. Providing a training program for American faculty members regarding these issues were reported a way to approach this issue in previous literature (Chapdelaine & Alexitch, 2004; Trice, 2004). Although difficulties in language and communication could be issues at the initial interactions, these obstacles should be addressed together in order to utilize the potential benefit of international visiting scholars as a form of brain circulation. This in turn could be beneficial for the development of new research and the advancement of knowledge in various academic fields.

**Limitations**

This study examined the experience of transition among Japanese visiting scholars to the United States. There are several limitations in this study. A major challenge was the sampling. Due to the relatively small number of Japanese visiting scholars, the participants were recruited regardless of their home or host institutions. Although this might help to increase exposure to a variety of experiences across different
universities to be examined in the study, it did not allow for a close examination of a particular institutional context.

Although the design of the research allowed for participant recruitment across institutions, after the actual sampling of participants, it turned out that over half of the participants visited a single university in the United States. This might have skewed the findings of this study in being more relevant to this particular prestigious institution. Although this is a limitation to understand the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars at various institutions, as noted in the introduction, international scholars are mainly concentrated at research-focused institutions. Therefore, the concentration of the participants at several research-focused prestigious universities might have been unavoidable to some extent.

Another limitation was the variance of the sample in terms of the timing and periods of visits. As discussed in the method section, the scholars’ periods of visits varied from six months to twenty-four months. In addition, the time spent in the United States prior to the interview varied from about one month to twenty-four months, including three participants who already returned to Japan at the time of their interviews. This variance has probably reduced the consistency of the interview results, especially between those who had and had not spent much time in the United States. Related to this, the themes discussed in chapter ten regarding issues after the scholars’ return to the home university were mostly focused on the expected challenges because the scholars had not experienced the actual transition to move out from American universities. Therefore, once they in fact finished their visiting period and returned to their home institution, their actual challenges might be different from their expected challenges. This needs to be
examined in a future study. Other potential areas of further study are explained as well in the next section.

Finally, the limitation in the coding process also needs to be mentioned. Although it is ideal to have a second coder to code all interview transcripts separately and compare the codes in order to enhance the rigorousness of the research method, the second coder of this study only coded about 10% of the interviews. In the coding and analysis process of the current study, I faced challenges in finding a second coder. The interviews of the current study were done in Japanese, and I initially tried to find researchers who could understand the Japanese language and had time to take the role as a second coder, which proved to be difficult. Therefore, I translated three interviews in English, and a fellow doctoral student coded them as a second coder. Since the second coder was not able to code all the interviews, this potentially reduced the methodological rigorousness in the coding and analysis process. However, with the lack of human resources to help the coding process, this was the most realistic approach that I was able to actually take.

**Future Study**

This study explored the experience of visiting scholars from Japan to the United States. Although there were some limitations of the current study, the findings of this study suggest several areas for future research. First, although this study did not limit the sample by scholars’ home and host universities, the results showed that institutional differences seemed to be an important factor that influenced the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars differently in various aspects. Therefore, a close examination of institutional contexts in relation to the issues regarding visiting scholars is important.
Multiple case studies and comparative studies on various institutions will be meaningful. This will help identify specific strengths and challenges to each institution, which would help with improving policies regarding international visiting scholars at these institutions.

In addition, a close examination of visiting scholar programs is also an important topic for future research. Some participants of the current study used this type of program, and the structure of the programs seemed to serve as a resource for the visiting scholars, especially for those who did not have existing connections with American colleagues. The challenges and support needs of these programs, by considering the cost and benefit of using these programs, could be explored more. Making comparisons across different visiting scholar programs might be an approach.

Although this study used individual visiting scholars as the unit of analysis, some themes that were identified from this study suggested the influence of institutional policies and arrangements on individual visiting scholars. Therefore, research on current institutional policies and arrangements regarding international scholarly exchange through visiting scholars needs to be conducted. In addition, institutional approaches regarding the use of international visiting scholars could be explored through interviews and surveys with university leaders, in relation to the institutional policy on internationalization as an important area for future research.

Furthermore, an examination of the population of former visiting scholars several years after their visiting experiences would be important. It would be important to study the actual challenges that scholars face after they returned to their home universities, as these could not be examined in the current study. Moreover, the examination of these people is also helpful to understand the long-term influence of overseas research visits for
visiting scholars. This could be examined through the former visiting scholars’ degree of engagement in internationally related activities and approaches, such as an involvement in international research collaborations and an inclusion of international aspects in their teaching.

Finally, although this study focused on the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars, visiting scholars from other countries should be also examined in the future. The findings of the current study reported some influence of the Japanese institutional and national policy arrangements and contexts that influenced the challenges and support for their transition as visiting scholars. Considering the country specific contexts is important, having a general understanding of the population of international visiting scholars from other countries is also meaningful. This population could potentially be very important as short-term brain circulation that could benefit both sending and receiving countries. Future studies on the general population of international visiting scholars will provide a significant contribution of knowledge and practical insights in the field of international higher education.

**Recommendation for Practice**

Based on the findings of the current study, several recommendations are presented for the improvement of current policies regarding international visiting scholars. In the following, recommendations for American universities, Japanese universities, individual scholars, and the Japanese government are presented.

**Recommendations for American universities.** Drawing on the findings of this study, several approaches might be possible at American universities to host international
visiting scholars, especially those from Japan, although this could be applicable for international visiting scholars from other countries.

- Upon arrival in the United States, since visiting scholars seemed to face challenges in finding apartments, more support in finding housing should be provided. As well, for scholars with children, information regarding public schools and arrangements could be provided together.

- Since scholars visiting for the first time tended to report challenges in the transition to the United States, institutional support should be focused on these scholars to provide services for setting up life in a new community, language issues, cultural expectations, and other arrangements. Cultural expectations, especially regarding the importance of communicating their needs, could be stressed in guidance for the first-timers.

- Sufficient information regarding the system of medical insurance and medical care for international visiting scholars should be provided, especially for the first-timers and scholars with family members.

- While visiting scholars were for the most part satisfied with academic resources and administrative support, some scholars reported challenges in finding opportunities for interaction with American colleagues at the host universities. Therefore, it is important for American universities to provide institutional arrangements to promote these opportunities, especially for non-STEM scholars. This could be done through matching scholars with other students and scholars with similar interests, or providing an office on the campus for the visiting scholars to meet colleagues on a daily basis.
Arrangements to integrate visiting scholars into the host community can be potentially beneficial for both visiting scholars and American colleagues through the international scholarly interactions.

- It is also recommended that American universities better utilize the population of visiting scholars as a resource to internationalize their universities by developing an institutional system to integrate visiting scholars at the home universities and by promoting interactions between the visiting scholars and the researchers at the host universities.

**Recommendations for Japanese universities.** There are several approaches that are helpful to improve the use of international visiting scholars at Japanese universities, based on results from the current study.

- Developing networks among former visiting scholars and gathering their individual information is important. This is not only helpful in providing useful information for future visiting scholars at the universities when they prepare for their own visits, but also meaningful to inform institutional approaches regarding the use of research leaves. The accumulation of information could be done by each institution or across institutions, by the community of academic fields, or by governmental organizations.

- The visiting scholars who visit the United States on their first long-term visits mainly experienced challenges regarding language, culture, and procedural issues. Therefore, offering institutional support for these scholars would be meaningful. A system to connect former visiting scholars to prospective
visiting scholars in order to give information and advice on cultural and procedural matters might be an approach.

- The visiting scholars with family members had different needs regarding the use of research leave policies. Providing support for visiting scholars with family members might be particularly important, specifically through providing information regarding public schools for their children in the United States and developing policies that take scholars’ spouses into consideration.

- The timings and periods of research leaves are issues that need to be considered in order to use the short visiting period effectively. The institutions need to develop research leave policies that allow some flexibility in the timing of departure and the period for visits in order to respond to the difference of academic calendar of these two countries.

- This study showed that financial support from the home institutions was critical for visiting scholars to actually become visiting scholars. The importance of financial support is especially highlighted due to the current lack of governmental financial support for overseas research visits. Therefore continuous institutional financial support is meaningful. In addition, since the amount of funding might be sometimes insufficient, which is especially possible when visiting scholars visit the United States or other Western countries, institutional assessments regarding the sufficiency of the amount of financial support is also meaningful.

- At the institutions where the use of visiting scholar policies was uncommon, the development of an effective policy of scholarly exchange is important in
order to promote research progress and to provide professional development opportunities for professors. At these institutions, institutional assessments to identify the potential obstacles in developing these policies need to be conducted as the first step. A comparison with the situation at peer institutions regarding the research leave policies would be insightful to approach this issue.

• Especially at the institutions where the use of visiting scholar policies was uncommon due to the limitation of financial and human resources, an addition of institutional-related missions to research leaves might serve as a potential solution in raising understanding among colleagues regarding scholars in taking research leaves.

• Particularly at the institutions where the use of visiting scholar policies was uncommon due to the busy work lives for faculty members, providing institutional support for work substitution while the scholars are away is crucial to develop an institutional environment where scholars can take research leaves without worrying about their relationships with other colleagues. Creating an institutional atmosphere through these arrangements, where scholars are encouraged to take the research leave abroad, is also imperative.

• Considering the current focus on internationalization of higher education in Japan, Japanese universities need to strategically plan the use of international visiting scholars as a resource for the internationalization of universities. Having the capacity to receive insights and recommendations for institutional
improvement from the former visiting scholars and developing institutional systems and services for hosting international visiting scholars would be important.

**Recommendations for individual scholars.** The findings of the current study can be useful for individual visiting scholars in order to improve their experiences as visiting scholars.

- Since many of the respondents noted a lack of institutional networks among academic visiting scholars, especially in the non-medical fields, the prospective visiting scholars should gather information and develop networks with colleagues personally to assist their process as visiting scholars.

- Especially for scholars embarking on their first international academic visit, having appropriate cultural and academic expectations regarding American higher education and society would be helpful in being effective at the host university. Seeking support from colleagues who have had previous academic experiences in the United States is also meaningful.

- Since fluency in English was a resource for enriching the experience and interactions during the visits, English preparation is also crucial to the effective use of time as visiting scholars.

- Being active and open to the opportunities at the host universities is important for the visiting scholars to have interactions with other scholars at the host universities and to have other academic opportunities during the visits.

- Though taking family members to the visits increases the cost of the visits and adds extra work to making arrangements, such as with children’s schooling, it
would give more opportunities for social interactions during the visits through the community that family members are involved in.

- Developing international networks with American or international colleagues at international conferences is helpful if the visiting scholars hope to take research leave in abroad in the future. Existing networks with international colleagues are important resource in finding host universities.

- When the scholars are trying to find host universities, they should seek support from colleagues who have connections with American or international colleagues.

- Prospective visiting scholars who do not have existing connections with American scholars as well as first-timers should consider applying for visiting scholars programs. These programs typically provide support for administrative assistance and promote interactions among other colleagues at the host universities.

- Scholars should seek support from departmental colleagues when the home institution does not have a regular use of research leave policy.

- Although visiting scholars tended to be busy before they left, in order to use the limited time as a visiting scholar, it is important to prepare for the visit, especially in seeking out the people who they want to meet, in researching available opportunities, and in communicating with others online and colleagues who might have visited the institutions before.
Policy implications for the Japanese government. Based on the findings of the current study, several recommendations for policy arrangements at the Japanese government are provided.

- Despite an increase in recent government initiatives on the internationalization of higher education in Japan, the promotion of international scholarly exchange, including the use of international visiting scholars, has not received much attention compared to the exchange of students. A national policy on higher education should also highlight policies regarding international scholar exchange as a part of overall internationalization initiatives.

- Since financial assistance is a crucial resource for individual scholars, providing more funding for scholarly exchange through international visiting scholars at the governmental level is important. The consequence of the recent discontinuance of governmental financial support for overseas research should be examined if this might have potentially hindered the knowledge advancement and academic productivities of Japanese scholars in terms of research productivities and opportunities for international collaboration.

- This study revealed that the policies on research leave for sending international visiting scholars varied by institutions. Gathering and sharing information regarding arrangements and use of visiting scholar policies from different institutions is imperative so that institutions are able to learn better practices from others and improve their policies on research leaves.
• It would be a good idea to accumulate data and information from former
visiting scholars to provide resources for future visiting scholars, in
cooperation with the effort of individual institutions.

• A national atmosphere for promoting research and academic activities at
universities should be developed by providing financial and human resources
for scholars so that they are able to engage in research and to have
opportunities to visit abroad for research and professional development.

Concluding Remarks

This study of the transition experiences of Japanese visiting scholars identified the
motivations, activities, challenges, support, and other contextual and personal factors that
affected scholars throughout the stages of their transition. An increase of connections
with scholars across borders due to the globalization highlights the importance of
internationalization of higher education both in Japan and the United States. However,
the focus on higher education internationalization has often been on student exchanges,
rather than scholarly exchange. This study shed light on the population of Japanese
visiting scholars by examining their issues as part of a larger discussion of scholar
mobility and internationalization of higher education. Although this study examined the
experiences of Japanese visiting scholars, the findings are relevant to visiting scholars
from other countries, where might already started to put resources for scholarly
exchanges.

Opportunities as visiting scholars are beneficial for individuals to advance their
research through engagement in both individual and collaborative projects, development
of networks with international colleagues, improvement of English language abilities and
cultural awareness, and participation in an international academic community. Inclusion in the international academic community is especially crucial for scholars in non-English speaking countries like Japan because English is the current language for scientific communication, and to have access to the most up-to-date international academic discussions in English is essential to keep up with the frontier of knowledge creation.

The experiences of visiting scholars are also potential resources for the institutions working toward internationalization of higher education and improvement of institutional practices on research and teaching practices. Moreover, faculty members’ international academic experiences are beneficial as educators of students. Therefore, institutional and governmental support for better utilization of international visiting scholar policies is crucial, especially in the current context of globalization and the needs for internationalization.

Although a lack of financial and human resources at home institutions often limited the number of visiting scholars who are sent to abroad, through the opportunities as visiting scholars, the participants of the current study were stimulated and inspired from the educational practices in a different country. These opportunities are crucial for the faculty members’ professional development, which is also beneficial for their research progress, improvement of teaching practices, and promotion of the internationalization of higher education. With the findings and the recommendations of this study, future international scholarly exchange through international visiting scholars could become even meaningful and effective for individuals, students, host and home universities, and countries.
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Appendix A: Pre-interview Questionnaire

**Background Information Sheet for Interview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Part A: Demographic Information</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sex</td>
<td>Male / Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Marital Status</td>
<td>Single / Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Highest Degree Received</td>
<td>Master’s / Doctoral Name of Institution ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Name of Home Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Professional Status/Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Career History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Academic Disciplines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Part B: Visiting Scholar Status Information</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Visa Type</td>
<td>J-1 / Other ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Family Members Accompanying you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Date of Arrival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Date of Returning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Funded By (Name of Funding Program)</td>
<td>Home Institution / Host Institution / Self-funded / Other: ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Name of Host Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Your department or center at Host Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. English language ability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Previous US Visits (Please specify year, length, and purpose of visit. i.e. student, postdoctoral researcher, lecturer, conferences, visiting scholar, tourism)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Semi-Structured Interview Protocol for Japanese Visiting Scholars

(60 to 90 Minutes)

I. Moving-in
1. What motivated you to come to the United States as a visiting scholar?
   **Probe:** What are (were) the purposes, goals, and expectations of this visit?
2. Was this visit voluntary or required?
   **Probe:** Was there anyone who recommended that you become a visiting scholar?
   Who were they?
3. How did this visit happen?
   **Probe:** How did you find the U.S. institutions, department, and professors that you work with in the U.S.?
   **Probe:** Who pays (paid) for your stay? In order to receive the financial support (if you are receiving any), what do (did) you have to do?
   **Probe:** What are your home institution or funding organization’s requirements before and after your stay as a visiting scholar?
4. How did you prepare for the visit?
5. How might your personality have contributed to becoming a visiting scholar?
6. What was it like to make the initial transition to the academic environment in the United States as a visiting scholar?
7. When did you feel like you had exited from the initial transition? What was different when you finished your initial transition?

II. Moving through
8. What kind of academic and social activities are (were) you engaging in during your visit? Who do (did) you do those activities with? Where do (did) you do those activities?
   **Probe:** What is a normal week like? How do you spend your time in one week?
9. How often do (did) you interact with other researchers, professors, colleagues, and students in your department at the institution in the United States? What are (were) the interactions like?
   **Probe:** What are (were) the nationalities of the people you are (were) often in contact with? Are (Were) they mostly Americans, Japanese, or others?
10. In your experience, what stands out to you in both your academic and social life that is (was) different from the Japanese values and social norms? Please provide some examples.
11. What were some turning points and highs and lows during your experiences as a visiting scholar?
   **Probe:** What are (were) the positive academic experiences in the U.S. that you could not experience in Japan? Please provide any example.
   **Probe:** What are (were) the negative academic experiences in the U.S. that you do not experience in Japan? Please provide any example.
12. What is your overall reaction to your experience as a visiting scholar and visiting the United States? Do you think it was successful or not? If so, why?
   **Probe:** Have your experiences met your initial expectations? If so, why or why not?
13. How might your personality have contributed to your particular experience as a visiting scholar?
Probe: How did your personality either help to cope or make it difficult to go through the transition?

14. Have you encountered any problems or difficulties in your experience? If so, what are (were) they?
   Probe: What issues arose during the transition, if any?
   Probe: What have been the difficult things in the transition to the new environment in the United States?

15. How did you cope with the issues related to the transition, if any?
16. Refer back to challenges /barriers/difficulties, how did your personality contribute to these?
17. What kind of arrangements, activities, and interactions are (were) helpful in going through the transition, if any?
   Probe: Who do (did) you find helpful in your experience as a visiting scholar while staying in the United States?
   Probe: What kinds of service and support provided by your visa sponsor, department and Office of International Students and Scholars at the US institutions are (were) helpful to you?

18. What areas of support would you want to see improved or made available? [Support]

III. Moving out

19. How have you changed through the experiences of being a visiting scholar -- academically, culturally, socially, and personally -- if at all?
20. In transitioning out of America and back to Japan, do you have any anticipated (or experienced) challenges in bringing your experiences back to your home country?
   Probe: What are (were) the obstacles and challenges after returning to your home institution, if at all?

21. What kind of impact do you think you will make on your home and host institutions through the experience of visiting scholars?
22. How will you apply (are you applying) your research and academic experiences in the U.S. at your home institution after you go back?
   Probe: How are you going to bring your experience back to your home country?
23. What would you do differently if you had another chance to become a visiting scholar again?
24. What advice can you give to future visiting scholars from Japan?
25. Is there anything else you want to add?
## Appendix C: List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Academic Fields</th>
<th>Host University</th>
<th>Type of Home Institutions</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Accompanied family members</th>
<th>Highest academic degree</th>
<th>Main Funding</th>
<th>Periods (months)</th>
<th>Timing of Interview</th>
<th>Past international experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11 months + 1 month - after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8 months +</td>
<td>Academic use; conference; one month visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7 months + 6 months +</td>
<td>Conference; tourism; research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7 months + 6 months +</td>
<td>Degree abroad (non-US); academic use; conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Wife &amp; a child</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 months +</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PhD (US)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7 months + 3 months +</td>
<td>Lived until 7 years old in the US and College, graduate degrees in the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Wife &amp; a child</td>
<td>PhD (US)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4 months +</td>
<td>Degree received in the US (MS &amp; PhD); visiting scholars- weeklong - for 3 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 month + 3 months +</td>
<td>Conferences &amp; meetings 4 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Master (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11 months + 6 months +</td>
<td>Academic use; conference; short research visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 months + 3 months +</td>
<td>Travel and research 1-2 weeks for 3 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Husband &amp; a child</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8 months +</td>
<td>Studied in the US; work related to developing country; academic use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Wife &amp; a child</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6 months + 6 months +</td>
<td>1 month student; conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Wife &amp; 2 children</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2 months + 2 months +</td>
<td>Visiting scholar; conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Wife &amp; a child</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24 months + 2 months +</td>
<td>1 year exchange student experience; short visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Master (Japan)</td>
<td>Host university</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8 months + 8 months +</td>
<td>Academic use; conference; research trip non-US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>Rank/Title</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Dependants</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>Additional Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>University B</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Wife &amp; 2 children</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8 months + 1 year exchange student; academic use; academic conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>University B</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Wife &amp; 2 children</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9 months + Academic use; conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>University B</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8 months + Visiting scholar for 1 year; conferences; academic use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>University B</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PhD (UK)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8 months + Degree abroad; visiting scholar;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>University C</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Wife &amp; a child</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 months + 11 months + 1 year exchange student; academic use; academic conference; stayed in Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>University C</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Wife &amp; a child</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4 months + Tourism 1 week once</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>University D</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>Master (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9 months + Academic use; conference; stayed in Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>University E</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11 months + 1 year exchange graduate student; academic use; academic conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>University F</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Wife &amp; 3 children</td>
<td>Master (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8 months + Academic use; conference; research 3 months &amp; 1 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Research Center A</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11 months + Academic use; conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Research Center B</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PhD (Japan)</td>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10 months + Travel abroad; exchange student non-US; conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>