Being a Foreign Professor of EFL in Japan: Administrative Work and Internationalization of Higher Education

Thesis submitted in accordance with requirements of the University of Liverpool for the degree of Doctor of Education

by Harlan Kellem

December 16, 2020

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Hazel Brown for her time and attention during all the stages of the research project. Carrying out the research and writing on my own timeline was not the kindest approach. I thank you for your long patience! I would also like to thank my supervisor Dr. Ian Willis for his insightful comments and suggestions. Also, I greatly appreciated all the teachers and students that went along on the journey with me through all the modules of the program. The foundational ideas of this thesis were worked through in various ways long before it was undertaken. It is with the thoughtful comments and ideas of cohorts and teachers throughout the process that helped to make this project possible.

I am especially grateful to my participants for taking time out of their busy schedules to talk with me. I understand that discussing one's own experiences and institution took equal parts courage and patience with me!

Also, thank you to my family, Kunie and Kasey, for supporting me throughout all the years of the research project.

Being a Foreign Professor of EFL in Japan: Administrative Work and Internationalization of Higher Education

Abstract

This study investigated the lived experiences of foreign English-language professors working at higher education institutions (HEI) in Japan. Rather than being a new development in Japanese higher education (HE), internationalization runs through the entire history of the modern period. Traditional education practices in Japan were overhauled and redesigned starting at the beginning of the Meiji period (1868). Leaders such as Ito Hirobumi, Mori Arinori, and Guido Verbeck, imported the structure and content of what became HE in Japan. After transitioning into the modern era, German and English were the main languages of instruction. The institutional structures of HEIs in Japan were designed by blending both traditional Japanese educational practices and Western models.

This dual nature of Japanese and Western influences on HE created what has been described as internationalization as "Japanization" (Hashimoto, 2000) and internationalization as Western hegemony (Ishikawa, 2009). With the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT, 2012, 2013, 2014), funding internationalization of HE, partly through increasing the number of international students and faculty, research in this field has increased. An investigation of part-time adjunct lecturers of English (Whitsed & Volet, 2011) found that rather than being intimately involved in transformative internationalization of their HEIs, foreign teachers experienced their work as taking place on the periphery of their institutions. Considering the importance of academic rank on work experiences, the current study focused exclusively on tenure-track and tenured professors.

The study employed hermeneutic phenomenology (van Manen, 1990) to investigate lived experiences of tenure-track and tenured foreign professors of English as a foreign language (EFL) working in Japanese HEIs. Administrative work, where the level of the institution (Knight, 2004) and the individual (Sanderson, 2008) meet was the primary focus. Conversational interviews (van Manen, 1990; Kvale 1996), were used to discuss administrative work with 14 participants. In line with the ontological and epistemological assumptions underpinning a qualitative constructivist approach, participants' reflections on

their lived experiences were analyzed using constant comparison (Corbin & Straus, 2015) and phenomenological reflection (van Manen, 1990).

Six themes emerged from the data, categorized under Hierarchy and Cultural Mediator. Hierarchy is made up of the following units of meaning: doing as you are told, maintaining the structure, and autonomy. The units of meaning that make up Cultural Mediator are: Japanese way, different cultural perspective, and cultural liaison. By working in a high-ranking position, participants reflexively create and maintain international and intercultural curricula and programs where many individuals within and outside of their HEIs have the opportunity to interact with foreign ideas, languages, and people. Rather than experiencing their role as being exclusively on the periphery, or as a centrally-located colonizer, participants operate in a third space, acting as a bridge that unites Japanese and foreign approaches to HE. Finally, the study recommends that the content and processes of administrative work be submitted to critical, systematic evaluation of professors themselves, potentially as part of in-place faculty development practices.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements **2**

Abstract **3**

Glossary **7**

Personal and Professional Context **8**

Chapter 1: Introduction **11**
1.1 The Historical Roots of Internationalization of Japanese Higher Education 11
1.2 The Historical Roots of the Intermediary or Cultural Mediator 15
1.3 A Note on Transition and Turmoil During the War Period 19
1.4 Meiji Period Tensions Manifest in Today's HE 19
1.5 Internationalization as Englishization: Western Hegemony 20
1.6 Internationalization is Japanization: Native Superiority 21
1.7 The Significance of Internationalization of Japanese HE in Recent History and Today 23

Chapter 2: Literature Review **25**
2.1 Definitions and Internationalization in HE Generally 25
2.2 New Public Management 28
2.3 Levels of Internationalization and International Students 30
2.4 Internationalization Processes and Faculty Members 32
2.5 Internationalization of HE in Japan 35
2.5.1 Role of faculty members in Japanese HE internationalization 36
2.6 The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, Cultural Marginal, and Cultural Mediator 39
2.7 Hierarchy in Social and Organizational Structure 48
2.8 Hierarchy in Stratified Systems Theory (SST) 51
2.9 Brief Summary and Research Questions 55

Chapter 3: Methodology **58**
3.1 Phenomenology 59
3.2 Hermeneutic Phenomenology and Methods and Procedures 62
3.2.1 Methods: Interviewing 64
3.2.2 Methods: Data analysis 65
3.3 Methods and Procedures Employed 66
3.3.1 Pilot study and orienting to the lived experience of participants 66
3.3.2 Sampling 68
3.3.3 Data analysis 74
3.4 Quality and Verification 78
3.5 Positionality and Ethics 79
3.6 Summary and Review 80

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion **82**
4.1 Category 1: Hierarchy 84
4.2 Doing What You are Told – Negative Experiences 87
4.2.1 Faculty meetings 88
4.2.2 PR activities 88
4.2.3 Curriculum 90
4.2.4 Entrance exams 93
4.2.5 Power and frustration 95
4.3 Maintaining the Structure 97
4.3.1 Managing teachers 98
4.4 Autonomy 101
4.5 Category 2: Cultural Mediator 106

4.6 Japanese way 107
4.6.1 No special treatment 107
4.6.2 Work behavior 109
4.6.3 Communication style 111
4.7 Different Cultural Perspective 113
4.7.1 Work behaviors 113
4.7.2 Communication style 117
4.7.3 Different ideas 120
4.8 Cultural Liaison 124
4.8.1 Liaison to the community 124
4.8.2 Liaison at home (within HEI) 125
4.8.3 Liaison abroad 127
4.9 Brief Summary and Research Questions Revisited 134

Chapter 5: Conclusion 137
5.1 Implications for Practice & Theory 139
5.1.1 Recommendations for professional practice 139
5.1.2 Implications for theory – the DMIS 142
5.2 Limitations of the Study & Suggestions for Further Research 143
5.3 Ethical Considerations and Professional and Personal Impact 145

References 147

Appendix 1: Interview Guide 157

Appendix 2: Participant Information Sheet 159

Appendix 3: Participant Consent Form 165

Glossary

Japanese................English gloss

genkan....................entryway
kami........................above
karoshi....................death by overwork
kochira....................over here, me, us
kokusai...................international
kokusaika...............internationalization
kyojyu......................professor
oku...........................interior
omote......................front
sakoku.....................closed (to foreigners) country
shimo.......................below
sochira.....................over there, you
soto.........................outside
tengu.......................trickster, monster
uchi..........................inside
ura...........................back

Acronyms

DMIS.......................Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity
EFL..........................English as a foreign language
EMI.........................English-medium instruction
HE...........................Higher education
HEI..........................Higher education institution
IDI...........................Intercultural Development Inventory
JALT........................Japan Association of Language Teachers
JET..........................Japan Exchange and Teaching Program
MEXT......................Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology
SIETAR...................Society for Intercultural Education, Training, and Research
SST..........................Stratified Systems Theory
TESOL....................Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
TFELP.....................Tenure-track/tenured foreign English language professors
THE........................Times Higher Education

Personal and Professional Context

I can still remember the moment this research topic was born. It was in an intercultural communications course in my master's program. The class had read a chapter from Hall's (1998) *Cartels of the Mind: Japan's Intellectual Closed Shop*. Considering that Hall was an official diplomat, representing the US to Japan, this is as damning an account of Japan being a culturally narrow-minded nation as can be found. It was during our class discussion of the ways in which Japanese universities have historically been difficult if not impossible places for foreigners to work on an equal footing to Japanese academics that our American-born professor mentioned that he is a tenured full professor working for a Japanese university. Also, many of his colleagues were foreign-born full professors. Their respective intellectual shops were decidedly not closed to them. We did not debate further the ways in which foreign professors are excluded or integrated into their departments and universities, and it turns out that this specific set of experiences has rarely been researched in depth. Although the ideas that were new to me on that day were not investigated until years later during my course work for the University of Liverpool, the idea that always remained is the way that there seemed to be two vastly different realities at play. Japanese cultural practices make organizational structures an especially difficult location for foreigners to operate successfully. On the other hand, as a foreigner living and working in Japan, I had seen and experienced ways in which foreigners were prized for their background, experiences abroad, and mother-tongue English language abilities.

My teaching career started in Japan. I am originally from the Midwest in the US. I studied English literature and Japanese language as an undergraduate at a large public university. I studied abroad at Hiroshima University for two academic semesters. I was originally interested in Japanese language and culture for family reasons. My uncle is a professor of intercultural communication and English at a university in Japan. Growing up, I spent time with my cousins who are half-Japanese and half-American. I first visited Japan at the age of 13. It is due to these experiences and family connections that I later chose Japanese as my second language at university.

Perhaps because I had these experiences, after graduation I was offered a job to teach English in Japan on the JET Program. The first three years I taught in Japan I worked at elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. I taught alongside licensed Japanese school

teachers as an assistant language teacher. I enjoyed the constant stimulus of living and working in a foreign culture. It was in my third year working in Osaka that I joined a master's program in education, with a focus in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages). After the three years on the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Program were up, I began teaching at university as a part-time adjunct lecturer. I have over 12 years of experience as an instructor at the tertiary level. After being part-time, I held two different positions, for three years each, as a full-time adjunct lecturer, on limited-term contracts. I have also been a senior instructor on a limited-term (three year) contract working for a Japanese university in Oregon in the US. All the students were undergraduates at a university in Japan, living in Oregon for a 10-month study abroad program.

Of particular relevance to the present study is the fact that I have never held or even applied to a tenure-track position. Not having completed a doctorate is only part of the reason for this. Especially in the field of TESOL in Japan, it is possible to become tenured without holding a doctorate. One personal/professional reason I have pursued the present research topic is related to my curiosity in academics performing administrative work. In my naivety, back when I began the EdD program, I saw this topic as one way to confront the feared unknown. In my limited experience of academics being involved in administrative responsibilities, I was sure that many people who go into academe are there to either research or teach. Before beginning my research, I had an ingrained idea that the practice of giving academics administrative roles and putting them in positions as managers of each other contained a certain danger, an incongruity between academic autonomy or freedom and bureaucratic control. It seemed to me that being a manager, with everything that entails – including evaluating the performance of colleagues, managing budgets, and making decisions about research and curriculum agendas of other academics – was inimical to the principles underlying learning and teaching. I had always felt that devoting time to maintaining the institutional structures of universities required a vastly different mindset than is necessary for researching and teaching. In short, because of my lack of direct experience with administrative work, it had always been a dark, unexplored area of the work-life of academics. As I have found throughout the stages of my research, this topic was not only a shadowy area of my own thinking, but an under-researched area in higher education literature as well.

As will be seen below, the key study that opened up the intellectual space for this project is Whitsed and Volet's (2011) study of foreign, part-time adjuncts teaching English at Japanese universities. Along with Hall (1998), they show how foreigners are excluded and not an integral part of their institutions. As I had direct experience as a part-time adjunct at Japanese universities, I understood the perspective they presented. However, it turns out that in investigating internationalization of Japanese universities, perhaps the area of focus that best addresses internationalization processes is administrative work. As a result of my personal and professional experiences with Japanese culture and Japanese higher education, I was sure that there was more to the story. It turns out I was right.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 The Historical Roots of Internationalization of Japanese Higher Education

"...the present age is tangibly an offspring of the Meiji experience." (Jones, 1980, p. xv)

"The stubborn strength of Japan's academic apartheid lies deeply embedded in the history and psychology of modern Japan and it will not vanish at a mere wave of the *kokusai* (international) wand." (Hall, 1998, p. 100)

The beginning of a deep understanding of the experiences of foreign academics working for Japanese universities must necessarily look to both the trailblazers who were first embedded in educational institutions, and to the greater context of internationalization of higher education in Japan's history. Although Tokyo University was first officially recognized as such in 1877, it and other institutions of higher learning sprung out of older traditions. However, because Japan was officially closed to all outsiders for centuries, with the exception of a small, strictly controlled contingency of Dutch traders in Nagasaki, foreign educators were only first allowed into Japan from 1859, following the forced opening of Japan's borders by the American navy led by Commodore Matthew Perry in 1853 (Quigley, 1966, p. 194).

The core of the present study is the ways in which foreign faculty are involved in internationalization processes in their academic departments and institutions. Following chapters will explicate and analyze the crucial component of hierarchy and status that must play a part in considering international and intercultural influences of individual faculty members on HEIs. However, as noted by the scholars quoted above, because the relatively conservative and ethnic homogeneity of Japanese culture creates practices and institutions that manifest historical realities in pertinent ways in contemporary life, it is vital to inspect the roots of the present situation.

The Japanese archipelago was closed to foreign nationals from early in the seventeenth century until the middle of the nineteenth century. Included in this *sakoku*

(“closed country”) policy was the death penalty for Japanese who were caught returning from abroad (McConnell, 2000). Although there were a few known cases of samurai sneaking onto British boats and taking exploratory trips abroad, Japanese started going to the West (the US and Europe) in more significant numbers in the 1860s. Around this period, the US, Britain, and France fought battles on the coastline of Japan over trade disputes. It became obvious immediately that Western military technology was far superior. Leaders in the late Tokugawa, then the Meiji (1868-1912) period quickly decided that Japan would follow suit and adopt scientific and technological advances in order to maintain national sovereignty and avoid becoming a colony.

The first government-sanctioned group of Japanese leaders from samurai families sailed to London in 1863. Four of the five men would later become ministers in Japan, including Prime Minister Ito Hirobumi. One studied engineering in Scotland and the others studied military affairs, science, politics and law at University College, which later became the University of London (Duke, 2008, p. 30). In another group of samurai who went abroad during this time was a future minister of education, Mori Arinori. He initially studied science and technology, and quickly became interested in political theory and education. In total, from 1868 to 1870, a total of 174 students were sent abroad by the government (Marshall, 1994, p. 36). Then, in what would become the most influential of these excursions abroad on Japan’s system of schooling, government-sponsored samurai, led by Kido Takayoshi and Tanaka Fujimaro, travelled across the US, and to England, France, and Germany (Prussia) over a two-year period, 1871-1873. They befriended professors and heads of schools in each country, and visited hundreds of primary, secondary, and tertiary schools, with their main goal being to construct a national school system for Japan upon their return.

In the ensuing decades, the samurai who experienced life abroad and undertook formal university instruction in science, engineering, politics, and social thought in the US and Europe sifted through the eclectic ideas learned in those various cultures, all while attempting to reconcile and incorporate traditional Japanese knowledge and cultural ways of valuing. Japan’s leaders battled over which world view – Confucianism (originally from China), Shintoism (native to Japan), or Western (Individualism derived from Christianity) – should underpin both the new system of education and the overall governmental structure of the country. Ultimately, by 1890 Japan’s elite had settled on adopting and adapting German ideas and structures: “Thus Confucian domination of higher education was ended

and Western scholars emerged triumphant, in uncontested control of the university" (Rubinger, 1986, p. 204). The country's constitution of 1889 was based on Germany's (Quigley, 1966, p. 195). As for schooling and the structure and purpose of universities, the German idea of education for the state, and not for individual enlightenment, was adopted as foundational. This allowed a compromise between borrowing a foreign legal and educational structure, while best maintaining nativist values and norms.

As the term itself suggests, universities ("university" coming from Old French meaning "totality" and "universality"; OED) have always been global or international institutions (Altbach, 2006). As described above, Japan is no exception; the structure and many of the presuppositions underlying the purpose and goal of HE in Japan are of foreign, especially American, French, and German, origin. The samurai who studied abroad and became familiar with foreign HEIs were instrumental in importing then adapting what they learned to the Japan context. In a parallel fashion, foreign educators were brought into Japan in increasingly large numbers starting in the late 1850s.

The first foreign-born educator to have a lasting effect on Japanese education was Guido Verbeck, an American of Dutch descent, who was among the first foreigners to enter Japan in 1859 (Duke, 2008, p. 27). Verbeck's influence on the future leaders of Japan is archetypal; he was an engineer by training and a Christian missionary by choice. Because of the historical factors at play in Japan from the opening of its borders in 1856 until the end of WWII and beyond, Japanese were forced into a position of both accepting and rejecting the Western worldview which had Christianity as a part of its foundation, but was rapidly and increasingly becoming technological and materialistic in its outlook. Interestingly, Verbeck was an embodiment of this dualistic worldview. He taught English, politics, economics, and science to samurai youth from throughout Japan. As an example of the types of students Verbeck taught, Okuma Shigenobu later became prime minister and the founder of a prestigious private university, Waseda (Duke, 2008, p. 302).

As will be discussed in detail in later chapters when considering the experiences of current foreign academics in Japanese universities, echoes reverberating from this Meiji period are clearly heard today. Verbeck was primarily a language specialist and was hired as the head teacher (similar to a dean today) of Daigaku Nanko in 1871, which became Japan's first university six years later, Tokyo University (Altman, 1971). Daigaku Nanko was founded the same year foreigners were officially allowed into Japan, in 1856. The tensions that

existed during this time between Japanese and Western cultural influences were reflected in the initial name of the school: Bansho Shirabesho, which translates literally to "the Office for the Investigation of Barbarian (that is, western) Books" (Duke, 2008, p. 19). Between 1856 and 1871 when Verbeck took over there had of course been what could be described as incredible progress made in Japan, though not without difficulty, towards modernization.

Along with Verbeck, and what would become Tokyo University, other prominent institutions of higher education at this time were also headed by foreigners. In 1872, the Ministry of Education opened Japan's first teacher training college, Tokyo Teacher Training School. Hired as the first head teacher was the American Marion Scott (Marshall, 1994, p. 46). In 1873 Henry Dyer, a Scotsman and recent graduate from the University of Glasgow, was hired by the Ministry of Works to found Japan's first school of engineering, the Imperial University of Engineering. Also, the entire faculty of the school came from Great Britain (Duke, 2008, p. 176). In yet another case where Japanese leaders looked to foreign educators to create schools, the founder of the Massachusetts Agricultural College (the University of Massachusetts today) in the US, William Clark, was hired by the Japanese government to create the Sapporo Agricultural College (the University of Hokkaido today) in 1876. As was the case in all three of the schools mentioned above, Clark's agricultural college included a curriculum taught entirely in English by non-Japanese faculty.

A major issue that was entangled in the struggle taking place to turn Japan into a country that more resembled European countries and the US in power and prestige, while protecting and securing Japan's borders both physically and psychologically, was how to avoid becoming victims to colonialism or neocolonialism. It was perhaps this fear that drove Japanese private and public employers of foreigners during the Meiji period to occasionally treat them like "live machines," "living reference books" (Jones, 1980, p. 125), or "tape recorders" (McConnell, 2000, p. 84). In 1877, when Tokyo University was given university status, because the HEI structure was borrowed from abroad, all classes except medical courses (which were taught in German) were taught in English and the faculty was almost entirely American and British (Duke, 2008, p. 231). It is not difficult to imagine how this top-down incorporation of foreign languages and cultures was viewed with skepticism by many Japanese.

In addition to the public and private schools that would later become Japan's first universities teaching mainly English language and teaching *in* English, which required

students to be competent in the language before entering the tertiary schools, Japan's newly formed ministries all had either formal or informal language training as a required prerequisite to service involving modernization (Marshall, 1994, p. 34). The significance of English initially playing such a vital role in education in Japan cannot be forgotten when considering today's realities and ideologies surrounding language education. As Japan emerged from WWII, again the US and English, through the Supreme Command Allied Powers, was intermingled with powerful foreign influence on Japan's governmental and educational structures.

Especially when considering Japan's long, pre-Meiji history of *sakoku* (closed country) from 1636 to 1856, and the surface-level, but deeply meaningful, homogeneity in physical appearance of ethnic Japanese, one begins to gain more of an understanding of why scholars have analyzed Japan's resistance towards transformative internationalization as being an "intellectually closed shop" (Hall, 1998), and a form of "nationalism" focusing on "Japanese/we/inside versus being non-Japanese/other/outside" (McVeigh, 2002, p. 149). The ways in which internationalization and English education in Japan can be a driving force behind nationalism and national identity will be analyzed below. The seemingly polarizing forces involved in becoming intercultural or internationally-minded while bolstering traditional, national mindsets will be addressed in more depth throughout each subsequent chapter.

1.2 The Historical Roots of the Intermediary or Cultural Mediator

It is hoped that academics today voluntarily engage in internationalization thoughtfully and without naivety. We cannot escape the specter of the war-torn 20th century, however. One life-changing practice that began to become more common throughout Japan and the rest of the world in the 19th century was the increase in individual people migrating to foreign countries. This was a relatively new development. US Senator Heyburn in 1912 articulated the attitude that echoes the outlook on international affairs that Japan had dealt with since the US and European battles began on their coasts in 1853, and would culminate in the horrific wars with China, Russia, and the US and its allies in WWII.

> There never has been a time in the history of the world when any progress was made through peaceful agreements...Every advance step toward what we term civilization today has been the result of war. A rule that has been tried out through so great a period of time is entitled to some respect (Butler, 1912, p. 145).

In the same vein, Park (1928, p. 886) describes the historical tendency of people to migrate as "whole tribes." The point here is that when contact with foreign cultures occurs at the level of the tribe or, more recently, the country, as was the case when Perry led a fleet of ships to Japan's coast under the flag of the US navy, this has historically led to battles or war.

However, the growing phenomenon that was first theorized in 1928 is the resulting mindset of the individual, as opposed to the tribe or a nationally-aligned military, who voluntarily and privately migrates to a foreign culture. It was only a short time after the Meiji period ended in Japan (1912), that this theoretical concept of the "marginal man" was born (Park, 1928). Because Park's conception of what will later be called "cultural marginal" (J. Bennett, 1993) is the first discernable trace of the core theory applied to the current study, that of the *intermediary*, or *cultural mediator*, it bears examination here.

In one of the earliest published articles (Butler, 1912) discussing the psychological aspects of individuals from different nations or cultures interacting with each other, it is argued that a specific mindset geared towards peace and understanding is fundamental. Having an "international mind" includes the necessary elements of learning "to measure other peoples and other civilizations than ours from their own point of view and by their own standards rather than by our own" (Butler, 1912, p. 144). This idea of imaginatively stepping outside of one's own perspective when trying to build peaceful bridges of understanding with people from other cultures is a bedrock necessity in intercultural and international processes in higher education.

The concept of the marginal man takes as its main subjects Jews, African Americans, and people of "mixed-blood" (Park, 1928; Stonequist, 1935, 1937). The focus is on Jews' experiences in Europe and the US, and African Americans' and mixed-bloods' experiences in the US. Although a vastly different context, important analogs with what was happening in Japan in the Meiji period can be seen. At least in part, what Japanese leaders were going through psychologically when sifting through and importing Western systems and values that could be implemented in Japanese education, can be seen as a release of energies that

were “formerly controlled by custom and tradition,” leaving many “more or less without direction and control” (Park, 1928, p. 887). Although this is merely one interpretation of what happened in Japan’s history, the objective facts of WWII lend some credence to the claim. In part, it was Japan’s borrowing from foreign education systems as well as bringing in foreigners to found and teach in HEIs that contributed to a backlash of ultra-nationalism and rejection of what was seen as undue foreign pressure (Marshall, 1994).

Coming from post-classical Latin *marginal* (*marginalis*) meant “written in the margin.” The current usage of the word, as well as the common usage circa 1928, is “relating to an edge, border, boundary, or limit; situated at or affecting the extreme edge of an area, mass, etc.” (OED). During the Meiji period in Japan (1868-1912), as well as from 1912 to at least the end of WWII in 1945 and the years immediately after, foreigners in Japan were most certainly marginals. The very structure that employed non-Japanese in both private enterprise and public institutions was set up to keep foreigners officially on the margins. In the Meiji period and beyond, foreigners were hired on limited-term contracts, often for one-year periods, some renewable for up to a three- or four-year period (Beauchamp, 1976; Duke, 2008; Jones, 1980). Also, the etymology of the term marginal as *written in the margins* reflects the ultimate agency that Japanese employers had over foreign staff. It was the Japanese employers who wanted and maintained ultimate control over the influence foreigners could have.

The focus of this study is on foreign academics working in Japan. However, it is noteworthy that some Japanese themselves may have become marginalized, culturally speaking. The famous case of Mori Arinori – education minister from 1886-1889 – who spent many years abroad in the US and Europe is one example. Mori was assassinated by a swordsman in 1889; the reason given was that he disrespected Japan’s traditional ethics and practices of Shintoism (Marshall, 1994, p. 58). Mori and others had upon occasion gone so far as to recommended that Japan change its national language to English (Morikawa, 1989, p. 51). Clearly, the state of being a marginal man presupposes to an important degree what W. E. Du Bois called a “double consciousness,” and involves what has been described as looking at oneself in between two mirrors (Stonequist, 1931).

The marginal man theory is relevant inasmuch as it is the ground out of which the concept of intermediary or cultural mediator eventually developed. Already in 1937, Stonequist, the first scholar developing Park’s marginal man theory, contrasted marginality

with being an "intermediary." Stonequist (1937) mentions Fukuzawa Yukichi (whose face is on Japan's ¥10,000 bill since 1984), who was one of the most influential educators in the modernization of Japan (Yasukawa, 1989, p. 17), as being in an intermediary role between Western countries and Japan. Fukuzawa spent years abroad and became a firm believer in Christianity and freedoms for the individual. Similarly, Nitobe Inazo, who studied under the aforementioned American professor Clark at Sapporo Agricultural College, spent considerable time abroad and married an American woman. Nitobe saw himself as "a bridge over the Pacific Ocean" (Duke, 1989, p. 8). Because of the changes in Japanese and other advanced societies around the world over these more than 100 years, the experiences of these individuals perhaps cannot be directly or simply compared to the experiences of expats and intermediaries today. However, it is only with an understanding of these early educators that we will later be able to analyze the experiences of international and intercultural processes at work today. To make this historical connection clear: Fukuzawa was the founder of one of the most prestigious private universities in Japan today, Keio University. Also, Nitobe acted as a law professor at two of the highest-ranked Japanese universities today, Kyoto University and Tokyo University (Duke, 1989), and his book, *Bushido: The Soul of Japan* (1900), is one of the most famous to ever explain Japan to Anglophones.

In what can be seen as a direct link in the literature to this study, the German doctor and educator Erwin Baelz is described as an architype of an intermediary between Japan and Germany (Stonequist, 1937). Baelz was a faculty member of Tokyo University's medical department for many years (Duke, 2008, p. 231). He married a Japanese woman. He saw himself as aligning with Japanese interests at times and with German interests at other times. His son later described his father's role as that of a "mediator": "in fact his position in this respect gave him wide outlooks upon two antipodal civilizations, and thus enabled him to see both in accurate perspective" (Stonequist, 1937, p. 177). One who has been written about in similar terms is the first foreign educator of influence in post-*sakoku* Japan, the Dutch-American Verbeck, who was seen as being flawless at Japanese, and even as having known more about Japan than the Japanese themselves (Duke, 2008). It is this move from being marginalized as an outsider who affects the "extreme edges of an area" (OED), to being in a central position of an intermediary/mediator that is the focus herein.

1.3 A Note on Transition and Turmoil During the War Period

It is imperative to understand the foundation or roots of internationalization of Japanese higher education. Of course, the significance of Japan's imperial past and its involvement in WWII have profound effects that will forever shape the psychological and material structure of the people and nation. As history, especially history unrelated to higher education, is not the primary focus of the current study, a brief quote from the historian Marshall (1994), discussing the Supreme Command Allied Powers post-WWII reconstruction of Japan will act to sums up the internal turmoil Japan went through from the opening of the country in 1856 through 1945 as it became "modern."

> "Officials in the British Foreign Office declined to 'waste our energies on this sort of "missionary" enterprise' and some even suggested that the prewar 'ideological chauvinism' in Japan would not have been so extreme 'if the Americans and ourselves had not so assiduously attempted to foist Christianity and Western culture on the Japanese'" (p. 166).

Leading up to WWII most all academic posts that were earlier held by foreigners were intentionally turned over to Japanese. The trend to train the indigenous population to take over academic roles held by foreigners was nearly completely accomplished as early as 1890 (Marshall, 1992). In addition, it has been recognized that power and authority in social institutions operate in "unthinkable" ways during war time (Jaques, 1976). At the danger of overlooking decades of higher education activities in Japan, this introduction focuses mainly on the early Meiji period for precisely these reasons.

1.4 Meiji Period Tensions Manifest in Today's HE

In tracing the tensions discussed thus far which largely grew out of the Meiji period – which was a reaction to opening up to the outside world following Japan's 250 years of isolation – two discourses in recent literature can be clearly seen. In much the same way as Japan's identity was beginning to incorporate a Western worldview (Christianity, individualism, scientific-technical epistemology) while simultaneously attempting to keep traditional values (Confucianism, Shintoism [strict feudal-hierarchical relationships]), discourse and research on internationalization today reveals these age-old tensions.

On the one hand, by making English the required language at all levels of education, including tertiary, the structures and goals that must be in place to maintain such a requirement forces internationalization to be a type of insidious Westernization. On the other hand, in strong reaction against this neocolonial pressure is the way in which internationalization is utilized as an instrument of nationalization, or a way to inculcate in students the uniqueness of the Japanese culture and race.

1.5 Internationalization as Englishization: Western Hegemony

With recent programs such as the Global 30 Project, Japan's federal government is funding universities to become more international. In 2008, the government launched an initiative to offer grants of up to the equivalent of USD 12.2 million to 30 core universities to remain or become leaders in internationalization (MEXT, 2013). The main goal intended for these universities is to increase research grants, and the number of international students and faculty (Yonezawa, 2010). Although English education has always been a foundational aspect of university education in Japan, recent developments and funding schemes have placed a renewed importance on programs, such as degrees being offered entirely in English, and certificate and degree programs emphasizing and encouraging Japanese students' English as a foreign language ability, and study abroad participation.

Critics of the way in which making English the dominant foreign language in Japan's universities decry not only the invading nature of language itself, but the underlying institutional structures that necessarily accompany English education. One specific example can be seen in what is termed English-Medium Instruction (EMI). Japanese universities are bringing in international students in record numbers. One development that has been necessary therefore is the number of classes that are taught in English, rather than Japanese, as these students all come from non-Japanese speaking countries. In creating programs that are open to students from anywhere in the world, assuming of course that they understand English at an academic level, not only are courses themselves changing, but the very structure of the departments and universities are evolving. By offering both short-term programs as well as degree programs that do not require students to ever take a class taught in Japanese, Japanese universities are finding that they must further open themselves up to international modes of evaluation. This results in ways of organizing and

evaluating the effectiveness of curriculum that had previously been more or less alien to Japanese HE (Tsuneyoshi, 2005).

One specific example of this process of HEIs being forced to align procedures along international, and most importantly – Western – institutional practices was seen by Osaka University as it initially became involved with the Times Higher Education Supplement (THES) ranking organization in 2006, Quacquarelli Symonds Limited (Ishikawa, 2009). Ishikawa, affiliated with Osaka University, discusses the way the university was contacted and surveyed to become one of the universities eventually ranked by the THES. In her analysis of the "emerging hegemony" of Western university systems around the world, even non-English speaking societies, she fails to take into account the history discussed above when she states that: "Since the late 19th century, Japan has imported western knowledge, translated it into the Japanese language, and thus never relied on a foreign language as a medium of instruction" (Ishikawa, 2009, p. 165). Although Ishikawa's point that Japan has its own vernacular and way of structuring its HEIs is valid, she is overlooking the depth of the conflict that is most recently manifest in the various forms of internationalization of Japanese HE today. During the early years of higher education in Japan (1870s), *all* classes were taught in English (or German), mainly because the scientific and technological content was itself from abroad.

The way in which prestigious Japanese universities are forced, albeit somewhat indirectly, to align themselves with prestigious universities in the West is clearly seen when looking at world rankings, which are largely driven by the quantity of publications that come out of the university (Marginson, 2014). Ishikawa points to what could be seen as today's manifestation of the Japanese-Western tension: "Exposed to pressures from inside and outside to 'internationalize,' universities transform themselves if not always willingly" (2009, p. 171). This represents one manifestation of the involuntary aspect that internationalization is having in Japanese HE, whereby American and British quantitative and qualitative measures must be adopted.

1.6 Internationalization is Japanization: Native Superiority

While one side of the coin is the way in which internationalization in Japanese HE is a forced Westernization, the flip side of the coin is the way in which internationalization has bolstered national identity among Japanese (Kubota, 1998; McVeigh, 2002).

To the discerning eye, the meaning of internationalization will necessarily manifest itself in a multitude of ways (Goodman, 2007). The distinction that has been made in looking at Japanese HE is the seemingly overbearing way in which national identity has been glorified (Hashimoto, 2000; McConnell, 2000). It was not until the early 1980s that internationalization became a circulated word in Japan, steadily replacing the concept of modernization (Goodman, 2007). The booming growth of the post-WWII economy was obvious at this point, causing many economists and academics from related fields to turn their attention to the causes of Japan's seemingly rapid success following the country's defeat in WWII.

The increased focus on internationalization caused yet another ideological panic throughout Japan, and again the forces against neocolonialism seemed to converge into a renewed push to inculcate Japanese children/students with a knowledge of and respect for Japanese culture and tradition. The idea being that in order to engage with people from other countries, one must have the core Japanese identity solidly in place (Hashimoto, 2000). In one specific example, Hashimoto's analysis of this phenomenon, "internationalization is Japanization," points out the difference in Japan's policy-makers' conception of *individuality* as opposed to the Western concept of *individualism*. To avoid the ancient danger of losing their Japanese identity to Western powers, policy makers from the Ministry of Education, Science, and Culture articulate the importance of individuality as one's ability to contribute to the group, as opposed to the idea of individualism where the individual is represented as opposed to the group (Hashimoto, 2000, p. 41).

Hashimoto is pointing out a potentially fatal danger, a recapitulation of the very tendency that contributed to the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Japanese in WWII. Although a fixed, unquestioning link between nation-state and culture should be avoided, the tendency to know on an intimate level one's past and present identity is arguably of fundamental importance. The present study has as a core aim the description and analysis of the way in which this upholding one's cultural identity represents the drawing and maintaining of boundaries. Clearly, both having boundaries (cultural and national, for instance) and traversing boundaries are necessary components to international and

intercultural processes. In the case of Japan, these two fundamental drives in their somewhat pathological extremes have been discussed as Japanization and Westernization, or a “we” versus “them” power dynamic.

1.7 The Significance of Internationalization of Japanese HE in Recent History and Today

In a global and regional environment where universities are increasingly being ranked and competing across national borders (Marginson, 2014), HEIs in Japan today are explicitly working to increase international prestige and viability. The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) has led important initiatives to further internationalize Japanese universities. Among the stated goals are to increase the world rankings of select universities, and bring in more international students and faculty (Kameda, 2013; MEXT, 2012). The seed of the current wave of internationalization can be traced back to the time that Japan started to boom economically in the 1980s after a generation of rebuilding after WWII.

In primary and secondary schools, internationalization was led by the government’s JET Program. The US and president Ronald Reagan were pressuring Japan to open up more, in order to increase trade with the US and other nations. The JET Program was considered as a kind of “gift,” or a gesture towards internationalization. Starting in 1987, 848 college graduates from English-speaking nations, led in numbers by the US, were hired by local prefectural and city boards of education as Assistant English Teachers. The JET Program grew to 6,000 participants by the year 1999 (McConnell, 2000, pp. 1-3). The program continues to this day. The JET Program was the author’s first job teaching in Japan, in fact.

As the JET Program was to elementary and secondary education, Prime Minister Nakasone’s 100,000 international students to Japan plan was to tertiary education (Yonezawa, 2006). In 1983, there were pressures from the Asian region as well as the US as discussed above. Japan was becoming a wealthy country that needed to once again open up further to the world. However, this time around, Nakasone saw as his and Japan’s role to pro-actively, rather than re-actively, open its borders (Pyle, 2006). The government-led plan resulted in success by 2003. Interestingly, when considering the ideological and structural hegemony of English and the West, around 90% of international students during this period

(1984-2003) came from other Asian countries (Yonezawa, 2006, p. 834). Nonetheless, the first big influx of international students into Japanese HEIs was complete.

The third period of internationalization of Japanese HE had as a goal the increase in number of international students to 300,000 by 2020 (Ninomiya, Knight, & Watanabe, 2009). As of 2018, there were 298,980 (Jasso, 2019). From 1945 to 1954 there was nearly zero government involvement with internationalization of HE, as Japan was occupied until 1951 and continued to rebuild thereafter. From 1954 to 1983 internationalization of HE activities were few and focused on explaining Japanese perspectives to other countries (Ninomiya, Knight, & Watanabe, 2009). It is with this picture of the past that we can view the present situation in Japanese HE, including the push to bring in more international faculty (MEXT, 2012).

In sum, processes underway to internationalize Japanese HE have deep roots. Especially in a society that highly values tradition and can be slow to change, Japan's past encounters with internationalizing forces will inform present circumstances. Starting at the end of the Tokugawa era with Perry and the US's forceful opening of Japan's borders in 1853 after 250 years of official isolation, Japanese society's relationship with the West has been understood as oscillating between two polarities. One manifest ideology is a sort of Western hegemony or neocolonialism, whereby both Japanese leaders and resident foreigners have been seen as trying to turn Japan away from its traditions, which had been influenced largely by Confucius and Shinto collectivism, towards Western-style individualism. Another could be described as a direct reaction to the danger of hegemony, that of nationalism. By praising the uniqueness and superiority of the Japanese identity, Japanization has served as a way to broadcast and inform the world of Japan's identity. It is atop this historical foundation that foreign academics operate today. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to consider the perspectives of individuals who are in a position to affect how HEIs are internationalized today. Working at a high level within the university places professors in a central location where program- and department-level decisions are made. Ultimately, this study aims to gain a deeper understanding of the perspective of individuals who are both centrally-located in their HEIs and culturally foreign in background.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Definitions and Internationalization in HE Generally

When considering definitions of internationalization, the first point to be made is that it is used in different ways by people in different positions in HE. This is true in the broader sense worldwide (Knight, 2004), as well as in the specific case of Japan. Goodman (2007) in his analysis of the term *kokusaika* (internationalization) in the Japanese context, calls the term “multi-vocal,” emphasizing that even within the same HEI *kokusaika* has multiple and sometimes contradictory meanings.

In order to define internationalization in this study, a good starting off point is Bartell’s (2003) definition: "a complex, all-encompassing and policy-driven process, integral to and permeating the life, culture, curriculum and instruction as well as research activities of the university and its members" (p. 46). The key words are “complex, all-encompassing” and “life, culture.” This gives an idea of the breadth of internationalization of HE. In order to conduct empirical research, a narrower definition is required. Knight (2004) offers a somewhat simplified definition: “Internationalization at the national/sector/institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, function or delivery of post-secondary education (p. 2).”

Adding to this widely used definition by Knight, de Wit and Hunter (2015, p.3) define internationalization as: “the *intentional* process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, *in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society* (italics in original).*”* As was reflected in the Introduction chapter, this study considers the importance of the national and institution levels on the daily work activities of faculty members. The primary focus of the study is on both the purpose and function of post-secondary education. Also, a closer look at the intercultural aspect will be necessary.

Knight's (2004) definition of internationalization of HE describes three levels: the national, sector, and institutional. Sanderson (2008) expands this definition's reach to include seven levels: global, regional, national, sector, institutional, faculty/department, and individual. As one of the first to explicitly focus on what may be involved in

internationalization processes at the level of an individual teacher's role and identity, Sanderson makes it obvious that the set of experiences, behaviors, and mindsets of individual people working in HE is an under-researched area. Although this study does not adapt Sanderson's suggestion of teachers developing authenticity and a cosmopolitanism self-identity, his additional levels to Knight's definition is key.

As has been pointed out, internationalization can represent a wide variety of processes, programs, or goals (Goodman, 2007; Knight, 2004). One useful approach to categorizing the multitude of meanings is offered by Stier (2004), who argues that at least three ideologies are operating behind the internationalization scene: idealism, instrumentalism, and educationalism. *Idealism* is of the type that is represented ideologically as providing a level playing-field by allowing people from all over the world equal access to education. By opening an HEI's borders, so to speak, people from economically poorer countries are able to gain qualifications from more prestigious institutions, for instance. A negative aspect of idealism is the danger of Western or Northern HE-system hegemony. *Instrumentalism* refers to the practical and money-generating aspects of internationalization. Exchange programs, online programs, or special programs geared towards international students can be a way for HEIs to profit both financially and in enhanced reputation. *Educationalism* is an ideology that underpins the areas of international or intercultural education, teaching and learning. By having as a goal the learning about another culture or language, for instance, students develop another perspective from which to view their own experiences. Study abroad programs that require students to spend a period of time living in another culture can be seen as one manifestation of educationalism. Especially pertinent to this study is the way in which instrumentalism is often the perspective of staff and administrators, whereas educationalism is the foremost perspective of teachers and researchers (Stier, 2004). It is expected that participants of the present study operate in both worlds, being required by the very definition of their role as professors as having both types of ends in mind as a part of their working lives.

One study that employed Stier's (2004) ideological framework – that of internationalization as idealism, instrumentalism, and educationalism – found that indeed different members of the university do have different perspectives on what role their department and the university can and should play in internationalization. Agnew (2012)

concludes that both academics and administrators at three different types of US HEIs tended to see internationalization in one of two ways: either the local community was to be served, and internationalization acts to undergird a university's connections to the surrounding locality; or the global community is emphasized at the expense of the local context. In interviewing both leaders of universities and departments as well as faculty members, Agnew (2012) learned that these two perspectives seemed to alternate in the minds of participants. Also, similar to Stier's argument, Agnew found that administrators tended to focus on instrumentalism, for example, the monetary boon to the university of programs provided to fee-paying international students. Alternately, faculty members who were involved primarily in teaching and research, saw internationalization as an opportunity for adding various perspectives from various cultures into the curriculum, as a way to broaden students' perspectives (p. 481). This "false dichotomy" (Agnew, 2012) between the local and global echoes the duality discussed in the introduction chapter, which has been described as a "closing in," and an "opening up" in the Japan context (Burgess et al., 2010).

Knight (2004) does include the concept and influence of globalization in her definition of internationalization. The current study is a more narrowly delineated look at foreign faculty working in HE in the Japan context, and has internationalization as its backdrop. Following other researchers in the field, globalization is seen here as having internationalization nested within it. Globalization is defined as "the economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement" (Altbach & Knight, 2007). In both conceptual and practical ways, internationalization is in part how institutions react to globalization. In detailing future possibilities for intercultural education, Killick (2018) posits that to claim an institution is global, or even international, is overly ambitious. His preferred concept when referring to HEIs that aim to include international or intercultural dimensions in curriculum and practice is "post-national" institutions (p. 10). Ideologies and practical implementations of network power (King, 2010), at play worldwide, including in Asia and Japan, will be addressed below. However, especially in considering both the historical roots of Japan's interactions with other countries, as well as the actual programs and activities that university faculty and staff are involved in, the appropriate level of analysis in this context can be termed internationalization *(kokusaika).* Globalization can be seen as a greater force that has a

greater impact at economic and political levels, reaching HE especially through management and neoliberalism.

In an important distinction that contrasts globalization with the more narrowly defined concept of internationalization, Enders (2004) explains it thus, "the concept of internationalization should refer mainly to processes of greater co-operation between states, and consequently to activities which take place across state borders. It reflects a world order in which nation states still play a central role" (Enders, 2004, p. 367). The pertinent aspect to the case of Japan is linked to the ideology that has been described as Japanization (Hashimoto, 2000), or the maintaining of national, including political and cultural, boundaries. In looking closer at Enders's explanation, it becomes clear that the present study represents a greater focus on “international” as well as "intercultural" (de Wit & Hunter, 2015; Knight, 2004) aspects.

The dominant ideologies stemming from neoliberal influences on management and delivery of HE worldwide have what King (2010, p. 584) calls “normative and network power,” influencing policy and management restructuring in Japanese HEIs as well.

2.2 New Public Management

Just as movements in internationalization and ideologies in curriculum and delivery of education are influenced by globalizing narratives in everyday, practical ways, so too is Japanese HE involved in and reacting to certain overarching ideologies of our times. One pervasive discourse that has impacted staff and faculty over the previous decades is new public management (NPM). One definition of NPM is: “a reform model arguing that the quality and efficiency of the civil service should be improved by introducing management techniques and practices drawn mainly from the private sector” (Bleiklie, 2018, p. 1). Whereas the traditional ideology in HEI governing includes the historical roots of Stier’s (2004) educationalism, and has been referred to as the collegium model (Hanada, 2013) or the “republic of scholars” (Bleiklie, 2018), the dominant governing ideology underlying NPM is the corporate model (Hanada, 2013) or operating “the university as a corporate enterprise” (Bleiklie, 2018). In the domain of internationalization of HE, this neoliberal, free market-driven ideology and model of governing underpins Steir’s (2004) instrumentalism.

The corporate model resulting in stronger hierarchical and bureaucratic control structures in universities is evident worldwide. In their study of universities in five European countries – Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, and Norway – Maassen and Stensaker (2019) explain how with more pervasive top-down bureaucratic hierarchical management structures becoming more powerful with regards to control of universities, vertical coordination is resulting in faculty having to spend more time on "administrative issues" (p. 462). Rather than teaching and research remaining the primary or foundational processes guiding HE, more energy and attention is being drawn to bureaucratic processes. In accord with the analyses mentioned above (Hanada, 2013; Bleiklie, 2018), it was found that while governance hierarchies are strengthening, there are concurrent "dysfunctionalities" apparent as a result of the oppositional function of faculty and departments as autonomous, or "loosely coupled" organizational units (Maassen & Stensaker, 2019, p. 464).

In their study of Danish universities, Lind (2019) points out how one of the HEIs under investigation had an especially strong history of independence and academic freedom for professors. In looking closely at environmental influences on management of universities in Denmark, it was clear that after the government-enforced in 2003 hierarchical management structures driven by economical and neoliberal ideas, hierarchical top-down power has been strengthened. Some researchers in fields which have selling-power in the current economic milieu were found to have increased power, at times allowing them to wield power beyond that which was explicitly attributed to them by their position in the formal status hierarchy in the university. However, the conclusion is unequivocal: "In the years following the 2003 management reforms, the hierarchy in Danish universities has been substantially strengthened" (Lind, 2019, p. 8).

It was during the same time that the Japanese government officially imposed neoliberal ideologies into the structure of national universities with the 2004 National University Corporation Act (NUCA). Universities were now to base their financial structure on the corporate model, theoretically acting as autonomous institutions depending more on external funding from the corporate world, and less on government taxpayer sources (Yonezawa, 2013).

From the Meiji period until WWII, Japanese universities were set up on what has been called the bureaucracy model (Hanada, 2013; McNay, 1995). Ultimate control was in

the hands of the Ministry of Education and the Japanese government. Following the war, the Allied Forces brought about a change in governance, laying out a “collegium type of organization” (Hanada, 2013, p. 541). This historical schism resulted in Japanese HEI management becoming doubleminded: “university governance had a dual nature, comparable to McNay’s bureaucracy model in the external relationship between universities and government and to the collegium model in internal relationships within the universities” (p. 541). It is with pressure from worldwide neoliberal trends in management and HE worldwide – discussed as “network power” by King (2010), and addressed by researchers in Europe mentioned above (Lind, 2019; Maassen & Stensaker, 2019) – that the Japanese government passed the NUCA in 2004. Two drivers behind incorporating public universities stated by government officials were to increase funding independence and top-down management power (Altbach, Reisburg, & Rumbley, 2009, p. 70). Formally, then, since 2004 Japanese HEIs are increasingly led by what has been called the corporate model of management (Hanada, 2013, p. 542).

The wider context within which university faculty operate is not the center of focus of the current study. However, all significant actors within universities are working within a wider context where structural constraints (King, 2010) and worldwide ideologies, including the “perverse outcomes of globalized knowledge-based economy” (Caruana, 2016), work themselves into the realities of specific decisions and actions taken at the level of the university department by faculty members.

2.3 Levels of Internationalization and International Students

As mentioned above, Sanderson (2008) breaks down the levels at which internationalization of HE takes place, listing seven where Knight (2004) had listed three. Bartell's (2003) conceptual article can be seen as being situated firmly at the level of the institution. By contrasting two types, Bartell argues that an institution’s culture will affect the actual amount of internationalization, with a strong culture and external focus being an archetypal institution involved in "transformative" rather than "symbolic" internationalization (p. 51). Similarly, in their study of academics involved in internationalization of the curriculum, Green and Mertova (2016) demonstrate how “transformalist” academics are “agentic” and intimately involved in self-reflective practices

where they shape and re-shape their “cosmopolitan” identities (p. 236-7). Especially considering the way in which foreign part-time adjuncts hired as native English speakers at Japanese universities often experience their role as being a part of the visible and token aspect of internationalization (Whitsed & Volet, 2011), Robson's (2011) further explanation and suggestions towards "transformative internationalization" may be one way to conceptualize the space where tenure-track and tenured professors’ experiences happen.

At the level of national government policy, decisions made are often iterative. This recursive process has been explained as “structuration dynamics,” where choices end up helping to create “structures of constraint which then act back on individual(s)” who make further decisions and carryout actions in the newly created environment (King, 2010, p. 584). Just as is the case on the worldwide stage, where universities are both the “object and the agent of globalization” (Caruana, 2016, p. 63), universities can be seen as actors both responding to and creating internationalization in Japan.

In an ethnographic study of an international student dormitory on a private Japanese university campus, Breaden (2012) details the ways in which the university is legally responsible for foreign students, as their visa sponsor and their financial guarantor in cases where students rent apartments off campus. As is common in Japanese society, the university and its personnel act "in loco parentis" (Breaden, 2012, p. 33). This results in international students being treated in a paternalistic way. The university is involved in community outreach programs, where international students engage in social events that inform the local community of the students' home culture. Also, the university is responsible for students who break the rules on campus or the law off campus (Breaden, 2012, p. 31).

Because all aspects of international students' lives are involved, the university's dealing with them is a dynamic process that should not be oversimplified. However, Breaden (2012) explains how the paternalistic way international students are dealt with by the university personnel is an example of "concordance and discordance with Japanese identity." The activities the university is involved in sometimes "emphasize or acknowledge international students' difference," and at other times, "guide students towards concordance with the mainstream [Japanese] social realm" (p. 30). This perspective can be seen as one example of how identity, in this case national cultural identity is formed and maintained. By labeling "international students,” who then participate in international or intercultural events in the community, their difference is accentuated; the fact that they are

foreign is emphasized. However, especially when it comes to fitting into the rules and customs of the local university or off-campus culture in Japan, international students are expected and guided inside the circle, so to speak. When it comes to local rules or laws, the fact that they are foreign has no bearing. It is no time to accentuate their being different.

In Japanese HEIs, internationalization often means international, or non-Japanese students. It can be used to broadcast an image of prestige for the institution or for generating extra income through student tuition and fees (Goodman, 2007). While focusing on the macro or sector level of analysis, Asaoka and Yano (2009) looked at the number of Japanese students studying abroad and made recommendations to improve this number. Their suggestions include more focused attention and funding from the national government to encourage Japanese students to study abroad while offering more scholarships to make it financially easier. Also, it is suggested that staff at Japanese universities are more proactive when possible to educate students about the benefits of studying abroad. One final finding of their study was that Japanese students surveyed (n=173) preferred a relatively short one-month study abroad program (Asaoka & Yano, 2009).

When Japan's economy was fully rebuilt following WWII, the second period of internationalization started in the 1980s (Ninomiya, Knight, & Watanabe, 2009). The plan brought out by Prime Minister Nakasone focused on bringing international students to Japan. Similar to today, in the third period of internationalization of HE, the stated goal was to reach 300,000 international students by 2020. When considering the structural significance of English as a language of instruction and as a foreign language required for most all university students, it is interesting to note that about 90% of international students are from the Asia region, primarily China and Korea (Burgess, et al., 2010). Considering the level of the national government, the significance of the number of international students in Japan and their contributions to internationalization and prestige cannot be overstated.

2.4 Internationalization Processes and Faculty Members

As a part of transformative internationalization, Robson (2011) emphasizes the importance of the individual being intimately involved. This includes academics being self-

reflective and responsible for proactively working with people from other cultures and having what she calls an "internationalist orientation" and a personal approach to internationalization processes (p. 623). This personal transformation academics in international or diverse settings can be intimately involved in is also termed “global academics” (Killick, 2018, p. 70). Participants in the present study all occupy a role which requires them to be deeply involved in intercultural interactions and activities.

Although this study focuses on internationalization, Cantwell and Maldonado-Maldonado (2009) approach current ideas about the effects of globalization on HE in a similar fashion. By drawing on Foucault and Giddens, they demonstrate the way in which individual people are iteratively involved in creating, maintaining, and defining globalization. Their argument is that we should not see globalization as an outside process that leaders in HEIs are finding it necessary to react to by accepting and voluntarily participating in the Times Higher Education (THE) ranking system and by prioritizing PhDs from American universities, for instance. Administrators and faculty members in HEIs in Kuwait City and Mexico, as two specific examples they cite, are participating in and giving credence to Western domination of HE norms and standards. World rankings of universities as well as curriculum design in Japanese HEIs are similarly seen by some Japanese scholars as being an example of Western hegemony (Ishikawa, 2009; Tsuneyoshi, 2005).

Studies that specifically focus on the experiences of international faculty are rare (Hamza, 2010, as cited in Killick, 2018, p. 182). This approach of primarily focusing on academics themselves is “the road less travelled” (Green and Mertova, 2016, p. 230). Munene (2014) used a qualitative approach to conduct a case study at a university in the state of Arizona in the US. The underlying presupposition was that foreign faculty experienced "exclusion and isolation both professionally and socially" (p. 453). Also, by touching on any and all aspects of life in a foreign country, Munene's findings are somewhat idiosyncratic and overly specific to the local context. For example, the way the local people react in the community when encountering foreigners is discussed. However, with regards to their work life, the study is revealing. In the cases where participants had pro-active department chairs as leaders, they felt more included and supported, despite their somewhat different approaches to teaching American students. However, in "most departments" the international faculty felt like they were often treated as outsiders. One of the common themes discussed by Munene's participants is the disrespect they experienced

from American students who did not like that they had accents or that they had different ideas than Americans about classroom behavior. Munene's (2014) conclusion is that to avoid a culture of "silencing" university administration should both actively train all faculty to be more inclusive and provide networking opportunities for international faculty.

The issue of offering formal support programs for international academics was researched in the UK (Pherali, 2012). The participants of the study did not think that academics such as themselves should have any sort of special support if it was based on their being foreign. To say that all faculty who come from other countries are in a unique position which requires a unique support system was seen as potentially discriminatory (Pherali, 2012). Foreign academics who use English as a second language in the UK mentioned how being in this position means that they work "much harder," even "twice or three times harder" than native English-speaking faculty because of the extra time and effort required to operate in a second language at a professional level (Pherali, 2012, p. 324). Although Pherali studied foreign academics in the UK, there are likely to be parallels to the current study. Foreign academics in Japan are also operating in a second language at work. Although, an important difference from Pherali's study is the way in which participants are intimately involved in language and culture education. Rather than teaching subjects such as psychology or physics, participants chosen for this study are by definition involved in intercultural activities as English (TESOL or linguistics) faculty.

In the Swedish context, which is arguably geographically and historically extremely far away from Japan, we can see the same phenomenon of "Englishization" (Hashimoto, 2000) as one main function of internationalization. In discussing an engineering department's teaching practices, Renc-Roe and Roxa (2014) describe how faculty use English as a rule, especially when any of their students are from outside the country. Although one cannot make a simple comparison between English being used in Japan and Sweden, this is one more instance of the impact of English being used as a lingua franca and its central role in internationalization of HE.

As the term itself suggests, internationalization will primarily be focused on the interactions of two or more nations, or people from different nations. However, it is informative to switch the focus of our lens onto individuals and their roles as actors within these larger processes. In studying academics working in a faculty of engineering in Sweden, it was found that faculty members were the drivers of internationalization processes, with a

primary focus on their local context (Renc-Roe & Roxa, 2014). In addition, the university or department-level policies that have internationalization goals imbedded within them are not taken at face value, but are rather enacted and embodied by individual actors who use judgement and discretion. Rather than looking to university policy, Renc-Roe and Roxa's participants first felt that their roles "being an academic in engineering" determined their level of professional international involvement (2014, p. 141). In other words, the nature of the work itself, including the practice of reading, writing, and teaching in English, is the determiner of academic identity, not the identifier being “foreign.”

Rather than being seen as a sort of cog in a global machine, academics first derive their cultural and behavioral practices from their local context (Renc-Roe & Roxa, 2014). The ways in which this local context interacts with the national and global levels are then of secondary and tertiary concern.

2.5 Internationalization of HE in Japan

Just as worldwide neoliberal trends in governance are manifesting and being propagated in the Japan context through NPM (Altbach, Reisburg, & Rumbley, 2009; Yonezawa, 2013), the importance of broader trends in internationalization is readily apparent upon examining MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology) stated goals. According to a concise English-language document from MEXT concerning higher education in Japan, the priorities of internationalization processes of HE are the three following areas: offering classes and degree programs entirely in English; increasing the number of international students in Japan to 300,000; providing grants to 30 universities to be cultivated as leaders in internationalization (MEXT, 2012). The “Global 30 Project” provides funding to 30 selected Japanese universities to increase internationalization. Among the main goals are to increase the number of international students and faculty (MEXT, 2013; Yonezawa, 2010).

A funding scheme that is related to the Global 30 project is the “Top Global University Project.” MEXT is providing additional grants of up to US$ 4.3 million annually to 37 universities to internationalize (MEXT, 2014; Shimmi & Yonezawa, 2015). This change initiative is one of the core programs, having as its goal to: "Use internationalization as the common thread for changing the overall university system and the internal culture" of

universities (MEXT, 2014). Among the 16 formally stated goals of the program, the first three are to increase the (1) "percentage of international full-time faculty staff and full-time faculty staff who have received their degrees at a foreign university;" (2) "percentage of international students," and (3) "percentage of Japanese students who have experience studying abroad" (MEXT, 2014). If we look to one of the leading indexes of what actually makes up a top university, the world rankings by Times Higher Education, 2.5% of the overall score is determined by the number of foreign faculty, and 2.5% that of the number of international students (THE, 2017). Also, research output in English is a numerically much more significant factor, as citations alone make up 30% of the THE overall score (THE, 2017). In discussing two national surveys of university faculty across Japan, Huang (2009) notices the increase in international faculty in Japanese HEIs, calling for further studies of this area.

2.5.1 Role of faculty members in Japanese HE internationalization

The specific study that opened up the intellectual space for this project looked at the role of 43 adjunct part-time foreign faculty teaching at universities in the Kansai area of Japan (Whitsed & Volet, 2011, 2013; Whitsed & Wright, 2011, 2013). Whitsed used the background of internationalization to analyze the perspective of the foreign teachers themselves. His approach was qualitative, his methodology phenomenology. In a series of interviews and focus groups, his participants addressed a wide range of topics. Perhaps because Whitsed was the first researcher in the Japanese context to construct the viewpoint of participants in a qualitative manner, his participants discussed a wide range of topics, including their overall impressions of Japanese HE compared to their home countries' HE. Example findings presented in Whitsed and Volet (2011) include: Japanese HE as "maintaining appearances" rather than being actual learning; the tendency of departments to treat adjuncts as outsiders, foreign adjuncts being employed instrumentally as a symbol of token internationalization, and the reality that students are mostly unmotivated to learn.

Drawing on the metaphor work of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and the Japanese social hierarchy work of Lebra (2004), Whitsed and Volet (2011) contrast two illustrative dualities that exist in the Japanese language and cultural landscape. Two metaphors that characterize foreign adjunct lecturers working in Japanese universities are *uchi*/*soto* (inside/outside), and *omote*/*ura* (front/back). The foreign adjuncts are characterized as existing in the *soto* and *omote* spaces. In interviewing foreign adjunct lecturers, it was found that rather than being in an integral role in their departments where they might affect change at the program or

curriculum level, adjuncts are kept on the periphery. In comparing Whitsed's study to later research, part-time adjuncts in Japan experience a context where they are not capable of operating fully as "transformalists," but are by formal status placed in roles as "transactionists," ultimately being there for the economic benefit of their HEIs (Green & Mertova, 2016). Instead of being one of the insiders and serving on committees, for instance, adjuncts are *soto*; they do not approach the central decision-making processes of the departments where they teach. Also, rather than being *ura*, or in important positions where they can internationalize their departments on a broad scale, they are in an *omote* position. Being *omote,* or out front, means that adjuncts are a showpiece. They are the individuals who interact with the greatest number of students as teachers, partly to present publicly a foreign face, a superficial internationalization (Whitsed & Volet, 2011).

Foreign adjunct lecturers echoed the ideology described above of internationalization being Japanization (Hashimoto, 2000). With regard to how they were treated by supervisors and faculty and staff in their departments, foreign adjuncts reported feeling as if they were there to shine a light on their difference. They often felt as if they were being "othered" and were deliberately isolated as a typical non-Japanese individual. In other words, within their departments there was no sense of the university trying to understand and incorporate foreign practices or ideas. Rather, foreign adjuncts felt as if they were kept on the periphery on purpose, where they acted as a way to highlight and solidify the Japanese identity of their students (Whitsed & Wright, 2011, p. 38).

Whitsed's overall focus on part-time adjuncts reveals the need for a detailed and systematic look at the hierarchical structure that faculty work within. Adjunct foreign faculty participating in Whitsed's study discussed the fact that the real impact they do have in making intercultural connections is with students inside their classrooms. Even though from faculty members and staff in their departments they felt like they were there as a token foreigner, when it comes to teaching in the classroom and spending hours teaching and interacting with students, actual meaningful intercultural communication is happening (Whitsed & Wright, 2011). It could be argued that one reason their main impact is in direct communications with students is because their status as teachers explicitly calls for this to be their main function.

As Whitsed and Wright (2011) suggest, their study focused on understanding the experiences of part-time foreign adjuncts who are by definition low-ranking and are

therefore kept on the periphery of their departments. They call for a closer look at this group of lecturers as potentially being in a position to contribute in greater depth to internationalization of HE in Japan. It is only in passing that they mention that a reason for adjuncts being *soto* and *omote* on the periphery may be because of their employment rank as adjuncts (Whitsed & Wright, 2011). It is this interplay between intercultural communication processes and professional status that the current study focuses on. By uncovering and analyzing the experiences of foreign adjunct lecturers Whitsed and his colleagues suggest further research looking at the following questions: What about the foreign faculty members who are tenured? Are they similarly kept on the periphery or are they involved in making important decisions about the directions programs and departments take?

In an ethnographic study of a university in the Tokyo area, Poole (2010) reported in-depth on the work life of tenured professors in Japan. Looking at Japanese professors and their regular work, Poole concludes that administrative work is the most important and time-consuming aspect:

> For many EUC *kyoju* (professors), meetings and other administrative activities are a defining part of their work... the administrative duties are taken quite seriously by a large proportion of professors. Committee and labor union activities, department meetings, general and department faculty meetings, writing entrance examinations, interviewing prospective students, proctoring both entrance examinations (five per year) as well as midterm and final examinations for all courses, add up to a considerable amount of administrative work during the year. Committee work is by far the most time consuming (p. 34).

In fact, in the case of EUC, even time spent on research should be limited because “too much attention to one’s research, at the expense of time devoted to the university in terms of administrative work, is not regarded positively” (Poole, 2010, p. 36). Describing the evaluation process of professors in promotion and pay considerations, the president of the university “decided to further reduce the number of publications needed for promotion, rationalizing this with the explanation that a climate of extensive and time-consuming administrative work prohibits professors from publishing in a timely fashion” (Poole, 2010, p. 24). More recently, in investigating effects of governance changes taking place since the NUCA in Japan in 2004, it was found that academics are becoming “increasingly busy in

recent years" as "they are required to increasingly participate in university management" (Morozumi, 2019, p. 205). The unreasonable amount of time that is required of faculty for administrative work, and away from curriculum and research, is becoming more demanding in these times of NPM and neoliberal forces in countries around the world. As was found in the above-mentioned survey of universities in five European countries, Maassen and Stensaker (2019) report that "strengthened hierarchical governance" is resulting in more "time spent on administrative issues" (p. 462). Beyond the work of Poole (2010) and Huang (2009) there has been little published research on the level of tenure-track and tenured professors work life in Japan. Because internationalization is often a process that involves programs, curriculum, and other activities at the department level, the administrative work of foreign faculty members deserves further attention.

As explained in the introduction chapter, with regards to the outside world, there are two processes happening in Japan at the same time, and there have been oscillations between the two polarities throughout Japan's history. On one hand is the drawing and maintaining of boundaries, and specifically national, cultural boundaries. Since consolidation under modernization in Japan (1858), and other places such as Germany (1871), nation-states have arguably become the primary level of political border. It could be said that Japan has a dominant streak of traditionalism which, on one level, is causing it to fortify and keep strong its national identity and sovereignty. Burgess et al. (2010) explain this in terms of *kokusaika* (internationalization) and refer to it as a "closing in." On the other hand, there can be seen an "opening up;" and this is more characteristic in the meanings surrounding the Japanese term *gurobaruka*, globalization (Burgess et al., 2010). In actually creating degree programs offered in English and pro-actively increasing the number of international students and faculty at Japanese universities, we can see one real way in which Japan is actually opening its borders. This dynamic duality of sternly maintaining and watchfully opening up borders is one idea that characterizes Japanese approaches to internationalization.

2.6 The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, Cultural Marginal, and Cultural Mediator

In its discourse on Japanese HE, MEXT itself calls for education to transcend boundaries, including national borders, which "was thought to be both an inevitable and vital way of moving Japan forward" (Arimoto, 2010, p. 199). As discussed above, there are foreign academics working at all status levels in Japanese HEIs. Thinking about the experiences of these academics, the starting off point must be that suggested by Whitsed and Wright (2016): foreigners as existing on the periphery.

In another instance of applying metaphors to understand the experiences of foreign faculty members working in Japanese HEIs, Whitsed and Wright (2016) describe foreign part-time adjunct lecturers as "*tengu* in the *genkan*." *Genkan* is the entryway to a Japanese house. It is always one step lower than the first floor. It is by the front door, where people remove and keep their shoes, and where delivery people stand when one signs for a package. The space is purposefully ambiguous. It is a transitional space, inside in some ways and outside in other ways. The two defining factors are that it is one step lower than the first floor, hence one step closer to outside. Also, it is where all the family's shoes are kept. Shoes only touch the ground outside, and the genkan space. This is the space that (foreign) adjuncts are said to occupy. By definition, part-time adjuncts are not regular and full members of the institution. They can more easily come and go.

Tengu are shape-shifting monsters in Japanese folk-lore. They are typically depicted as animalistic humans with wings, long noses and claw-like feet (Goodin, 1994). Tengu are the embodiment in lore of the fringe or margin of society. They represent potential freedom and destruction. They are the beings from which new and important knowledge and experiences can be gained. Likewise, they are the beings that can cause downfall and failure or destruction (Whitsed & Wright, 2016). Tengu are offered as an archetypal character that represents the ultimate potential danger of those who dwell on the margins. Although potentially participants of this study will have experiences that align with marginals and perhaps even dangerous liminal characters such as tengu, their role of tenure-track/tenured faculty suggests that these experiences of being marginalized will be limited or different in kind.

One of the two main theories applied to this study is the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). This model, which includes the concept of cultural marginality, was developed over decades by an intercultural communications academic and practical trainer using grounded theory (M. Bennett, 2004, p. 72). The foundational

theoretical concepts underlying the model include the following: experience is constructed; people can be more or less sensitive to cultural difference; and experiential constructivism is holistic, or involved in constructing a worldview rather than cognition, affect, or behavior in isolation (M. Bennett, 2004). To say that experience is constructed means that events are perceived through one's cultural lens. Rather than purely perceiving the world like a sponge, human beings incorporate perceptions by way of a cultural lens. Also, being sensitive to cultural difference makes clear the reality that different people will have different levels of cognitive complexity, partly derived from their lived experience and how much or little they have personally interacted with other cultures. Finally, experiential constructivism in M. Bennett's DMIS is the assumption that having different cultural experiences involves embodying different worldviews. In order to perceive, think, feel, and act in a different cultural setting as one originally from that culture might, it is necessary to actually have an "intercultural worldview" (M. Bennett, 2004, p. 74).

A key presupposition underlying the DMIS is that fundamentally people are different. Drawing on personal experiences abroad with the US Peace Corp., Kelly's (1963) personal construct theory, phenomenology, and multiple-reality theories in the social sciences, M. Bennett (1998) explains how ethnocentrism can be avoided by starting from the notion that another person's perceptions and reality may be different from one's own.

With a background in intercultural communication and intercultural sensitivity training, M. Bennett (1986, 1993, 2004) best articulated the idea of being a cultural marginal or mediator, as well as the stages that precede this worldview. The DMIS lists six developmental stages that can best describe an individual's outlook and behavior towards and in other cultures. There are three stages in two different categories: ethnocentric and ethnorelative.

In the initial stage of (1) Denial, people either believe that there are no real cultural differences, or they actively isolate themselves either physically or socially in order to maintain this perception. In (2) Defense, the existence of other cultural ways of being are acknowledged but either the person's home culture is seen as superior, or in the case of some long-time sojourners abroad, the new culture is seen as superior. In the final stage of ethnocentrism, (3) Minimization, the existence of different cultural perspectives is recognized but given a diminished importance. Instead, people with this mindset tend to overly focus on the ways in which we are all the same as human beings.

The ethnorelative stages of intercultural sensitivity start with (4) Acceptance. In this view, there is respect for other ways of behaving or valuing. It is recognized that out there, there are other cultural practices. The penultimate stage is (5) Adaptation. This stage represents a move to personally accept and go through new cultural behaviors and develop holistic frames of reference through long-term exposure to other cultural practices and worldviews. Of particular importance in adaptation is empathy, which M. Bennett contrasts with sympathy. Empathy is the ability to imaginatively take the position of someone from a different culture and try to see a circumstance from their perspective, rather than trying to imagine oneself in the circumstance (sympathy). Empathy will be explained in greater detail below. The final stage of intercultural sensitivity is (6) Integration. By embodying two or more cultural ways of viewing and acting in the world, the individual develops a meta-view of culture and realizes that he or she is actively engaged in the very process of creating identity. In integration, the person is "always in the process of becoming a part of and apart from a given cultural context" (Adler, 1977, cited in M. Bennett, 1993, p. 59). It is the ability to be both a part of a culture whilst maintaining a distance from it that characterizes individuals at this level of intercultural sensitivity. M. Bennett links together the two theories of cultural marginality and mediator when describing individuals in this final stage of development, and labels individuals who operate in this capacity as being in a "culturally marginal mediating role" (1993, p. 65).

An assumption underlying the DMIS is that to overcome ethnocentrism and become ethnorelative requires the ability to take part in a specific type of empathy. Drawing on Karl Rogers and Robert Katz, the definition of empathy is "the imaginative intellectual and emotional participation in another person's experience" (M. Bennett, 1998, p. 207). The goal of empathy is to imaginatively get inside the head and heart of the other person to participate in their experience of events as we imagine they might experience those events. To contrast, sympathy means "the imaginative placing of ourselves in another person's position" (M. Bennett, 1998, p. 197). Sympathy certainly has its great benefits and is not something to be avoided necessarily. However, the point is that rather than starting from one's own perspective and an assumption of similarity between people, to be successful in intercultural communication, starting from an assumption of difference means we strive to imagine reality from another person's perspective, partaking to some extent in their worldview.

In what can be seen as one of the clearest examples of both upholding and traversing boundaries at the level of the individual are the six steps involved in intercultural communications empathy. The process of empathizing with another person from a different cultural background involves: (1) assuming difference, (2) knowing self, (3) suspending self, (4) allowing guided imagination, (5) allowing empathetic experience, and (6) reestablishing self (M. Bennett, 1998, p. 209). The key components here are knowing one's self, then imagining to actually be in a different person's perspective, then thinking and feeling as they might about a given circumstance. The final step is coming back to one's own reality, perspective, and identity. The idea being that the goal of empathy in intercultural communication settings is not for all of us to become one or identical. To know one's identity and to be able to come back to it securely are two fundamental necessities in understanding another individual.

To tie together the concept of intercultural empathy with the DMIS explicitly, individuals in the stages of (5) Adaptation and (6) Integration would be able to smoothly participate in empathy as "perspective taking" (M. Bennett, 1998, p. 207). Individuals in (Stage 4) Acceptance, though perhaps less adept, may also be capable of perspective taking, as their worldview is across the threshold of ethnorelativism, and out of ethnocentrism.

The six stages of the DMIS (M. Bennett, 1986, 1993) were foreshadowed in earlier work on "mediating persons." A mediator is a "creative synthesizer" (Bochner, 1981, p. 17). Similar to M. Bennett's six stages of intercultural development is what Bochner calls "culture learning," consisting of four stages (1981, p. 12). Culture learning takes place after an individual has experience interacting in a foreign culture. The first two stages are (1) a "clinging to the culture" of one's origin, and (2) "rejecting" one's own culture and adopting the new one (Bochner, 1981, p. 12). These two initial stages could be explained as ethnocentric in M. Bennett's terms. The second two stages of culture learning are that an individual becomes (3) bicultural, by having two cultural frames of reference for being, or (4) multicultural, learning cultural practices of more than two cultures (Bochner, 1981, p. 12). The third and fourth stages of Bochner's culture learning could be seen as exemplars of being ethnorelative, in DMIS terms.

A foundational tenant that was further developed in the DMIS is the idea that "cultural relativism can be expected to serve only as a limited guide to action in the practical world of affairs" (Bochner, 1981, p. 14). It is the fifth and sixth stages of the DMIS where

individuals' worldviews allow them to practice empathy across cultural boundaries. It is also in these two developmental stages where one's worldview makes one capable of being a cultural marginal in a mediating position. As explained above, cross-cultural empathy requires both self-knowledge, perspective taking, and returning to one's self. Bochner's (1981) culture learning model incorporated this idea by warning against untethered cultural relativism. To be a "constructive" cultural marginal (J. Bennett, 1993) requires the ability to see one's thoughts-emotions-actions as a process that requires a wide-lens view of the cultures involved, but an ability to make a firm decision in the end.

The final stage of the DMIS – Integration – describes the worldview of cultural marginals. In a further explication of this concept, J. Bennett theorizes that there are two possible conflicting ways of being a cultural marginal. The focus on the individual's identity and perspective is described thus.

> "An individual who has internalized two or more cultural frames of reference frequently faces an internal culture shock. This intrapersonal response is not due so much to external interaction with a single different culture, but rather to the recognition of conflicts between two cultural voices competing for attention within oneself...When a person responds to this internal dialogue with a compromised ability to establish boundaries and make judgements, we can say that the individual is "encapsulated" or trapped by marginality... In contrast, by maintaining control of choice and the construction of boundaries, a person may become a "constructive" marginal. A constructive marginal is a person who is able to construct context intentionally and consciously for the purpose of creating his or her own identity" (J Bennett, 1993, p. 112-113).

One aspect of *encapsulated* marginality is the feeling of being "inauthentic all the time" or being in a state of "terminal uniqueness" (J. Bennet, 1993, p. 115). There is a feeling of being without a group of peers or being completely isolated, only acting as a cultural role player but never being an active agent creating culture. An encapsulated marginal is an individual at the DMIS stage of Integration who faces situations that they are not capable of acting in or responding to in a way that integrates their experience into their identity. It represents a kind of break or failure to fully integrate.

By being able to draw on two or more cultural frames of reference successfully, the *constructive* marginal actively creates boundaries, understanding his or her value structure

and acting on self-decided ways forward. In addition, a constructive marginal "feels authentic and recognizes that one is never not at home in the world (J. Bennett, 1993, p. 118).

Another important aspect of agreement between "mediating person" (Bochner, 1981) and "cultural marginal" (J Bennett, 1993; M. Bennett, 1993), explained by all three authors is that individuals can be both cultural marginals and mediating persons. The context, as well as the constructed meaning, of a given circumstance will determine if someone is one or the other or both simultaneously. Conceptually, this is simple to understand if we picture two cultures and draw a circle around each one. The space between those two cultures may be overlapping like in a Venn diagram, or a slightly open gap may exist. A person who stands in that space between the two cultures is both on the margins and in the position of a bridge, or mediator. The criteria for participation in the present study include being originally from a foreign culture, at least up to the undergraduate level at university, and currently living and working in Japan. It is partly this contextual reality that makes participants marginals and mediators.

One overarching goal of this study is to raise awareness of the experiences of cultural marginals and intermediaries. Especially with the exponential growth of both international students and faculty (Killick, 2018), and various types of transnational HE (Caruana, 2016), stakeholders within institutions often operate in multicultural and diverse contexts. Rather than existing completely alone, or within small bands of similar colleagues within one institution or even one country, there is "a global community" of marginals or intermediaries who all share a similar set of experiences (J Bennett, 1993, p. 116).

As an example in society of cultural marginals, it was found that among second-generation Hare Krishna culture adults none of the participants felt like they were part of mainstream culture (Horback, Rotherby-Jackson, 2007, p. 16). Participants experienced cultural marginality and felt as though they were in between Hare Krishna and mainstream culture. Participants referred to themselves as “observers,” “shape-shifters” (p. 8). Growing up as children of Hare Krishna converts, they did not consciously choose to be a part of that culture. However, because the culture was embodied in their parents and care-takers, they are in part members of the Hare Krishna community. Coming from a different set of religious and daily-life practices than most members of mainstream culture causes them to feel as if they occupy a liminal space. Another important finding is that second-generation

Hare Krishna participants of the study all felt a kinship with other second-generation followers (Horback & Rotherby-Jackson, 2007). As J. Bennett (1993) makes clear, to be a healthy "constructive marginal" one strongly identifies first with other marginals who have similar cultural experiences of being in-between.

The DMIS was used as the foundational theory behind a widely-used survey, the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI; Hammer, M. Bennett, Wiseman, 2003). The IDI has undergone thorough validity and reliability testing and is currently used in many countries around the world by researchers, students, schools, and organizations. The co-creator of the IDI instrument Hammer runs a company which trains people on IDI administration. The IDI is therefore a proprietary instrument. The owners of the IDI run training sessions and provide certification courses to people interested in administering the survey. To attend the training course in the US and administer the instrument in a study requires a large payment (Hammer Holdings, 2018).

Initially, Hammer, M. Bennett, and Wiseman (2003) created a questionnaire then refined it to 50 questions. The IDI has evolved with further research. In 2003, five factors were clearly delineated. The ethnocentric stages were: (1) Denial/Defense, (2) Reversal, and (3) Minimization. The ethnorelative stages were (1) Acceptance/Adaptation, and (2) Encapsulated Marginality. These were the categories that were possible to fit into a statistically reliable and valid survey.

The creation and continual testing of the IDI has shown that M. Bennett's (1986, 1993) DMIS is a useful theoretical framework to use in quantitative studies employing the IDI. More recently, the IDI positions individuals on the DMIS continuum, between Denial and Adaptation. The key difference between M. Bennett's (1986, 1993) DMIS theory and its application in the IDI (Hammer, M. Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003) is the final stage of Integration, in which M. Bennett includes the worldviews of encapsulated marginal and constructive marginal. Hammer (2011) explains that when statistically tested on the IDI, this final stage of Integration on the DMIS is more closely related to identity creation, and therefore not only limited to intercultural sensitivity like the previous four stages. For this reason, questions which might tease out a participant's cultural identity creation in Integration is not statistically testable on the IDI.

In one empirical study it was found that accurately placing individuals at the end stages of the DMIS, especially in the final stage of Integration, is problematic when scoring

the IDI (Lee Olson & Kroeger, 2001). As well as being involved in integrating two or more cultures into their own identity, Lee Olson and Kroeger's participants self-identified as "cultural mediators" (2001, p 129). Also of particular interest to the present study is their finding that cultural mediators seeming to score above the Adaptation stage of the DMIS tend to have both high second-language proficiency and experience living abroad for extended periods of time (Lee Olson & Kroeger, 2001).

In surveying 336 high school students, aged 13 – 19, Straffon (2003) had similar findings with regards to the final stages of the DMIS. As mentioned above, Adaptation is the final stage testable using the quantitative IDI measure. Students in this final stage of "Cognitive Adaptation" had spent a "significant amount of time in and among other cultures" (Straffon, 2003, p. 497). In fact, in averaging up the number of years students had spent outside their home culture, those in the final stage of intercultural development had spent 6.7 years abroad. As M. Bennett explicates, developing an intercultural worldview, or set of perceptions, necessitates lived experience in and with various cultures.

Similar findings are hinted at from the opposite point of view, where participants fail to score in the final stages of the DMIS. Klak and Martin (2003) administered pre- and post-tests of the IDI to students enrolled in their university courses. Their university's one-time culture event, a "Latin American Celebration" was the intercultural experience in which students partook in between surveys. In acknowledging that their students did not have opportunities to experience different cultural ways of being long-term, they found that "the final two stages (of Adaptation and Integration) are largely beyond the scope of typical university education" (Klak & Martin, 2003, p. 451). This statement reveals the way in which the ethnocentric stages and the first two ethnorelative stages of the DMIS are amenable to quantitative measures using the IDI. It is only after extended exposure and involvement with a culture, or cultures, different from one's own home culture, however, that Adoption and Integration can be seen.

It has also been suggested that through extended periods of time living in a foreign culture, it is possible to develop deep and complex cultural knowledge and ways of being, that are inextricably intertwined with moral decisions (Endicott, Bock, & Narvaez, 2003). Another study mentioning the importance of time spent living and working with others from different cultural backgrounds mentions the additional aspect of gaining depth of information from participants using multiple intercultural sensitivity measures, as opposed

to reducing the mode of data to quantitative measures, such as the IDI. Because their own study was delimited by the scores on the IDI, the participant scoring in the most advanced stage of intercultural sensitivity development was in Adaptation. In other words, the final stage of Integration did not factor into the study (Altshuler, Sussman, & Kachur, 2003).

The DMIS has also been used by researchers as a ground for developing other instruments to measure intercultural sensitivity. By choosing to not use the IDI, but to develop their own questionnaire, Roberson, Kulik, and Pepper (2002) used the constructivist and developmental presuppositions of the model as a foundation for their own process. The participants were graduate students of business. They underwent training in intercultural sensitivity by acting out role-play situations, where they actually had to go through behaviors and experiences that involved working with individuals from different cultural perspectives. Part of the researchers' rationale is based on the worry that by only asking about "attitudes or other psychological characteristics" responses may be subject to "social desirability bias" (p. 42). They instead had participants experience small-scale, but real-world, examples before answering a survey.

When taken together, the above applications of the DMIS demonstrate the strength of the IDI as a quantitative measure best employed when dealing with large numbers of participants who are predicted to score within the first five stages, up to Adaptation. This excludes participants who have spent lengthy periods living in and interacting with different cultures. The final developmental stage of Integration, especially, is not scoreable in quantitative terms (Paige, Jacobs-Cassuto, Yershova, & DeJaeghere, 2003), but is best seen as a dynamic worldview, where individuals are iteratively creating and re-creating their identity as they act as mediating marginals. Although participants of the current study may vary in their intercultural sensitivity, it is largely the way in which they are cultural mediators operating on the margins of two cultures that makes the DMIS the most applicable theory.

2.7 Hierarchy in Social and Organizational Structure

Universities are different than business organizations, making them difficult to evaluate in a similar fashion. Many businesses throughout the developed world have traditionally used the bureaucratic hierarchy as an organizational structuring tool. Universities, however, are often structured in a hierarchy but are clearly a different type of

organization. Mirroring the unique structure of the university on the whole is the differences between professors who cherish academic freedom and a high degree of autonomy and administrators who value efficiency, structure and organization (Bartell, 2003). Just as the previously mentioned studies conducted in Europe demonstrate the burgeoning context of hierarchical management taking away more time and energy from academics (Maassen & Stensaker, 2019), professors in Japan must devote immense amounts of time on administrative work. A part of the role, or status rank, of tenure-track and tenured professor in Japanese HEIs is the large amount of administrative work required (Morozumi, 2019; Poole, 2010).

After conducting pilot-study interviews with two professors, the research was narrowed down to areas where faculty are most involved in internationalization activities of their departments and universities, that of administrative work. As mentioned above, Poole (2010) makes this point explicitly: "*Kyoju* (professors) appear to spend most of their time in meetings, administrative tasks, and politicking and little time in 'educational' activities: teaching academic subjects to students. Likewise, time and energy spent on 'research' seems limited" (p.2) and less important than “extensive and time-consuming administrative work” (p. 24). This study focuses on administrative work because it is both the most important part of the work-life of tenure-track and tenured professors, and it is becoming an overpowering aspect of work that has yet to reach its limits within NPM ideologies, and the evolving effects of the 2004 NUCA incorporating Japanese public universities.

To take a closer look at the deep roots of status and hierarchy in Japanese society in general, Lebra starts from an explanation of how Japanese language itself includes daily-use words for "you" and "me" as locational markers, able to show rank between two individuals. For instance, *kochira* means "over here" and "me/us," while *sochira* means "over there" and "you." (1992, p. 50). In a historical analysis of social hierarchy in Japan, Lebra (1992) explains how the head of a noble household occupied the above (*kami*) position. The hierarchy presented is "tri-dimensional," meaning there are six polarities. The head of the household occupies the highest position, which includes interior (*oku*), above (*kami*), and front (*omote*). The opposite of these three positions is rear (*ura*), below (*shimo*), and exterior (*soto*). The head of the household is "above" and both in control of the family, house, and estate (interior), while also being publicly recognized as the head of the family (front). As an example, a servant who works in the kitchen is located at the bottom of the hierarchy and is

therefore rear and below. A servant such as a driver would be located below and exterior (Lebra, 1992, p. 65). There are perhaps many similarities in structure to other cultures, when considering royalty and nobility. A further detailed explanation of social hierarchy is beyond the scope of this study. However, it is important to explicitly recognize the deeply embedded and ancient structure of hierarchy. Even in a profession such as university academics, hierarchies can dominate. While perhaps similar to many other cultures in this respect, the importance of hierarchy is especially pertinent and obvious in Japanese language, and social and organizational relationships. One of the founders of the field of intercultural communication, E. Hall also offers as an exemplar of “highly structured hierarchies” the Japanese “special elaboration of status and deference” (1959, p. 40).

Thinking about the organizational structures in primary and secondary education more broadly, schools are often arranged in bureaucratic hierarchies (Packwood, 1989). So too are HEIs. Of course, in thinking of academics' work life holistically, they are professionals rather than employees in superordinate-subordinate relationships. However, it is precisely professors’ roles and specific work tasks in administration of their departments and universities where it can be seen how professors are working within a hierarchy.

One unstated presupposition that formed an important delineation in Whitsed's studies of foreign adjunct lecturers in Japanese HE is that of professional status (Whitsed & Wright, 2011; Whitsed & Volet, 2011; Whitsed & Wright, 2016). One criterion to participate in their study was being a part-time adjunct not on the tenure track. The reason is not because this is the only type of foreign faculty that exist. In fact, non-Japanese academics are employed on limited-term full-time contracts, usually limited to four or five years. Also, tenure-track and tenured positions are open to non-Japanese. The findings of Whitsed and his colleagues related to foreign adjuncts operating in a liminal space on the periphery of their departments and institutions stems from two main reasons. One is their being foreign, or non-Japanese nationals and Japanese as a second language speakers. Especially in a country like Japan where the total foreign population small, at around 2%, being a foreigner means that in most social and professional situations one is by definition in a minority and marginal position. The second reason Whitsed's participants operate mainly on the periphery being involved only in superficial internationalization is related to professional status. Full-time (year-to-year) contract lecturers are more involved at the curriculum level. Similarly, being tenured or on the tenure-track necessitates that professors are no longer

soto (outside) and *omote* (front/token) only. What then are the differences between being a part-time adjunct and being a tenured/tenure-track faculty member? This question led to the second theory applied to this study: Stratified Systems Theory (Jaques, 1976, 2006).

2.8 Hierarchy in Stratified Systems Theory (SST)

It has been argued that human actions reveal an ancient underlying hierarchical value structure in consciousness (Peterson, 1999). In order to act, the one best way forward must be chosen. At any one time, individuals have a variety of competing options of what action to take next. Many of these decisions are influenced by what is valued. To choose one thing over another, especially habitually, means that that pathway is valued over others in a hierarchy of competing options. In some sense, then, cognition and action point to underlying hierarchic structures (Peterson, 1999, p. 72).

Likewise, hierarchy in work situations are known to be 3,000 years old (Jaques, 2006, p. 1). Stratified Systems Theory (SST) takes as one of its cornerstones the fact that hierarchies are a natural structure. Jaques held degrees in science (BA), medicine (MD), and social relations (PhD). By tying together various fields of learning, he links mental processing and work within an organization through the natural structure of hierarchy (2006, p. 33). The ancient and psychological existence of hierarchy are mentioned here only to suggest the depth and significance of the structure. The primary reason hierarchy is applicable to this study is the specific choice to study tenure-track and tenured professors working in contexts influenced by NPM (Hanada, 2013). Much of Whitsed's findings were intimately intertwined with the fact that his participants were all part-time adjuncts and peripheral by contract (Whitsed & Volet, 2011; Whitsed & Wright, 2011). The difference in status between part-time adjuncts and tenure-track/tenured faculty is therefore expected to illuminate different types of experiences of foreign academics in Japanese HE.

In his theory, Jaques calls organizations that are structured in “bureaucratic hierarchies” (1976, p. 17) or “managerial accountability hierarchies” “requisite” (1976, p. 4; 2006, p. 1). By using the term requisite, Jaques means "in the sense of being called for by the nature of things, including man's nature" (1976, p. 6). SST starts "with the nature of human nature, values, and culture" (Jaques, 2006, p. 12). A necessary element of a requisite organization is trust and openness between all employees.

SST makes explicit the various facets of the hierarchy, which is made up of strata. Each stratum can be clearly categorized based on the "time-span of discretion of the role" of the employee (Jaques, 2006, p. 37; 1976, p. 109). A typical organization will have five or seven hierarchically organized strata. The time-span of a role is determined by looking at the task within the role that requires the longest time to bring to completion (Jaques, 2006, p. 24). A typical seven-layered organization will include the following strata and time-spans of work tasks.

- Stratum VII: 20 - 50 years.
- Stratum VI: 10 - 20 years.
- Stratum V: 5 - 10 years.
- Stratum IV: 2 - 5 years.
- Stratum III: 1 - 2 years.
- Stratum II: 3 months - 1 year.
- Stratum I: 1 day - 3 months.

An individual's role within the hierarchy can be determined by the time-span required in the longest work task they are responsible for. For example, a task that requires 18 months total will ideally be done by an individual who is at Stratum III in the organization. Thinking about foreign adjunct lecturers who are employed on one-year contracts, they fill a role that requires tasks to be completed within one or two academic semesters. In Japanese HEIs, a course lasts 15 weeks. Lecturers either have one-semester or two-semester long courses. It is likely that they would be at the equivalent of Stratum II in Jaques’s model. Tenure-track and tenured professors, however are in a role above Stratum II. Most foreign professors have a course that lasts two years, where students write their graduation thesis. They meet with the same class of students weekly in their final two years of university. Another common task foreign professors have is establishing and running study abroad programs with other universities. The researching, planning, carrying out, and evaluating and revising these programs can easily last around five years. This means that many tenure-track or tenured professors’ roles could be classified as Stratum IV or V in the hierarchy of their HEIs.

Time-span is an objective measure that determines where certain roles fall within a bureaucratic hierarchy. When considering the best fit for individuals within an organization,

Jaques provides two different approaches to determine which role one should requisitely occupy. Jaques initially theorized that there is a difference in mental levels of abstraction that correlate to the time-span of a role.

The following is the early formulation of Jaques (1976) theory with regards to how individuals might fit into the strata. This is a level-by-level description of how

> people at different work-strata actually work: differences in their perception of tasks, differences in the planning and organization of their work, differences in how they carry their relationship with the external task in which they are engaged, and indeed, in the fullest sense, qualitative differences in the way they picture the world in which they are working. (1976, pp. 142-3)

The first level of abstraction (time-span: below three months) is the *perceptual-motor concrete*. People who optimally work at this level are best at dealing with concrete objects that can be worked with directly. The second level of abstraction (time-span: three months - one year) is the *imaginal concrete*. Mostly, concrete objects or processes are dealt with, but with an added level of imagination where the objects are not always physically present. The third level of abstraction (time-span: one year - two years) is *imaginal scanning*. Work at this level involves long-term projects that require planning in parts. An entire project cannot be seen in the mind's eye at once, but by scanning different parts in imagination only. The fourth level of abstraction (time-span: two years - five years) is *conceptual modelling*. An individual working at this level must work with that which exists, but also be able to mentally picture alternative models to think about the pros and cons of implementing a vastly different working process, for example. The fifth level of abstraction (time-span: five years - 10 years) is *intuitive theory*. People working at this level are able to intuitively theorize what is happening in their field and to be able to construct alternative theories (Jaques, 1976, pp. 144-151).

After further developing SST, Jaques posited what he calls complexity of mental processing, which determines an individual's potential capability to do work (2006, p. 24). There are four methods of mental processing: (1) declarative processing, (2) cumulative processing, (3) serial processing, and (4) parallel processing. *Declarative processing* involves being able to offer separate and unrelated reasons for carrying out a task. *Cumulative processing* means that reasons are brought together in a reasoned sequence. *Serial processing* involves being able to put together a coherent chain of reasons for doing a task

in a certain way, and even includes the ability to explain two different lines of reasoning, for example. *Parallel processing* is the ability to weave together many different chains of reasoning, showing how they all interact and differ (2006, p. 22).

The clearest measure of where a role should be placed in the hierarchy of strata is that of the role’s work tasks time-span. As can be seen from Jaques own articulations of mental capacity and how it evolved into a less clearly delineated aspect of his SST theory, the actual capability of individuals to operate at the role they currently occupy involves subjective judgment and discretion. In fact, the most important presupposition underlying Jaques entire theory is that bureaucratic hierarchies are "human judgment systems" (2006, p. 21). SST aligns with the overall approach taken in the current research project. As will be explained in the next chapter, the methodological approach to this project is hermeneutic phenomenology, which also presupposes that humans and their thought processes ought to be the final arbiter, rather than "technocratic," purely objective and quantitative methods of management (Jaques, 1976, p. 56) or research (van Manen, 1990, p. 34). For Jaques, the time-span in a role is determined. In turn, the strata of roles in an organization are determined. In order to assess a person's work capability however, judgement and discretion must be involved while considering the complexity of mental processing and information complexity. The important point to remember here is that in order to have a requisite organization, all individuals should be in a role where their potential capability and their role's time-span align.

The globalized knowledge economy and neoliberalism are practically manifest in Japanese HE at least since the NUCA in 2004, that worked to strengthen top-down management control (Altbach, Reisburg, & Rumbley, 2009; Yonezawa, 2013). Research in Europe shows recent increases in time spent on administrative work of academics (Maassen & Stensaker, 2019), all while the use of this managerial control is channeled through hierarchy (Hanada, 2013; Lind, 2019). Jacques (1976) general theory of bureaucracy and SST is applicable to the current study when considering the aspect of work focused on herein: administration of HEIs by academics. A potential weakness of the theory lies in its later focus on organizations. By focusing on the level of individuals rather than institutions, the roles of individuals within hierarchies will remain the primary aim.

2.9 Brief Summary and Research Questions

This survey of the literature on internationalization of HE begins with Knight's (2004) definition, which includes "processes and functions," as well as "intercultural" aspects. It then incorporates Sanderson's (2008) levels of analysis, which add that of individual people involved. This is a similar approach to Cantwell and Maldonado-Maldonado (2009) who claim that rather than passively reacting to various forces of globalization, staff and faculty members in HEIs iteratively take part in creating globalization processes. This seems to be the same phenomenon happening with internationalization in HEIs in Japan. The greater context of the globalized knowledge economy was then briefly touched upon, as it has had a direct tangible influence on the management of HEIs in Japan, just as it has in multiple other countries around the world suffering from neoliberal, top-down finance-driven ideologies taking hold in the academy. A survey of multiple countries in Europe shows how hierarchies are being strengthened (Maassen, 2019). The NUCA in Japan formalized NPM in public universities as well (Hanada, 2013).

There are three qualitative studies that specifically look at international faculty and their work life in the US, UK, and Sweden. Researchers have learned that some foreign professors in the South West in the US believe that department-level support for foreign faculty, and training for non-foreign faculty, staff, and students, would be beneficial to help bridge the gap between their home and foreign cultural ways of teaching and being an academic (Munene, 2014). However, foreign professors in the UK conveyed their opinion that offering departmental support specifically because they are foreign is a type of stigmatizing discrimination (Pherali, 2012). Renc-Roe and Roxa (2014) found that rather than seeing themselves as foreign professors, participants in their study mainly saw their identities as being a part of their field of study. Regardless of their nationality they are part of an international peer group of academics.

In looking specifically at being a professor in Japan, Whitsed and colleagues found that part-time foreign adjuncts mainly fill the role of tokens of internationalization operating on the periphery or margins of their departments and universities (Whitsed & Volet 2011; Whitsed & Wright, 2011, 2016). In a book-length ethnography of the work-life of professors at a Japanese university, Poole (2010) found that administrative work outweighs both teaching and research in importance and time required.

Drawing on these researchers, as well as Lebra (1992) and E. Hall (1959), the theories of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (M. Bennett, 1986, 1993) and Stratified Systems Theory (Jaques, 1976, 2006) are chosen as the most appropriate to look at the experiences of being a foreign tenure-track/tenured professor working in Japanese HEIs.

The aim of the study is:

to investigate the lived experiences of tenure-track/tenured foreign English language professors (TFELP) employed at Japanese universities, against the backdrop of internationalization of HE, and within the broader context of the influences of new public management.

The objectives of the study are:

1. To demonstrate the ways in which TFELP are involved in their universities and departments with work that is beyond individual teaching and research.

2. To express the way TFELP experience the administration of their departments and universities, in light of increasing new public management trends in HE in Japan and worldwide.

3. To investigate and articulate the intercultural experiences of TFELP, in the context of their being both peripheral (non-Japanese) and central (tenure-track/tenured rank).

4. To provide recommendations on how TFELP and related stakeholders can improve their ability to administer their departments and universities in times of increased neoliberalism in HE.

The research questions that guide the study are the following.

1. How do TFELP employed at Japanese universities experience curricular, program, and other administrative work of their departments and universities?

2. In what ways do TFELP perceive and interpret their administrative work as taking place in a bureaucratic hierarchy?

3. In what ways do TFELP perceive and interpret their administrative work as intercultural experiences?

4. In what ways can the administrative work life of TFELP be improved?

The research questions reflect the overall exploratory nature of the study, looking specifically at the location where the individual and the institution interact in a context of internationalization of HE. The following chapter will present the underlying presuppositions of the approach, and the methods and techniques employed.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The aim of this research project at the outset was to gain an understanding of the way in which foreign English language tenure-track and tenured professors in Japanese universities perceive and understand their administrative work. The study is framed by the practices and ideologies of internationalization of HE, as well as the emerging influences of neoliberalism manifested as NPM. The topic was first conceptualized after considering the institutional discrimination of foreigners at Japanese HEIs reported on in I. Hall (1998) and in discussions with American-born tenured professor at Japanese universities. Structuralized discrimination is a reality in Japanese HE, especially when considering the historical contractual practices, that continue today, of universities employing non-Japanese academics (Jones, 1980). Later, the work of Whitsed showed how part-time adjunct foreign lecturers in Japanese HEIs are also peripheral and marginalized (Whitsed & Volet, 2011; Whitsed & Wright, 2011, 2016).

After considering the interconnected ideologies behind both internationalization of HE processes (Stier, 2004), and *kokusaika* (Burgess, et al., 2010; Whitsed & Wright, 2011) in the Japan context, it was determined that the meeting point of institution and individual is the optimal location of analysis. Decisions made, and actions taken by professors who are intimately involved in international and intercultural processes in HE are the building blocks of the iterative internationalization process. In particular, the "intercultural" (Knight, 2004) aspect involved in internationalization suggests that the spotlight be on individuals as the embodiments and co-creators of the intercultural.

The approach taken here is similar to the conceptual framework presented in a study of the meanings attributed to internationalization of the curriculum by participants across 15 universities in Australia. Leask and Bridge (2013) place "disciplinary teams" and the individuals on those teams at the core, the center, of their model which extends outwards to the "global context" (p. 84). One point of emphasis in their framework is that when it comes to designing and overseeing internationalization of the curriculum, the natural beginning is located within the specific discipline, the outer layers of the model are respectively: institutional context, local context, national and reginal context, and global context (Leask & Bridge, 2013). The complex nature of crafting and maintaining curricula,

therefore, considers the complex context, but must start at the center, with the people and teams directly involved.

Two studies looking at the role of individuals in internationalization were most informative to the chosen methodology of this study. Whitsed and colleagues used a phenomenological approach in their investigation of foreign adjunct lecturers in Japan. Also, Pherali (2012) employed hermeneutic phenomenology to study foreign professors in the UK. The informative nature of studies in this area suggested hermeneutic phenomenology (van Manen, 1990) as the most fit methodology for the current study. This approach "combines both interpretive/hermeneutic methods and descriptive/phenomenological methods for the purpose of examining the lived experiences or lifeworlds of those being studied" (Hatch, 2002). *Lived experience* is defined as: "our situated, immediate activities and encounters in everyday experience, prereflexively taken for granted as reality rather than as something perceived or represented" (Oxford Dictionary, 2011). Van Manen emphasizes that we are studying "already passed" or "lived through" experiences (1990, p. 10). Rather than investigating beliefs, attitudes, or policies, for instance, the focus was on participants' lived experiences and their reflections and interpretations of events and situations in the past, at the moment of the interview. The overall purpose of this study was to understand the role tenure-track and tenured foreign professors in Japanese HEIs have in the intercultural and internationalization processes of their departments and universities.

3.1 Phenomenology

Hermeneutic phenomenology is an interpretation-laden version of phenomenology and is nested within a constructivist paradigm. At the core of phenomenology as a philosophy as well as a research methodology is the worldview that: "What we perceive are 'first and foremost' not impressions of taste, tone, smell, or touch, not even of things or objects, but meanings" (Binswanger, 1963, p. 114). In other words, human beings and their sense-making processes through meaningful lived experience provide the material of data. Presuppositions underlying the constructivist approach, and this study, are that "each of us sees things differently" and "individual characteristics or social characteristics (such as era, culture, and language) can facilitate or obscure a given perception of the world" (Moses & Knutsen, 2012, p. 9-10).

Two dominant varieties of phenomenological methodologies are commonly used in education settings: transcendental phenomenology and hermeneutic phenomenology. For example, in their overviews of phenomenology as a qualitative research tradition, Patton (2002) draws mainly on van Manen's (1990) hermeneutic phenomenology, whereas Creswell (1998) draws most heavily on Moustakas's (1994) transcendental phenomenology. Van Manen's (1990) approach was chosen as the best fit for the current study. It will be discussed in detail below, and can be contrasted to Moustakas's (1994) conceptualization of transcendental phenomenology as an objective scientific approach where the job of the researcher is to "describe things in themselves, to permit what is before one to enter consciousness and be understood in its meanings and essences" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 27).

The call to phenomenologists is to look "to the things themselves" (Heidegger, 1962, p. 50; Moustakas, 1994, p. 26). The driving force behind transcendental phenomenology is to understand and describe the essence of the lived experience under study. The transcendental aspect of Moustakas's approach is the realization that although individuals, through their particular and unique perceptions and worldviews, will have unique experiences, the essences of those experiences will have an objective and transcendent quality. This ontological underpinning of transcendental phenomenology, which conflicts with the hermeneutic approach adapted to this study, can be seen in the following articulation.

> [Transcendental] phenomenology, step by step, attempts to eliminate everything that represents a prejudgment, setting aside presuppositions, and reaching a transcendental state of freshness and openness, a readiness to see in an unfettered way, not threatened by the customs, beliefs, and prejudices of normal science.... (Moustakas, 1994, p. 41)

Transcendental phenomenology as practiced by Moustakas, and seen in the line-by-line interview data analysis technique used in psychology by Hycner (1985), does not allow for outside theory to be involved. In addition, the effects of the researcher's interpretation and the epistemological acceptance of the researcher's overall involvement in drawing out, identifying, and representing meanings of lived experiences is minimized or ignored. As discussed in the Literature Review chapter, both theories applied to this study have strong presuppositions underlying them. The additional emphasis on hermeneutics was fully

incorporated into the methodology, forming a continuity between the phenomenological and constructivist approaches of M. Bennett (1998) and Jaques (1976).

The DMIS assumes that people are different; their cultural background and experiences play a role in how they interpret perceptions and experiences (M. Bennett, 1986, 1993, 1998, 2004). When culture is an object of study or an interpretive lens, inherent differences between individuals and groups act as a necessary presupposition. By way of a person's cultural framework, "there is an intervening set of patterns which channel his senses and his thoughts, causing him or her to react one way when someone else with different underlying patterns will react" differently (E. Hall, 1959, p. 118). Likewise, SST is built upon the assumption that hierarchy in work structures is ancient and requisite (Jaques, 1976, 2006). In hermeneutic phenomenology, even though "it is better to make explicit our understandings, beliefs, biases, assumptions, presuppositions, and theories" (van Manen, 1990, p. 47) one must also mentally step outside of one's own positionality to look to the phenomenon in itself. Throughout the data analysis, for instance, it was necessary to deliberately consider the ways in which participants may clearly *not* be experiencing their administrative work as cultural mediation or playing a role in a hierarchy.

The pertinent additional element in the methodology underlying this study is hermeneutics, or "how one interprets the 'texts' of life" (van Manen, 1990, p. 4). The aim was to provide an "interpretive description" (van Manen, 1990, p. 18) of the lived experiences of foreign professors' administrative duties in Japanese HEIs. The overlap between transcendental and hermeneutic variations of phenomenology is great. However, the inclusion of hermeneutics firmly places my approach in the interpretive/constructivist tradition, rather than a "transcendental realism" (Miles & Huberman, 1994) paradigm in the post-positivist tradition. In interviews, participants themselves were taking part in interpretations of their lived experiences to varying degrees. It was the researcher's goal to remain fully oriented to the research questions and the experiences under study. However, as in much of the research in the constructivist tradition, there was a clear recognition of the researcher "as a research instrument" (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). There was a conscious acceptance of the researcher's role in interpreting the participants' interpretations (see van Manen, 1990, p. 27).

3.2 Hermeneutic Phenomenology and Methods and Procedures

Researchers differentiate between methodology, methods, and research techniques or procedures (van Manen, 1990). Methodology refers to the overall approach to the research project, including philosophical positions on ontology and epistemology. It includes the assumptions discussed above, especially phenomenology as representing the fact that the primary focus of study is meanings and essences of lived experience. Phenomenology as methodology also includes the underlying worldview that individuals take an active part in meaning making and constructing reality, especially social and cultural reality. There is a fluid exchange of meaning in interaction between subjects and objects, rather than either the subjective or the objective perspectives being isolated or preferred. Knowledge is created by the researcher in a thoughtful iterative process, which includes taking part in a dialogue with participants who have experienced the phenomenon under investigation.

In considering methodology, method, and techniques, a closely-related approach to phenomenology, which was initially considered as an option for the present study, is narrative inquiry. Narratives share the underlying qualitative constructivist presuppositions, that people are actively involved in creating meaning through their experiences. By "co-constructing the stories that are told as part of the research," the researcher and the participants create narratives (Hatch, 2002, p. 28). Narrative inquiry as a research methodology has as its goal the production of "explanatory stories," where the end goal is a plot-driven story created in tandem with participants through reflection (Polkinghorne, 1995).

My application of narrative is within a phenomenological approach, similar to the manner in which stories, or narratives, have been described as methods or procedures in education research (not as methodologies), equating them with interviews as a source of data in qualitative research (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011, p. 455). As the fourth research question of this study makes clear, one aim is to make suggestions for improving professors' approaches to the demands of administrative responsibilities. In piecing together phenomenological descriptions, personal anecdotes and stories make up the bulk of the data. However, the final goal of co-creating a narrative with participants has been deemed inappropriate when considering the practical angle of the present study.

As within the hermeneutic phenomenology tradition of van Manen (1990) adhered to in this study, the specific methods used throughout require first of all that the researcher is “steadfastly oriented to the lived experience” (p. 43) of participants. As for methods chosen to apply to any particular research, the specific lived experience under investigation necessarily determines specific methods to be employed. Each hermeneutic phenomenological study will differ in its use of various methods. Van Manen (1990) suggests the following options for data collection.

- Using personal experience as a starting point
- Tracing etymological sources
- Searching idiomatic phrases
- Obtaining experiential descriptions from others
- Protocol writing
- Interviewing
- Observing
- Experiential descriptions in literature
- Biography as a resource for experiential material
- Diaries, journals, and logs

Once data has been collected, the researcher applies phenomenological reflection (van Manen, 1990, p. 77). The goal is to try to capture the essence of the lived experience, in the current study, the essence of engaging in administrative work for foreign professors. Because “meaning is multi-dimensional and multi-layered” an interpretive description of lived experiences requires one to consider multiple “meaning units” or “structures of meaning” (van Manen, 1990, p. 78). In making sense of the data during reflective analysis, the researcher notices and organizes themes. In phenomenology, “themes may be understood as the structure of experience” (van Manen, 1990, p. 79).

Hermeneutic phenomenology as practiced and explicated by van Manen (1990, p. 30) allows room for the researcher to “invent” or select specific techniques or procedures for data gathering and analysis. Falling within the qualitative tradition, interview techniques were drawn from Kvale (1996), and analysis and coding techniques were drawn from Corbin and Strauss (2015).

3.2.1 Methods: Interviewing

The qualitative research interview must be planned and structured to be consistent with all other aspects of methodology and the overall purpose of the research project. "The interviewer him- or herself is the main instrument for obtaining knowledge" (Kvale, 1996, p. 117). This study employed the semistructured, conversational interview. This type of interview allows the researcher to investigate specific areas of academic interest in an open format. The questions are conversational and linked to the research questions. Initially, an interview guide is prepared. Thinking about the research questions, the interview guide reflects conversation starters that will address the topic under study.

The interview questions can be categorized into nine types (Kvale, 1996, pp. 133-135):

1. Introducing questions – Open-ended questions that let the interviewer introduce topics of interest. E.g. "Can you tell me about...?"
2. Follow-up questions – Noticing "red lights" and significant words to ask about in more detail.
3. Probing questions – Asking for more details, for more elaboration on what is said.
4. Specifying questions – For example, clarifying if the participants themselves did or said something, rather than heard about something.
5. Direct questions – The interviewer specifically asks about themes that are relevant to the research.
6. Indirect questions – Asking about how the participant feels about another person's behavior, for example.
7. Structuring questions – Keeping the interview on track by respectfully steering the participant away from irrelevant topics.
8. Silence – Allowing the participant thinking time, especially on topics they may not have previously given much thought.
9. Interpreting questions – Involves the interviewer rephrasing what the participant has said to try to take one step towards interpretation and analysis.

The interview itself is recorded and a transcription made. The transcription of a recorded interview is a slight transition "from an oral to a written mode of communication" (Kvale, 1996, p. 163). The specific transcription process followed in this study will be discussed below.

3.2.2 Methods: Data analysis

The hermeneutic phenomenological reflection practiced in data analysis is to "grasp the essential meaning of something" (van Manen. 1990, p. 77). The overall goal driving analysis forward is "we try to unearth something 'telling,' something 'meaningful,' something 'thematic' in the various experiential accounts – we work at mining meaning from them" (van Manen, 1990, p. 86). The current study adopted the thinking techniques for analysis and coding strategies presented in Corbin and Strauss (2008). Hermeneutic phenomenology allows the study and the research questions to drive all decisions of methods and procedures. In the same way, Corbin and Strauss explicitly state how their approach "presents a set of analytic techniques that can be used to make sense out of masses of qualitative data" (2008, p. ix-x). In other words, the techniques of analyzing data that are used in grounded theory can be applied to any qualitative study aiming to "do 'quality' descriptions" (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. x). The data is coded after going through the following analytical thought processes (Corbin & Strauss, 2015, p. 90).

- Questioning
- Making comparisons
- Thinking about the various meanings of a word
- Using the flip-flop technique
- Making use of life experience
- Waving the red flag
- Looking at language
- Looking at emotions that are expressed
- Looking for words that indicate time
- Thinking in terms of metaphors and similes
- Looking for the negative case
- Using other analytical tools

The researcher uses all relevant knowledge to think carefully and in detail about the meaning of the participants' descriptions of their experiences. Analysis is done with full awareness that participants themselves engage in and co-create a dialogue with the researcher; they are reflecting and interpreting to various degrees the experiences under

discussion. The specific ways that these strategies were employed in data analysis will be discussed in detail below.

3.3 Methods and Procedures Employed

3.3.1 Pilot study and orienting to the lived experience of participants

As discussed above, there are two main theories that apply to this study. However, the hermeneutic phenomenological approach taken requires that the researcher begins with no a priori theories in mind at the outset. The backdrop and overall field of the study was established first. Namely, internationalization of HE in Japan in an increasingly neoliberal context under NPM. Everything being studied takes place within the boundaries of international and intercultural processes at play in HE. Next, after a review of the literature, including the ideologies and assumptions undergirding internationalization, the studies that stood out as most meaningful and salient were those that used phenomenology to investigate lived experiences of individual people. Next, it was decided that what would be pursued would be either the experiences of students or faculty members and their iterative practices that shape internationalization. Practical and ethical reasons led to a determination that faculty members were the best group of participants to focus on in this case. Due to the researcher's unavoidable career moves, it was not possible to have access to international or Japanese students as participants. Also, because faculty members are involved in conceptualizing, creating, running, and evaluating internationalized curriculum and programs that affect students, it is recognized that they are in a more central position of power when it comes to internationalization of HE.

By way of further explanation of the researcher's positionality, it should be noted that action research is one commonly adopted methodology in EdD research, especially in professional contexts. These stages of implementing change in action research as a key step in the research was not an option for me. Being at the level of non-tenured lecturer I work at multiple HEIs over short periods of time, including during the course of the EdD program. Having guaranteed access to research participants or programs where change might be implemented as a part of the research was not an option.

The underlying presuppositions of action research include implementing a change, or "social action," and in some way measuring the results in a looping sequence (Glassman, Erdem, & Bartholomew, 2012). The type of processes carried out by while incorporating case studies, Leask and Bridge (2013) use action research as an umbrella methodology, with a recognition that all who are involved in internationalization of the curriculum are operating in a complex environment where continuous revisions, updates, and modifications are required. However, during the early stages of the current research project, action research was ruled out on grounds of not being practically possible.

Prior to the start of the data gathering stage of the research, two pilot interviews were conducted. The interviews will be described here inasmuch as they helped determine the final focus of the study and the shape of the research questions themselves. The decision to focus on administrative duties of professors, not research or teaching activities, was the result of a careful refining process.

The pilot interview participants chosen were tenured English language professors. Andrew had been a tenured professor for 20-25 years. He is a fellow member of an academic association. The interview took place in his office. David had been a tenured professor for 3-5 years. He was also a fellow member of an academic association. The interview took place in a local coffee shop. Both interviews were transcribed and analyzed. These interviews allowed for practice of all stages of research: planning the interviews, interviewing – questioning and listening skills, taking field notes, transcribing, and analyzing data.

During these early interviews, it became clear that to gain a better understanding of internationalization happening in Japanese HEIs, it was best to look to the nexus of where individuals are engaged in curriculum, program, and other administrative work of their departments. In other words, two levels where internationalization of HE takes place meet in this study: the level of the institution (Knight, 2004), and the level of the individual (Sanderson, 2008). The approach arrived at post-pilot interviews is similar to the model presented in Appleby and Pilkington's (2014) approach to being a critical professional. Their model has at the center of all professional learning the individual. The outer levels or context within which professional practitioners work include the institution and the wider context (p. 130). The starting point and center of the process, however, is *the individual*. Because theirs was one of the first studies of its kind, Whitsed and colleagues asked foreign

adjunct lecturers about their overall impressions of working in a university in Japan. Similarly, in the pilot interviews for the current study, questions about the participants' overall workload were asked. Both teaching and research were possible topics, and were discussed in some depth.

After further refining, through the pilot interviews and the review of relevant literature, it was determined that personal research and teaching are likely to have less of an impact on internationalization. In fact, in these areas of a foreign professor's work life, it is possible to be completely uninvolved in what would be recognized as internationalization. The aspect of academic work-life, however, where all TFELPs are engaged in internationalization is their administrative work. Partly because their positions in Japanese universities are actually reserved for non-Japanese native English-speaking professors, internationalization and intercultural experiences are common among all TFELP. The data gathered from these pilot interviews is not included as data in the current study. They were a necessary element in further refining the topic and carried out with a recognition that learning to interview is done "primarily through one's own experience with interviewing" (Kvale, 1996, p. 147).

3.3.2 Sampling

After carefully considering all data-gathering options (listed above) employed in hermeneutic phenomenological studies, interviewing was chosen to be the most fruitful, realistic, and painless for participants. Sampling was both purposive and snowball (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). In order to address a gap in the professional literature, the specific group of tenure-track and tenured professors was chosen. As was explicated above, experiences of part-time adjunct foreign lecturers (Whitsed & Wright 2016), as well as junior international faculty members (Brotherhood, Hammond, & Kim, 2019) have been found to be largely playing a "token" role in internationalization of Japanese HEIs. Along with other researchers in the Asian region who exclusively interviewed international or foreign participants (e.g. E. Kim, 2015; S. Kim, 2016 in Korea), and recent research on English Medium of Instruction carried out in Japan (Brown, 2019), it was determined following the early stages of the study to focus on non-Japanese professors of English.

Practical realities also worked to form the boundaries of research possibilities of the present study. It was not possible to focus on one institution, as personal and professional obligations required that I live in Japan and the US, working at multiple different HEIs during

the course of the project. A second practical reason for excluding Japanese nationals as participants was the researcher's limited language abilities and an uncertainty about the reliability in employing interpreters. At the start of the research project, I had 12 years of experience living and working in Japan. Throughout the years I, and colleagues around me, have had innumerable difficulties in mixing English and Japanese. It was determined that to use English exclusively would be the optimal way to avoid misunderstandings, especially stemming from cultural differences that are intertwined with the use of language.

One example of cultural differences between native Anglophones and Japanese that complicates intercultural communication studies is the difference of public and private self and the amount of information people are comfortable disclosing in conversation. In a classic work, Barnlund (1975) explains the psychological difference that can exist between those with a Japanese background as compared to a US background. Especially with an interlocuter who is relatively unknown, the tendency for Japanese is to be "predominantly passive" and "to withdraw from further exploration of sensitive matters" (p. 118). In the field of linguistics, Yamada (1997) makes a similar point with regards to the predominate private self. Especially in conversation, Japanese treat talk as a communicative medium that warrants caution and suspicion" (Yamada, 1997, p. 17). Whereas Poole (2010) was an insider conducting an ethnographic study of his particular institution and was trusted by his Japanese colleagues, the present study is similar to Whitsed's work, where the researcher did not hold a position of status or intimacy at one HEI while carrying out the interviews.

The criteria for participation in this study were that the participants are a:

- Foreign national (to Japan) and native English speaker
- Tenure-track or tenured professor at a university in Japan
- TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages), applied linguistics, or culture (i.e. intercultural communication) specialty.

Participants were drawn from a professional network in the Kansai area of Japan. They were all people met through academic associations or graduate school-organized workshops. The participants all attended Japan Association of Language Teachers (JALT) conferences, the Society for Intercultural Education, Training, and Research (SIETAR) conferences, or Temple University Japan lectures on language or culture education. 15 participants were contacted purposively and two were introduced by other participants, following the snowball

technique. 17 potential participants were identified and emailed, asking them to volunteer to participate. 14 people agreed to be interviewed and were participants in this study. Table 1 below lists the status of participants and the approximate number of years they have been in their positions. All participants are ethnically white. Five participants worked for small universities, with student enrollment between 2,000 and 4,000 students. 9 participants worked for large universities, with 18-25,000 students enrolled. Their countries of origin are Australia = 1, Canada = 3, UK = 4, USA = 6. All participants came to Japan sometime after their university undergraduate education was completed. 13 participants are male, one female.

Table 1

Participant Characteristics

Pseudonym	Tenure-track/tenured	Approximate number of years in position	Public or private university
Alex	tenure-track	1-2	private
Adam	tenured	11-15	private
Don	tenured	26-30	private
Ed	tenured	26-30	private
Hank	tenured	16-20	private
Harold	tenured	6-10	private
John	tenured	21-25	private
Larry	tenured	6-10	public
Mary	tenured	3-5	private
Pete	tenured	11-15	public
Rudy	tenured	11-15	public
Sam	tenured	6-10	public
Vern	tenured	6-10	private
Warren	tenure-track	3-5	private

Interviews were conducted in the participant’s office, at a coffee shop, or online, via Skype. The interviews lasted between 56 minutes and two hours, with the average length being one hour and 22 minutes. All participants were guaranteed anonymity and were informed that their participation was voluntary, meaning they could decide to withdraw at any time. An interview guide with four main questions was followed (see Appendix 1). After briefing the participants on the aim of the research, an open-ended question asking participants to talk about the administrative work they are involved in was asked.

Administrative work is explained here as work that is not personal research and teaching. There is only one case where a participant discussed research that he is involved in as a part of a university-wide committee. Also, participants were asked to discuss teaching only in its connections to administration. The main examples of this are when participants are supervisors of part-time adjunct teachers or work on curriculum that is program- or department-wide. The specific topics of conversation that were provided to participants in writing via the participant information sheet are:

- Meetings
- Department or school events
- Open-school events
- Curriculum development
- Interactions with faculty and staff in department
- Ceremonies or official events
- Intercultural activities, such as study abroad
- Other programs and administrative duties.

The interview guide the researcher followed, but the participants did not see, had a similar but more exhaustive list of topics to discuss:

- Administrative work:
    - Committee work
    - Faculty meetings
    - Overseeing faculty, hiring teachers for instance
    - Other administrative work
- Curriculum-level work:

    - Setting course or program requirements
    - Deciding textbooks, goals and objectives, or assessments for other teachers
    - Entrance exam work
    - Collaboration with colleagues
    - Other curriculum-related work
- Other programs or events:
    - Open-school or PR events such as high school visits
    - Study abroad, curriculum or trips
    - Official events, such as entrance or graduation ceremonies, required retreats
- Use of Japanese at work:
    - Speaking with staff, reading, writing

Interviewing within the hermeneutic phenomenological tradition has two purposes. One is for “exploring and gathering experiential narrative material” in the form of “stories, anecdotes,” and “examples of experiences” (van Manen, 1990, p. 66). The participants were therefore asked to share anecdotes and specific examples of decisions they had made and activities they had been involved in while carrying out their administrative work. The second purpose of interviewing is to “develop a conversational relation with an interviewee about the meaning of an experience” (van Manen, 1990, p. 66). As is consistent with the tradition of phenomenology, the interviewer guides the interview under the assumption that the participants are co-creators of their reality. The meanings attached to their lived experiences are explicitly and implicitly addressed throughout.

Below are examples of interview questions asked, following Kvale (1996, pp. 133-135).

- *Introducing questions*: Please tell me about the administrative work that you are involved in.
- *Follow-up questions*: I would like you to talk about your use of the term slave, or slave to two masters. (Rudy)
- *Probing questions*: And how do you feel about that (study abroad) program? (Adam)

- *Specifying questions*: (Discussing a study abroad program and working with a colleague from the Philippines) Do these projects and decisions happen in a casual way? (Warren)
- *Direct questions*: It sounds like your job title could be liaison. (Vern)
- *Indirect questions*: Can you tell me a little more about what you meant when you said the incompetent people, or the people who aren't interested? (Pete)
- *Structuring questions*: Yeah, that's my next topic of discussion, we can talk about that now. (John)
- *Interpreting questions*: It sounds like you are pretty flexible, you take into consideration the perspective of the people you are working with. (Mary)

All the interviews were recorded using a digital recording device. Understanding that they were participating in doctoral dissertation research, all participants agreed to the interview being recorded.

After each interview, field notes were written. This served two main purposes. It was necessary to reflect on the way the interview went. The role of the researcher in deciding the types of questions, the amount of prodding for more information, and the comfort level of the participants to open up, were all considered carefully and improved upon with each successive interview. Also, the overall impression that the interview created was recorded. It was important to write out a simple description of the atmosphere of the conversation and any specific thoughts that would not show up clearly later in inspecting the transcribed dialogue itself. The field notes were used for reference purposes, to shed light on the data analysis.

Although it is understood that "transcribing involves translating from an oral language, with its own set of rules, to a written language with another set of rules" (Kvale, 1996, p. 165), the speech of participants was not changed in any way. It could be argued that because the participants in the current study are professors, they often speak in a style that more represents written language than many other sections of society. This was certainly the case most of the time. The oral utterances of participants were not included in the transcription in only two cases. If the participant repeated words or thinking sounds such as "um" or "oh" they were not included. Also, to maintain anonymity, when the participants gave specific names, for instance of programs or places, the transcript does not

include this information. An example is if the participant said the name of their university, the transcript reads: my school. The beginning of the transcriptions all include a summary of the main points discussed in the interview. The audio recordings were listened to two times. The first time to create the transcriptions, and the second time to carefully go over each word again, double checking that what was written in the transcription matched what was said.

After removing all potentially identifying information and including a summary of topics discussed, the transcripts were emailed to participants. They were asked to check for accuracy and again were able to remove any information that they did not feel comfortable disclosing. There were no follow-up interviews. The pilot interviews conducted prior to the start of official data collection, as well as the narrow focus decided upon after a review of the professional literature, allowed all the interviews to be well-focused and mostly on-topic. In hermeneutic phenomenology as the guiding methodology of this study, the researcher did not “let method rule the question, rather than the research question determining what kind of method is most appropriate” (van Manen, 1990, p. 66). Because the main research question was formulated prior to the start of the interviews as it is written above, one conversational interview per participant allowed sufficient amount of data to be gathered.

3.3.3 Data analysis

The techniques of data analysis detailed in Corbin and Strauss (2015, p. 90) derive from what was initially termed constant comparison (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Grounded theory is a methodology in and of itself and was not chosen as fit for this study. Grounded theory requires the research to be driven by theory construction and therefore does not incorporate outside theory to aid in analyzing data and emerging themes (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). Especially in research primarily concerned with practice, as with the EdD, grounded theory may be an approach that takes research one step too close to theory and one step too far from practice. The aspect of theory building, therefore, was not applied to this study. However, as suggested by van Manen (1990), techniques and procedures for data analysis are flexibly chosen by hermeneutic phenomenologists with the ultimate goal of staying oriented to the research question and the essence of lived experience. The following are some specific examples of the ways in which data analysis was conducted in this study. The techniques are thought processes the researcher goes through, not questions included in

the interview. Participants' utterances are listed first; the notes written during the analysis follow.

1. Alex: "There's the entrance examination that you have to sit in and proctor, which is several hours of utter tedium. Sitting quietly, interspersed with the occasional stroll. And sitting back down again. Yeah, you've got to be quite strict. You're not supposed to do anything. You're not allowed your phone in there. I understand. In one of them I chose to write poetry, quite surreptitiously so. And I think I got away with that. But it's quite a tedious activity."

- *Questioning*

How much does Alex and other participants adjust and mold themselves (ideas, principles, behaviors, communication style, etc.) to the institution? What is this doing to him/them?

2. Alex: "I think they are just not used to dealing with the new guy. So there's going to be communication issues, misunderstandings and me simply not knowing stuff, which is, you know, problematic."

- *Making comparisons*

This reminds me of Larry saying that he had to ask lots of questions when he first started. He thought it was a good way to get to know people and be proactive.

3. Adam: "It depends on, for example, our coordinator for one of the courses is working on American studies, and then my colleague is the second pair of eyes."

- *Thinking about the various meanings of a word*

Most might say this is just a set phrase, a unique synecdoche, but is this the case? Literally it means that the second person is interchangeable, as long as they have eyes they qualify. How much of the administrative work of participants is like this? In some ways, it is like musical chairs. Of course, there are cases where people are chosen or by chance their skills match the job really well. But still, this seems like more of a chance occurrence than a regular part of the process of matching people to tasks.

4. Adam: "Where the ideas come from and that it is not just, oh, this is my idea. At the beginning, when we were first designing the program, I was looking at James D. Brown,

his book on curriculum and also van Leer. I forget the title, it's like authenticity and autonomy. But, it's about curriculum development. So we were looking at different sources for thinking about curriculum.

- *Using the flip-flop technique*

One interesting way to think about this would be to see if anyone talks about Japanizing HE, using the ideas of Japanese academics/theoreticians as a basis. Other than the preference given to Japanese nationals from early on in HE, late 19th century, there has been no reference of this.

5. Hank: "That was a revelation to me. And that helped me a lot when I was working with Japanese colleagues to set up these trips. Waving off Japanese colleagues who were taking groups of students overseas and so on, realizing that for them, there was a huge responsibility of making sure that everything went well. And for me, there was only the joy of seeing students grow in front of me. And, if you asked me to take a group of students overseas tomorrow I'll jump at the opportunity, because that is such an addictive experience. But for a lot of my Japanese colleagues, the main experience was, I hope nothing goes wrong, nobody gets hurt, nobody gets run over."

- *Waving the red flag, which includes questioning the researcher's assumptions*

It seems strange that professors go on trips abroad with students. None of the participants so far have talked about if it is odd to have professors going on trips with university students. This is something that would never happen in the States. Students would always go by themselves. The amount of paternalism experienced in the relationships between professors and students in Japan is something interesting.

6. Hank: "I was only a pretend vice president anyway, but I made some suggestions, some strategy. We tried and that didn't work either. The meeting went on for hours and hours."

- *Looking at language*

"Pretend vice president"? As he said, this was to give him necessary power to deal with schools abroad, setting up exchanges, etc. It is interesting how in this case it is actually *not* pretend. He is thrust into the role of being the actual vice president here.

7. John: “Usually the person who heads it up, always I think, the head of the committee is a full professor, and I’m not so I’ve never headed that committee. And we talk about the international students, or students going overseas. We interview students to see if they qualify to go overseas for various study abroad programs. We, that group, they kind of take care of our international students. We kind of monitor what they do.”

- *Using other analytical tools – Explicit comparison*

This is another case of foreign faculty members being in a liaison position, overlooking foreign students. Think about the significance of the term *monitor* here, and look at the overall narrative in comparison, as well as other participants’ use of this type of language.

The above demonstrate the explicit analytical techniques employed while reading through the data. Constant comparison during phenomenological reflection happens both within and across participants’ explanation of experiences.

The data was initially coded for topics. The topics discussed the most include: committee work, curriculum, relationships with colleagues and staff, Japanese use, and workload. Next, thematic statements were identified or created after following constant comparison techniques outlined above. Themes are identified using a “wholistic or sententious approach,” and “the selective or highlighting approach” (van Manen, 1990, p. 92-3). It is acknowledged that in identifying emerging themes, the researcher makes a “judgement call” (van Manen, 1990, p. 94). In thinking about individual statements within the overall interview conversation, the researcher pays attention to those that repeat or point to a pattern. Also, with the highlighting approach, some themes or concepts are taken directly from what participants have said. The Findings and Discussion chapter will be organized thematically. As discussed in the literature review, status and hierarchy were deciding factors at beginning stages of the research, stemming from the findings of Whitsed and Volet (2011), and the emerging developments caused in part by NPM (Yonezawa, 2013). The traditional idea and present reality of Japanese universities make them both collegial, which includes autonomous self-driven work among equal colleagues; and hierarchical, where administrative structure clearly divides power among higher and lower ranks (Hanada, 2013). This potential dichotomy was therefore especially salient when coding the data, as the influence of bureaucratic hierarchy plays a part in administration.

The concepts of the cultural mediator and cultural marginal discussed in the literature review also informed the data analysis. Previous research found that long-term engagement with another culture (Straffon, 2003), and high-level proficiency in a second language (Lee Olson & Kroeger, 2001), result in participants scoring in the penultimate stage of Adaptation or being beyond quantifiable measures in the final stage of Integration on the DMIS. This studies qualitative and hermeneutic phenomenological approach is designed to investigate individuals who are beyond quantifiable on a survey such as the IDI, but are in the process of creating and recreating their own cultural identity (Paige, Jacobs-Cassuto, Yershova, & DeJaeghere, 2003), while simultaneously building their HEI's internationalization processes, programs, and curricula.

The overall purpose of the research is to address emergent themes which together make up the lived experience of doing administrative work.

3.4 Quality and Verification

Hermeneutic phenomenology is a human science (Moustakas, 1994; van Manen, 1990). The study is of lived experiences of human beings. In order to verify and judge the quality of the research findings, the phenomenological tradition looks directly to the researcher's interpretations (Creswell, 1998, p. 207). The researcher plays a role as a research instrument, but the procedures are transparent, systematic, and rigorous. The specifics of the manner in which the interviewing and analyses were carried out are presented in this chapter as a way to make explicit the ways in which the research moved forward. Rather than thinking in terms of validity and reliability as understood in the quantitative traditions, where statistics make up a part of the data, hermeneutic phenomenological studies are evaluated on their own merit. With regards to how to evaluate the quality of a study, van Manen (1990, p. 18) offers the following:

> "Human science research is rigorous when it is 'strong' or 'hard' in a moral and spirited sense. A strong and rigorous human science text distinguishes itself by its courage and resolve to stand up for the uniqueness and significance of the notion to which it has dedicated itself."

The ultimate goal in analysis and writing up the interpretive descriptions of participants' experiences is to strive for "precision and exactness by aiming for interpretive descriptions

that exact fullness and completeness of detail, and that explore...the fundamental nature of the notion being addressed" (van Manen, 1990, p. 17). The themes and aspects of what it is like for TFELP to do administrative work in Japanese HEIs will be discussed. The ultimate evaluation criteria will be whether the interpretative descriptions are "well-grounded and well supported" in the interview data presented (Creswell, 1998, p. 208).

3.5 Positionality and Ethics

Ethics approval was granted by the committee for research ethics (see Appendix 2 & 3 for the consent form, ethics approval letter, and participant information sheet). None of the participants were employed by the same HEI as the researcher, which eliminated any considerations of conflict of interest. A participant information sheet was prepared and distributed to all potential participants. Participants were informed of the purpose of the study, and were guaranteed anonymity throughout. After having a chance to ask questions, the participants signed a consent form, which explains that they are ultimately in control of their data and can withdraw from the study at any time.

The personal stance of the researcher is present in the decision-making throughout the study. A list of personal researcher principles will be enumerated. First, I only considered carrying out a study where individual people were the center of attention, the primary focus, and the loudest, strongest voice. This decision was based on principles similar to those expressed in recent work of David Killick (2018, p. xiii), where he says, "we should be constantly vigilant to remember that our students and our colleagues are, and have the right to be seen as, individuals whose identities matter." By this I mean that I did not see other aspects of internationalization of HE to be as primary or pressing, for example, by looking at policy documents (e.g. Yonezawa & Meerman, 2012), or university mission statements (e.g. Anzai & Matsuzawa, 2013), areas that have been investigated in the past. After a review of the literature focusing on HE, it became clear that more studies including the attitudes, opinions, and experiences of academics actually doing the work of internationalization in HEIs was lacking. A corollary to this personal belief in the centrality of human beings and their lived experiences, was a preference of the researcher to talk with people, to get to hear stories and reflections on actual experiences. The mode of sitting and personally speaking with participants was preferred over another mode such as content

analysis or quantitative surveys where no conversational interaction with participants would have taken place.

As I am a limited-term contract lecturer, non-tenured, I also preferred to avoid choosing a group of teachers that were at the same status level as myself. It may have been more difficult for me to divorce my own experiences and opinions from participants. Bracketing my biases (Moustakas, 1994) throughout the data gathering and analyzing stages was easier in part because of this difference in status. Another principle that determined the final methodology of the study was my desire to avoid revealing too many confidential aspects of HEI processes. In other words, carrying out a case study or an ethnography of certain types of meetings, or at a particular university were avoided. I have no interest in trying to "uncover" anything that personnel do not wish to have disclosed. Also, I want participants to be active in describing and creating their own stories. During conversational interviews they could leave out stories or aspects of work that they thought might put their colleagues in an awkward position, for instance. There was no attempt by the researcher to be objective. Rather, my goal throughout is to be complete, thorough, and to honestly represent the lived experiences of participants.

3.6 Summary and Review

Going back to the Greek, the etymology of the term phenomenology reveals the two pieces of the word. Phenomenon- means "to show itself," and comes from the verb form meaning "to bring to the light of day." Where -logy is a form of logos, meaning "discourse," in the sense that "what is said is drawn from what is talked about" (Heidegger, 1962, p. 51-6). Phenomenology acknowledges the way that talking and writing about lived experiences are a part of the understanding and creating of meaning. More so, hermeneutic phenomenology includes the explicit methodological aspect of interpretation, which places it firmly in the qualitative and constructivist research traditions. The research questions drive the project from start to finish. Especially important to hermeneutic phenomenology is the significance placed on the role of the researcher, especially in his or her role as a writer. The writing up and sharing of the interpretive descriptions of participants' lived experiences is one of the most essential aspects of research.

With complete awareness “that lived life is always more complex than any explication of meaning can reveal” (van Manen, 1990, p. 18) this chapter has laid down the overall methodology, the specific method of interviewing, and the data analysis and coding techniques. The grounding of the findings presented in the following chapter will be firmly in the data, in the structures of meaning revealed during interviews and reflected upon systematically by the researcher.

The technical processes involved in interviewing followed recommendations by van Manen (1990) and procedures from Kvale (1996). The interviews were conversational and semi-structured. Two pilot interviews were conducted prior to data gathering. This allowed the research to be properly focused and vital learning through practice to be gained. An interview guide listing four questions and 13 possible topics related to administrative duties was followed. Interviews with 14 participants lasted an average of one hour 22 minutes. All relevant steps in the ethics review and the securing of anonymity were strictly followed. Transcripts were checked and approved of by participants.

Data analysis followed the carefully prepared transcriptions of the interviews. Analytical procedures from Corbin and Strauss (2015) were adapted to fit the needs of this study. Especially, the various thought processes systematically carried out were evolved and elaborated forms of constant comparison (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The data was coded initially for topics, and next for emerging themes. Throughout the interviewing and analysis, the focus remained clearly on the lived experiences pertaining to administrative duties of TFELP. This chapter has presented the specific steps followed throughout the research process, the end goal being a greater understanding of how individuals are iteratively involved in and creating the intercultural through internationalization of HE.

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion

This research uses hermeneutic phenomenology to investigate the lived experiences of foreign academics working at Japanese universities. Considering the levels of analysis that Knight (2004) and Sanderson (2008) outline as locations where internationalization of HE is taking place, this study exists at the meeting point of the levels of the institution and the individual. Through a review of the literature and early pilot interviews, it was recognized that teaching and research that participants undertake may not necessarily be related to internationalization. Therefore, the time-consuming and often top priority of administrative work (Poole, 2010), in an increasingly neoliberal context prioritizing NPM ideologies (Morozumi, 2019), was chosen to focus on as the area where all participants are involved in internationalization of their HEIs. Throughout the chapter, the research questions will be answered holistically. Just as they helped to shape the methodology and methods of the study, they form the frame of each section of analysis.

Research Question 1: How do TFELP employed at Japanese universities experience curricular, program, and other administrative work of their departments and universities? This question will be addressed throughout the chapter under the overarching categories of Hierarchy and Cultural Mediator.

The aspect of participants' lived experiences that edge closest to the level of the institution that will be presented in this chapter can be broadly defined as taking place in a Hierarchy. Throughout the interviews, participants make sense of their administrative work as happening in a sort of bureaucratic hierarchy. Intertwined with many of these ways of understanding their work for their institutions are the ways in which participants embody the role of a Cultural Mediator. Rather than looking at the objective structure of hierarchic work relationships, when considering the participants' experiences from a more subjective vantage point, the way that they as individuals help to create internationalization is evident. This chapter will present and critically analyze the units of meaning (van Manen, 1990) that, when taken together, make up the way foreign tenure-track and tenured professors make sense of their administrative work in a context increasingly influenced by NPM (Morozumi, 2019).

Six themes emerged from the interview data. The themes fit under the categories of Hierarchy and Cultural Mediator. The lived experiences of working in a Hierarchy include the themes:

1. *Doing what you are told*,
2. *Maintaining the structure*, and
3. *Autonomy*.

The lived experiences of working as a Culture Mediator include the themes:

1. *Japanese way*,
2. *Different cultural perspective*, and
3. *Cultural liaison*.

The experiences of working in a hierarchic structure will be presented first. *Doing what you are told* and *maintaining the structure* are the two core themes that intertwine to construct the majority of the lived experiences of working in a hierarchy. The archetypal image of a hierarchy is the pyramid. Participants can be seen as occupying a position near, but not at, the top of the pyramid. *Doing what you are told* could be pictorially imagined as listening to the people who are above oneself in the pyramid. In other words, people who have a higher status, such as the dean of the faculty, or the president of the university, occupy positions above the participants and direct their work in part. Also, rather than a specific person ranked above the participants telling them what to do, another aspect of these experiences is that the institutional structure, policies, and practices determine their administrative responsibilities.

On the other hand, *maintaining the structure* is best pictured as participants setting tasks or limits for individuals who are in a status position below them on the pyramid, in this case contract full-time lecturers, part-time adjunct lecturers, and some office staff. The third unit of meaning making up the category of hierarchy is *autonomy*, which describes lived experiences where a tension manifests itself through the seemingly contradictory work reality of being an autonomous, tenured especially, professor, and working within a hierarchic structure. These experiences are when autonomy reigns, and hierarchy falters. In the following section, the three structures of meaning making up Hierarchy will be presented and described in detail.

4.1 Category 1: Hierarchy

Research Question 2: In what ways do TFELP perceive and interpret their administrative work as taking place in a bureaucratic hierarchy?

Research Question 2 is answered in sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3. Just as the six meaning units or themes of participants' lived experiences emerged from the data, the category of Hierarchy was clearly suggested by participants themselves. In discussing his recently acquired position as a tenure-track faculty member, Alex describes his role as "having an elevated position means it's more scope to do more good." This metaphoric language of being in a *higher* position is found in many of the participant's explanations of their roles.

While discussing his administrative responsibilities in two different departments, Rudy repeatedly uses the term "I'm a slave to two masters." When asked about what this term means to him, he explains that, "It's hierarchical, right? So even though I'm above some people, I'm below other people."

Ed was directly asked in the interview about who specifically assigns administrative work to professors, whether it is the office staff, a dean, or someone like that. He answers: "usually a lower down person...It might be the idea of some top person, but then someone lower down will ask you to do it." In a similar mention of people in a higher position than participants, Don describes the decision to construct a new building on his campus: "Nobody approached me and said, what do you think about this? It was pretty much fiat from the top." These few examples show the typical mindset of participants. While describing in greater detail the units of meaning making up the category Hierarchy, similar such language discussing those above or below in status will be evident.

While discussing trips abroad that he organized and took with students, Hank articulates the fact that his institution was organized in a hierarchy, but that the distance between the ranks was short:

> "When there were big unforeseeable issues, certainly my boss, as head of the language center, would be very much involved on an hourly basis. And if there were huge issues, the president would also be involved. Quite a small university, so quite a flat organization."

These specific terms used by participants is of special interest: "slave," "fiat from the top," and "flat organization." Jaques (1976) makes explicit how bureaucratic organization

“should at all costs be avoided” in universities. Hierarchic organization of institutions is inappropriate where collegial relationships exist in practice and help to define the employees’ role. To some degree, participants are unquestioning in their responses to superiors; revealed in their language, however, is the competing traditional governing ideology of collegiality, which largely form the participants’ work lives when it comes to research and teaching (Bleiklie, 2018; Morozumi, 2019). So even though participants lived experience of their administrative work is interpreted as taking place within a hierarchy, the competing roles where collegiality is the norm often results in a lack of distinction between hierarchic role relationships.

When considering the layers of the hierarchy that exist above the president and board of directors of HEIs, the extreme top of the pyramid is ultimately only vaguely understood. The very top of the hierarchy, which is above and beyond any one HEI is the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (referred to herein as Ministry of Education). John brings up the Ministry of Education multiple times in the interview, explaining that:

> “We have required courses and elective courses. A lot of this gets prescribed by the Ministry of Education. They tell you how to distribute. And then you can kind of choose how to distribute, how many credits they get for what.”

Adam discusses the requirements of the Ministry of Education for his university to conduct a self-evaluation as a part of the accreditation process. He also brings it up in relation to his work on the faculty development (FD) committee, commenting: “The Ministry of Education was putting more pressure on schools to do faculty development.” In discussing where ideas for broad curriculum or program changes come from, Rudy explains that:

> “I don’t get upset about it because I know that with curriculum, or other things as well, sometimes it comes top-down, but the more things change the more they stay the same...The same goes for other things too, whether it’s this global English thing that everybody is talking about, that’s come from the Ministry of Education down, but people interpret at the university level the way that the university sees it best for them.”

The fact that the Ministry of Education is a distant entity from the regular working situations of professors in HEIs was a clear part of the way in which Harold discussed curriculum decisions he was involved in. Full-time office staff members in the academic affairs section

at his HEI are heavily involved in setting standards and requirements for English education across the campus. Although he has been in his position for a number of years, he remains confused as to the relationship between the Ministry of Education, the office staff, and the faculty members. Harold: “These are purely administrative people. It’s a top-down structure for them, and they are beholden to nobody.” In clarifying who is ultimately in charge of the curriculum he replies:

> “I really don’t know...I really don’t know who’s in charge. That’s part of my problem. I don’t really know who’s in charge. All I know is that this is one committee and they tell people on the English curriculum committee...what they want. And what they want, they claim is what the Ministry of Education wants. And every time I talk to people at different universities I hear different things: The Ministry of Education didn’t say X, Y, and Z, your school said that.”

The very top of the hierarchy, or perhaps located above all HEI hierarchies seems to be the Ministry of Education. However, the function it plays is so distant from participants that it is little understood and little discussed in interviews. In his explication of requisite organizations maintaining a hierarchy where authority and accountability are in balance, the mistake of taking away power from individuals is destructive to morale. With clearly defined managerial roles in a hierarchy, “power that cannot be appealed against is prima facie unjust power. It is autocratic and coercive (Jaques, 1976, p. 238).” Clearly, the Ministry of Education and participant’s HEIs are not a part of the same formal administrative hierarchy. However, in experiential terms, participants tend to see the top of the decision-making structure one that is far beyond their reach.

Another influential but vaguely defined aspect of the experience of working in a hierarchical structure is the way that behavior and work tasks are decided by way of practice or regular procedure. Rather than a specific superior giving directives the very structure of the department or institution is the determining factor that shapes behavior. During the interview, the conversation with Don made clear the way that he dealt with being a part of the weekly chapel activities in his department:

> Harlan: What do you think about that? Is that the kind of thing that you were in charge of, making those decisions?
>
> Don: No, no. That policy was set long, long ago.
>
> Harlan: Yeah? And you just go with it?

Don: Yep.

Harlan: Are there any changes that you made to that system?

Don: No.

Harlan: How did you adapt yourself to it?

Don: Well you, the adaptation is not hard if you know clearly what the rules are, or what the process is.

The often-discussed practice of participants being required to attend faculty meetings had a similar texture to it. The following are the neutral ways in which participants discussed the requirement.

Ed: “We had to attend faculty meetings. And if you don’t attend a faculty meeting then you should give a formal reason why you are not attending.”

John: “In the past it was recommended that you go. Probably for the last five years it’s been a requirement. And if you don’t go you have to have a written reason why, in advance.”

The boundaries that we act within at work are determined by context, including the cultural and the institutional. Jaques (1976, p. 26) refers to the milieu where “subjective” and “inter-subjective” interactions at work take place the “institutional zone,” which is within the “cultural zone.” Participants often see themselves as passively consenting to procedures that they themselves did not set up or choose to put in place. The way in which participants accept these procedural requirements and limits on their autonomy was also discussed in more negative terms. Participants can feel a kind of tension, as they are tenure-track/tenured professors being told what to do as if they were the students. Participants often experience their administrative work as one who has no power, no agency in their work. There can be a lack of a critical perspective when participants see the institutional zone simply existing outside of their sphere of influence.

4.2 Doing What You are Told – Negative Experiences

The theme *doing what you are told* emerged from the conversational interviews. Ed talked about his early years as a tenured professor doing administrative work thus: “I never felt that I was in a strong enough position to refuse. I almost always said yes to just everything over all the years, over 10 years, I hardly ever declined to do something.”

Similarly, Rudy mentioned that early in his post he tended to "do whatever I was told to do, and try to help out as much as possible." The experiences of doing what you are told ranges from what could be described as innocuous to objectionable or demeaning.

One negative case that caused only slight irritation is Hank's experience as an international student counselor, a position that required him to do very little. Hank: "In the end it was a sinecure. There was nothing to do except to see the report once a year from the counselor." In later years, Hank became the president of his university, when he was involved in work that was "much more real, none of those Alice in Wonderland kind of things."

4.2.1 Faculty meetings

In discussing his task of reporting from smaller committees to the faculty meetings, Warren explained that "I am forced to agree, in a way. Because I know that if I put up a fight, and I totally disagree with something, my opinion really isn't going to matter because I am so low ranking." Alex and Rudy both talk about their participation in the faculty meetings as just warming a seat. Alex: "The faculty meeting is all in Japanese, which I have to attend, but don't really participate in. I'm just a bum on the seat." Rudy is a bit more annoyed during his description of having to be at the faculty meetings: "They are kind of the worst as well...You are kind of just warming a chair." He continues: "I'm just sitting there and filling up a slot."

4.2.2 PR activities

Another aspect of doing what you are told that elicits negative feelings from participants is having to be involved in promoting the university. Rudy teaches courses in a department different from his primary department and is therefore given administrative tasks in both ("a slave to two masters"). He discusses one committee he is the head of there:

> "Suddenly I found myself the head of their publicity committee, which means I have to be responsible for their brochure, their pamphlet. I have to do their open-school events, all this stuff...I've got another nine months in that role. I'm just kind of waiting for it to finish...It takes a lot of my time, and I hate it."

Adam was made to promote his university by making visits to local high schools. His way of explaining these experiences conveys his displeasure:

> "A couple of years ago there was a kind of big push...We had to go around and I would usually visit two [high schools] a day...And you know, I never really bought into it. I mean, you shouldn't turn your teachers into salespeople."

In his involvement with PR activities for his HEI, Warren gave public lectures to large groups of high school students at events designed for multiple HEIs to meet in one central location. When asked what he thought about these events, he responded: "PR, I felt like I was working more in marketing than I was actually in education at points in time." Because Warren sounded like one of the busiest participants in the study, he was asked how he decides what to do and what not to do for administrative work. He reinforced the idea of working within a hierarchy when he explained that: "The lower ranking teachers, the new teachers, they are just boom, do this, do this, do this." When asked if he could turn down work he said:

> "Basically, when my boss, like the director of the center for international education, or my dean, or a VP or something says jump, I jump, so differentiating what's more important. And I guess if I'm asked, depending on the ranking of the person who asked me to do it, if they ask me to do it then..."

Finally, when Ed discussed the way in which he had to go on promotional visits to local high schools, he said that he wanted

> "to show people that I wasn't just like a cigar-store Indian...But the teachers and administrators that went around with me kind of got annoyed with me because I would talk about different things, like unrelated to what we were doing...So that didn't go very smoothly."

Ed's experience of being a "cigar-store Indian" is in reference to full-size Native American wooden statues that were often placed outside cigar stores in the Old West in the States. The meaning is that he did not want to be seen as someone that is only there to be seen and actually contributes nothing. This experience is related to being a cultural marginal and will be discussed again below. Overall, participants often did not appreciate being used in events that promote the university to high school students.

Jaques's SST lays out the model of a requisite organization that is organized in a hierarchy. The lowest-ranking employees operating at stratum I should be engaged with work activities that require from one day to three months in length (Jaques, 2006, p. 41). By way of explanation, he gives the example of copy-typing, a one-day task. An employee who

is fittingly employed at stratum I will be able to feel satisfaction at completing a satisfactory copy. In contrast, if given the same copy-typing task, an employee fittingly employed at stratum IV "would react to the experience by wondering why copy-typing had to be done in the manner assigned," and may be able to think up a new system where the physical task of copy-typing could be eliminated completely (Jaques, 1976, pp. 158-9). This mis-match of low-level – in the temporal sense of being finished in one day, for instance – with the high-level of status creates a conflict. Simply put: "Boredom is the response of a person whose level of work-capacity is too high for the work he is employed to do" (Jaques, 1976, p. 183). Especially apparent in the PR high-school visits, professors are simply filling up a slot. For these one-day tasks to be assigned to professors, a likely result is a mental schism where rather than being a perfect salesperson for their university, they may rather be wondering if there aren't better systems for PR, which if implemented may eliminate the need for school visits entirely.

4.2.3 Curriculum

When his department was short teachers and nearing the beginning of the semester, Alex volunteered to teach more classes than he was required to. Because he needed to focus on research and administrative duties more, he was rejected. Alex: "They put it through the committees and someone, one committee somewhere, someone said, no he's not allowed to." In an incident that caused a much stronger negative reaction from a participant, Harold explained how the curriculum goals and outcomes in his department are set. Rather than being able to focus on communicative language courses and assessments, his department was being forced to focus on courses and assessments that would provide the opportunity to quantitatively measure students' improvements. He talked about it thus.

> Harold: "Those of us who are doing the actual English education are forced into this...And they are forcing us to justify why we can't set certain course goals as a TOEIC [standardized English test] score...I absolutely hate it...We were told to do that, of course we had no choice...A lot of it is just the pressure that we feel from the administration about their quantifiable goals."

In his attempt to interpret how he feels about being in this sort of position of having to listen to office staff on curriculum issues, Harold explains:

> "I know that this is partly what I have been trained to do. But there is another part of me that thinks, you know, this could easily be outsourced. It's not really strictly

speaking administrative work...To me Japanese universities are horribly backwards because they refuse to separate teaching, research, and administration, they make everybody do all three...I don't want to do the admin stuff. I did not get this job because I wanted to be an administrator."

Similar to Rudy's experience of "finding himself" in charge of a PR committee, Harold here is dealing with both ambiguity in directives coming from above, and a lack of say in his own work. In a requisite organization, "the power exercised...must be authorized and legitimated by resting on consensus if it is to be effective" (Jaques, 1976, p. 190). As many other participants articulate as well, Harold is clearly not a part of a decision-making process that directly affects his work tasks. Being employed by an HEI as a tenure-track/tenured professor means that participants iteratively participate in both collegial and managerial-hierarchical governing structures (Morozumi, 2019). It is perhaps a lack of explicit knowledge and articulation of working in a hierarchy that results in the real flow of authority and power to be ambiguous and fluid. Without having professors take a more active role in their administrative work, in the sense of creating and constructing the actual tasks and the processes themselves, there is a danger of what Jaques describes as alienation: "To exclude people from taking part in policy-making, to impose policies or policy changes upon them, is a sure way to court rejection of those policies or changes. Participation is thus intimately associated with belonginess and alienation" (Jaques, 1976, p. 191).

Pete was the head of the English curriculum committee when he was trying to implement changes to English courses and overall curriculum directions in his department. Along the way, he started to realize that many of his colleagues did not want to change the curriculum. Some of them attacked him through emails. Pete: "They wrote to me, in a very nasty, various different people wrote to me because I'm the head of the committee that deals with it, so I'm kind of like a symbolic, I don't think it's particularly personal." Pete makes sense of the situation in terms of occupying a certain role at a certain time. Because he was the (symbolic) head of the curriculum committee, he became the target of criticism.

"Why should I be seen as sort of pushy or imperialist, or yeah, ideologically different? Those are the sort of terms that came up, you know, colonialist, all those kinds of, foreigners taking over, basically, I think is the message."

Again, when asked to elaborate on his comments that the arguments were not personal, he mentions: “I think it’s just because I was the head.” He reiterates it a moment later in the interview: “It’s not personal. It’s just the position you’re in.” After being asked to think and discuss more his part in the curriculum changes, Pete thought about how his official role as the head of the English curriculum committee was perhaps the determining factor in his role in the argument. It was clear that Pete did not feel personally responsible for the curriculum changes that he was in charge of implementing.

> Pete: “Well, it’s never, you know, things come down from the Ministry of Education to your, sort of, the president of the university level and the board. And then they then filter down to the ordinary teacher level. So it’s never, at least where I work, it’s never directly clarified as to, but there’s definitely a sort of atmosphere that we’re spending a lot of money on English teaching and English teachers.”

Even when directly addressing the issue, Pete cannot articulate where the initiative for the changes in the curriculum came from. This is a similar experience as Harold’s above, when he says “I don’t know who’s in charge.” The gap between professors and the very top of the hierarchic structure is perhaps too great to work in a clear-cut manner. These situations and the participants’ ways of making sense of them are closely related to the way in which professors do have autonomy in some of their administrative work, as they are also a part of collegial management structures as tenure-track/tenured professors (Bleiklie, 2018; Jaques, 1976). Autonomy and its uncomfortable relation with hierarchy will be addressed again below.

Requisite organizations structured on bureaucratic hierarchy are deemed inappropriate for universities, (Jaques, 1976, p. 344). The lived experience of participants reveals that they are in reality working in bureaucratic hierarchies, especially when it comes to administrative tasks. Perhaps based on the tradition of the academy and collegial relationships of the tenure system, professors are also not a part of a hierarchy. Pete experiences this confusion in his work life. As Jaques (1976) explains, a healthy bureaucratic system is built upon accountability.

> The manager-subordinate role relationship [is primary]. It is the relationship upon which the bureaucratic hierarchy depends. It may be defined as that relationship in which one person – the manager – is held accountable not only for the quality of his own performance, but also for the quality of performance of others – his

subordinates. It is this accountability which is the essence of the relationship. (Jaques, 1976, p. 63)

The lived experience of being on a committee, for Pete and other participants can be like participating in a phantom hierarchy. There is a head and more and less active members. However, the head has no actual authority. The members have no actual accountability. As the head of a committee, Pete was not actually a supervisor; the members of the committee were not actually subordinates. This type of experience can be seen as a sort of embodiment in daily practice of a confusion between the "republic of scholars" model (Bleiklie, 2018), and a bureaucracy model (Hanada, 2013) of HEI management, where professors are idiosyncratically picking and choosing which model they are acting under, in some cases regardless of what their colleagues think that they are doing.

4.2.4 Entrance exams

A common experience of most of the participants is creating and administering the English section of the entrance exam for their university. Nearly all students who wish to enter university in Japan must pass the entrance exam created by the university itself. Details of the exams and certain processes involved are confidential, but because participants were guaranteed anonymity, many of them were willing to talk about their subjective experiences in some depth.

Alex was in his first year of helping to proctor and create the entrance exams. Talking about proctoring the exam specifically, he said:

"There's the entrance examination that you have to kind of sit in and proctor [administer], which is serval hours of utter tedium...You're not supposed to do anything...I understand. In one of them I chose to write poetry, quite surreptitiously so, and I think I got away with that. But it's quite a tedious activity."

In Vern's case, there are multiple times throughout the year that his HEI administers the entrance exam, making writing the tests a routine, year-long responsibility of his. It is telling to pay attention to the pronouns used in this section of the conversation. Vern was speaking in the first person and then there is a noticeable switch.

"The first couple of years were very hard for me...I was having to do all this new work, and learn how to write the entrance test. There is a certain logic to it. You have to basically, through trial and error, you get the hang of writing the entrance

test. We have a certain way of, they have a certain format that they follow that I don't necessarily believe is the best way, but I do what people say we have to do."

When asked to elaborate on how he feels about doing this type of work, Vern says: "I feel frustrated, because I feel as though, you know, my voice isn't really being heard, and that logic isn't winning out." In explaining how he tried to raise his concerns of the validity of the test's format but was told that it was nearly impossible to change the way it has been done for years, he said: "They are not as interested in quality as they are in making money [from the tests]."

In speaking of the work-capacity of individuals, Jaques connects the worker's ability to cope with a task and its duration until completion. "Work-capacity" is defined as: "the longest time-spans with which an individual can cope." In other words, "the size of the life-space of an individual can be expressed in terms of the longest time-spans of goals within that life-space with which an individual is able to deal" (1976, p. 125-6). Different from the above explanation of Harold, when he says that some of his administrative tasks "could be outsourced," Vern in this case experiences his role on the entrance exam as being within his capability. He discussed how he could immediately see how the structure of the test could be changed. Due to his doctoral training, his research experience, and his work experience, Vern knows that the very process of how the entrance examination is constructed and implemented is within his capability to revise. In his experience, there is a disjunct between his status, as the head of the English section, and his inability in practice to make procedural changes affecting his department.

Another participant served as the head of the entrance exam committee and was able to make an impactful change to the system. Don "negotiated" for non-tenure track lecturers to be able to assist in writing the entrance exams. As he was the head of the committee for only one year, the following year he saw his work and the new system reversed.

> Don: "The next year I was sitting at a meeting table...I had just dropped back to being a regular editor, rather that the head of the whole damn thing. And when this was announced that this policy was going back to the old policy, I could see the surprise on the face of other old professors who had been on the committee with me when we had all negotiated this. And they are like, you guys have just screwed them. But you can't fight city hall."

This experience of his change to the entrance exam process being reversed the very next year after leaving his position as chair of the committee hints at the extreme end of the negative experiences participants discussed in relation to their administrative work and being in a hierarchy.

This experience of Don's decision lasting one year, while he was the head of the committee, then being overturned the very next year can be said to reveal the applied effects of the uncomfortable mix "bureaucracy model" and the "collegium model" (Hanada, 2013). As the succeeding head of the committee disagreed with Don's implemented change the following year, the system was changed back. In the above experience Vern was dealing with changing the structure of the entrance exam itself, Don's change was simply one of adjusting the type of faculty that work on creating the test items. In both cases, however, participants had a negative response as their intuition told them that their status should include the ability to affect long-term change. Theoretically, if administrative work of professors was organized in an explicit and proper bureaucratic hierarchy, or "requisite organization" (Jaques, 2006), tenured professors (such as Vern and Don) would be classified as stratum IV or V, with work tasks that span 2-5 years (IV) or 5-10 years (V). However, when looking at their lived experiences of administrative work, there seems to be a lack of distinction made between the collegium and the bureaucratic models. A mixture exists where even in administrative tasks, and committee work, collegial decision-making processes combine with the implicit hierarchy. The time-span of work tasks is decoupled from actual responsibility and status.

4.2.5 Power and frustration

In what was a rather benign but annoying experience, Alex shared an anecdote about asking for the English self-study room to be cleaned. He was picking up the room and noticed that behind desks and shelves it was

> "just incredibly grotty...There is mold on the wall. So I'm saying, to the lady responsible for the office, can we have this cleaned?... And it seems like it's this big political rigmarole of having the maintenance staff [clean it]. A colleague comes to me and says, oh it's a bit difficult. We can't just ask them. They might have priorities...It seems like the head of our department has to. It has to go to the head of the department who then is responsible for speaking to these people."

When asked to talk about how he felt about the politics involved in what he learned about his department through these conversations, Alex says: "I just find it slightly bizarre."

A common topic of conversation was the amount of time participants spend working and the amount of time they have available for vacation from administrative duties. Another aspect of *doing what you are told* that Harold found frustrating is the way he is made to report his whereabouts in-between semesters. He mentions that at most there are about three weeks in the summer when there are no meetings scheduled.

> "You have to be available...in August...They have to be able to contact me by telephone and/or email. And you know, it feels like I'm on a leash. There's a form you have to fill out before you leave, anywhere you go, and every teacher has to do it...It's like treating me like I'm a child...It's really kind of annoying."

In these two instances, Alex and Harold are experiencing their role as being subordinated to staff members, or to impersonal procedures. There is a mis-match between having crucial responsibilities in some areas of work, and being treated like a student or a child in other areas.

One of the most frustrating experiences discussed openly by a participant was Ed's placement on a student support committee. This committee discussed personal aspects of students' files, including details of their parents, such as income or marital status. Ed was the only faculty member on the committee, the other members being office staff. He had no choice in being on the committee.

> Ed: "There didn't seem to be any reason that they would put me on [that] committee. There was even no reason for me to know what they were doing...This is what got a new leader of the school who came in to really hate my guts. But I told him directly, I have no business knowing if the students have divorced parents...So I said please take me off the committee because I have nothing to contribute to it...They did not take me off the committee. I had to stay on the committee. So [it was] just out of spite that I was forced to stay on that committee. Just because, you know, who's the boss."

Ed's experience can be seen as the far end of the negative spectrum, when a participant directly asked to be removed from a certain administrative duty but was flatly refused. Ed explained this situation in cultural terms, mentioning that "Japanese people amongst themselves, they understand that you just can't say no to almost anything in any job

situation, you know, that a superior tells you to do." Looking back on the experience, he adds: "I should have just swallowed the football and just sit in silence during those meetings, just let it be a waste of time." In this way, experience of working within Japanese culture cannot be untwined with working in a hierarchy. Cultural aspects of participants' experiences will be detailed below.

In organizations where the role relationships between individuals are ambiguous, confusion and problems result when power and authority are in question. Authority is defined as: "an attribute of a role which gives the incumbent the right to exercise power within socially established limits, and to apply to others positive or negative sanctions (rewards or punishments) depending upon the quality of their behavior" (Jaques, 1976, p. 39). Authority operating in work relationships can be thought of as weak or strong: "The strongest is to have the authority to decide the limits within which another works. Less strong is to have authority to recommend given limits to another, but leaving it to the other to decide" (Jaques, 1976, p. 261). In the re-telling of his lived experience being forced to stay on a committee, Ed learns that he is under the strong authority of a leader of the university. He expressed his disapproval of his placement on the committee, as well as explicitly requested to be removed from it. His frustration and disappointment in his request being rejected shows a lack of understanding of how the hierarchy operates in his work relationships. Because of the lack of clarity, he feels injustice in not being able to remove himself from the committee. Ed's experience can be compared to Pete's example above, when he was the chair of a committee but was attacked by other members of the committee who not only refused his suggestions, but questioned his intentions. Pete learned that his authority as the chair of a committee is weak, and his colleagues were free to reject what he was suggesting. Ed, on the other hand learned how his supervisor's authority was strong, as his actual work parameters were out of his own hands. In both cases, participants only learned through frustrating experiences how the hierarchy works in practice. Neither of them could have predicted the outcome of their experiences by understanding the extant structure of their role relationships at work.

4.3 Maintaining the Structure

Because administrative work takes place within a hierarchy of roles, participants are simultaneously involved in telling others what do to. This theme is perhaps better expressed in the term *maintaining the structure*, meaning the structure of the hierarchy within the institution. As mentioned above, Pete had a bad experience being the head of the English curriculum committee when he was called “imperialist” and “colonialist” in bringing in changes. In the interview, an example of the most enjoyable administrative duties he is involved in is creating the entrance exam. Even though he mentioned that “I don’t like the actual content of the exams,” he considers it “a very positive experience.” He explains it this way:

> “In terms of a task and a small group of people, I think it’s a really great experience. You have this very clear timeline. You’ve got this very clear set of things that you need to do. And you’ve got different kinds of personalities to weld together to achieve it...I’ve done it several times. I’ve been the chair once. There’s a lot of responsibility. It’s kind of nerve racking to be honest. But once you’ve finished and done it, it’s very satisfying. And you feel like you’re a part, really embedded in the system.”

In this case, Pete feels great satisfaction in the experiences of being the head of, and involved in, a vital task to the university that has clear outcomes and time-pressured deadlines. His role relationships are clearly defined, as the task itself it clearly defined. Comparing his reaction to Vern above, who thought that the process needed to be changed and was disappointed to find that changing it was out of his hands, Peter experiences the clear procedural boundaries as freeing.

4.3.1 Managing teachers

A common experience to nearly all participants where they are maintaining the hierarchic structure is managing part-time or contract full-time lecturers. Many of the experiences described here will combine with the next theme of *autonomy*.

The pattern that weaves through nearly all the conversations about managing other teachers is that of giving lower-ranking teachers a degree of freedom in their own classrooms. Adam oversees both contract full-time and part-time lecturers. Adam: “It’s not that we want to control what the teacher is doing...Basically we say, you know, 70 percent. We want you to cover this [course curriculum] 70 percent. That 30 percent, if you want to bring in something different.” Warren sees his role in much the same way: “I really try to let

the part-timers choose their own textbooks. We have say, out of these four textbooks, all four of these we think will accomplish the goals that we want...so from these, what would you like to choose?" Warren describes the process of making textbook selections as a role in a hierarchy as well, when he talks about part-time teachers who do not make a selection by the deadline: "Then you have pressure from the top saying, yeah, where are these selections?" Warren is the final arbiter. His job is to approve the textbook choices of part-timers in his department.

Making a list of textbooks for teachers to choose from is an example of strong authority, where tenure-track/tenured professors are involved in "setting of limits within which the task [of those subordinate to them] is to be carried out" (Jaques, 1976, p. 258). Participants' role and status as being officially above contract lecturers and part-time lecturers is an example of an explicit hierarchical relationship that is recognized as legitimate by both sides. In situations where this clearly-defined status difference exists, participants often describe these experiences as taking place as expected. There is a stark contrast, however, when professors with tenured and even tenure-track status are working with each other. The hierarchy in committees, for instance, is in flux and unclear.

Rudy is also in charge of English curriculum decisions for teachers: "I'm ultimately in charge of writing those curriculum...but then we sort of hand them the curriculum and say, OK you can interpret it any way you'd like." Rudy recalled an incident when a lecturer failed to act within the hierarchy and went over Rudy's head, as the head of the curriculum committee, to report to the head of the center, Rudy's superior:

> "He didn't tell me first. He went to the head of the center without telling me about something that was in a committee. And I did chastise him for that because it should, it should be reported back to the committee before it goes to the next level. I don't know why he did that. But I kind of criticized him openly at the meeting for that. He apologized afterwards."

Rudy's description of this episode hints at the way in which professors and lecturers are working within a hierarchy, but one that is not always clearly defined and easily adhered to.

Harold articulates his role in managing teachers thus:

> "[My job is] making sure that the teachers are on the ball...That's something that we do as part of the curriculum coordinating, is materials as well as goals and keeping the teachers happy...We want them to have the ability to choose materials,

somewhat to choose the way they evaluate, certainly how to teach in the classroom. But we also want them to be professional."

John shares similar ideas:

> "Basically, the full-timers [tenured professors] coordinate with each other. And then the part-timers we hire, we tell them what courses we have and ask them how they would teach it. But they can choose their textbooks and [we] kind of work with that."

Alex has a similar situation, but explains the freedom he needs to give to part-time teachers in stronger language:

> "I think to some extent...perhaps there is still a feeling that the full-timers [tenure-track and tenured professors] are slightly held hostage by the part-timers, in the sense that we can't change things [curriculum and materials] too much...There is too much attention paid to the needs of the part-timers."

Alex is of the opinion that the hierarchy needs to be more explicit, that legitimate authority and power need to be exercised by those of higher status. The lack of clear boundaries, and the ambiguous nature of the relationship between official status in the HEI hierarchy of roles, and the autonomy that teachers cherish contribute to the confused mixture of hierarchy and autonomy. Jaques explains that in requisite organizations, the bureaucratic hierarchy consists of "manager-subordinate role relationships [that] should be specified correctly, precisely and explicitly" (1976, p. 67). Clearly, participants administrative roles, including managing part-time lecturers, do not take place in a business-like management system. However, this hierarchy of roles is the actual system of role-relationships between lecturers and professors. The limits of authority and accountability are ambiguous and fluid.

Both Vern and Mary discussed especially positive experiences related to their work managing other teachers. Vern was asked by the dean to be the head of the English section of his department. He explained his time in this role in positive terms, discussing how he brought together to some degree professors who were battling politically in his section. The way he worked with fellow professors as a mediator will be discussed below. As for his experience maintaining the structure, and managing teachers, he explained that as a tenured foreign professor:

> "It isn't an official position exactly. I was just the only foreigner on the team so I took it upon myself to oversee the foreign teachers. For me there was one foreign teacher overseeing 28 foreign teachers...A major role that I play is when we have problems

with foreign part-timer teachers...Normally I'm called upon to try to deal with those issues."

Mary and another English professor colleague were involved with both the office staff and the head of her department in making decisions about cutting part-time teachers' classes. She explained how "we were under pressure to cut some of the classes, to increase class size." As for the directive to cut classes, she explained that:

"the administrative staff, her point of view is, she wants to follow the rules that she's been told from the administration...the two of us [Mary and other English professor] were pushing to keep the part-time teachers. It was agreed on, and it was listened to, and we didn't go to a committee meeting for a vote on that. We decided it. We sent it out as a message to everyone on the committee and nobody objected."

In explaining her role as being involved in managing teachers, she explained further that:

"the part-timers would be oblivious to the fact that we were talking about those kind of factors...So I suppose you could say that it was almost an intervention...The higher up decision was made, so that we maintained some control of what was happening. I think that in many ways those are the kind of decisions that are made that is good for the university."

Mary clearly experienced being in a higher-ranking position than part-timer teachers as an opportunity to do what she saw as right by them, even though the decisions she was involved in were ultimately unknown to the teachers themselves.

In a similar role, Sam is in charge of setting up and running a study abroad program in his department. When it comes to duties related to this role, he is responsible: "I'm kind of the main person, the main person who connects with [the university abroad], is in charge of them. I tell the office staff what to do, what we can do, what's possible." In many cases such as these, participants embrace their responsibilities and roles in delegating work, making decisions, and setting boundaries for those who are positioned below them in the hierarchy.

4.4 Autonomy

Partly because research, and teaching to some degree, are carried out autonomously, meaning there is no clear hierarchy involved in structuring these aspects of

work, autonomy is also an important and somewhat inimical factor in some aspects of administrative work. As discussed above, the collegium model of organization runs parallel and interweaves with the corporate model in HEIs (Bleiklie, 2018, Hanada, 2013).

There are many cases when participants experience their work as having to do what they are told, such as Warren's and Sam's experiences (Warren: "When someone higher up says jump, I jump." Sam: "I never felt that I was in a strong enough position to refuse [work]."). However, other participants had a different reaction and experience, which involved more autonomy and power for individual professors. Partly due to being in his position for many years, Rudy felt that: "Now that I'm a tenured professor and there is really more that they expect of you, I can say no to stuff. I'm just doing as much as I need to." Vern also witnessed a gradual change in how he approached administrative work, becoming more able to refuse tasks over the years: "Until the past few years, I've just been obedient, and yes OK...The past few years I've actually said, you know I have something going on that day and I can't do it." As the only native English-speaking professor in his department, Sam was initially asked to look over and proofread English documents from colleagues or office staff. However, he saw this as beneath the work of a tenured professor.

> Sam: "From the start, I've been pretty unenthusiastic about doing proof reading of people's things...I wanted to be working as a professor, and not doing that...I'm pretty careful about kind of making sure that my role is similar to the other professors' roles."

Because administrative work takes place within a hierarchic structure, when autonomy reigns there can be confusion and political problems. This tension between the two can be seen in both the way that roles on committees rotate randomly and the way in which people can volunteer to do a lot or no work at all on committees.

In discussing his experiences on committees, where some people do no work and others do all the work, Pete articulates autonomy clearly: "I find that sort of sense of unfairness quite difficult to cope with. I don't quite know how to get around it, because there is very little sense of hierarchy." He explains that in many roles, such as the "head of a center...those positions do not come with some sort of sense of authority...It's all voluntary." After his experience as being seen as imperialist, bringing in outside curriculum ideas, Pete decided to not volunteer to be the head of any committees: "They're in that position now. And they have to take that responsibility, but have all the responsibility and

no authority." He explained the awkwardness of having people as heads or chairs but being in a system that only appears as a hierarchy, without functioning as one in practice. He explains that it would work better if the chair of a committee could actually make ultimate decisions rather than being over-ridden by other members of the faculty. But the way it actually works, he reiterates, is: "You have all the responsibility and no authority, and I think that's the tension."

As discussed by Morozumi (2019), Japan's HEIs are increasingly influenced by neoliberal ideology and NPM. Although the factors influencing participants lived experiences are many, the increased demand on being economically viable and led through top-down management structures is seen in the daily experiences of professors in situations where a tension exists between their belonging to a "republic of scholars" who operate with autonomy and a "corporate enterprise" that has clear manager-subordinate roles (Bleiklie, 2018). Pete describes what it like to be the nominal head of a committee, who seems to have actual authority when no one objects to his decisions, but in reality has no actual authority when disagreements arise.

Mary talked about a similar experience she was involved with where she and a colleague were trying to implement a system where international students who were native speakers of English would be paid to visit the Japanese students' EFL classes. It was suggested that she go to a prominent leader in the university to ask how to go about setting the system up, because "he knows all those little rulebooks and everything, [he's] somebody who could tell us how we could manage to fit them in." This leader was in favor of the idea and helped Mary and her colleague work out the details. Even though Mary saw putting international students into Japanese students' classes as a "win-win situation" one teacher who was on the same language committee vetoed the idea, because he "didn't think it was fair" to students of other languages. Mary: "He just put his foot down and just kept on saying, it's not fair; we shouldn't do it. And we had to drop it. We couldn't get it through." Once this one person on the committee "objected" to the idea, it "started exploding." Even though they had the full support of an important leader who was higher ranking than anyone on the committee, because all the faculty involved did not agree, the change could not be made. Looking back on the experience, Mary explained: "We were a bit fed up with it." Pete's and Mary's experiences demonstrate the actuality of autonomy often triumphing over hierarchy, even when administrative work is involved.

A clear instance of a participant being able to choose which committee to work on can be seen in Larry's experience of working on the international affairs committee. Larry worked on the committee for two years, and because assignments usually rotate every two years, the dean said (Larry): "We're trying to figure out where the staff are going to rotate to next. What are your thoughts, do you want to move out?" Larry agreed to stay on the international affairs committee: "I imagine I will be stuck with that, probably for the rest of my career, which is fine. I enjoy it." He describes the autonomy he has in his role as: "There's no one looking over my shoulder. There's no one telling me what to do at all." In what could be called having autonomy within a hierarchy, Larry sums up his relationships with the dean and others in his department thus: "I have very good communications with the dean, all different levels of the administration staff. It's a pretty good situation." In the end, rather than switching to committees that he would rather not be on, Larry was able to choose to stay on the international affairs committee.

One participant explicitly mentioned how heads of committees and other important administrative roles involve a degree of autonomy and equality. Harold: "There's no kind of top-down mandate. It's your colleagues recommending you." A more common experience, however, is that of roles rotating. This aspect of the structure that ensures that autonomy or equality, is a part of hierarchy is the system of random rotation. Administrative duties, roles on committees, and even heads of sections and departments are often decided on a rotational basis. When asked about how he was chosen to give a demonstration lesson at an open-school event to promote his university, John says: "I didn't know my colleagues were asked to do these things. And it comes around to me, and I'm like, yeah OK, I'll do it...It's probably something that is rotating around."

This experience of accepting rotating roles can be seen as an example of the "republic of scholars" (Bleiklie, 2018) operating under the "collegium model" (Hanada, 2013). As Jaques (1976, p. 345) explicitly states, academics should not be organized in bureaucratic hierarchies, but should be solely "members of an association." It is this equality amongst professors that is experienced at times, especially when roles rotate and all participate in the same types of administrative work. In describing their lived experiences, participants express how they are at times operating within a more or less clearly defined hierarchy, and at other times without a hierarchy.

In an extreme example of posts rotating, Hank moved up through all the ranks and ultimately found himself the president of his university. Hank: "I was in line to be head of the department, because that was done on a rotational basis...Nobody wanted to be the head of department, that's why it rotated. So, it was coming to me." Later in his career, in order to officially approve study abroad programs at partner universities abroad, Hank was made a vice president. He thought of the role as "a nominal vice president." He explains this experience as something that just happened: "I found myself in faculty meetings sitting next to the president. Now, I'd always sat at the back of the room so he couldn't see when I dozed off...But now I was sitting next to the president." Hank was given responsibilities that surprised him. Initially, he felt like a "pretend vice president." Later he was made the president because he was the best choice available when the president retired. He felt that this was no longer a pretend position: "I was moving into a completely different domain. This was no longer getting by in faculty meetings. This was the nitty-gritty of how the university was run. This was telling people to do things rather than asking for help." This was "a high-level management role."

At the time of the interview, Hank was no longer the president. In reflecting on the experience, he goes on to say, "After you're there for a while, either the administrative jobs will come to you by rotation, or because you're not one of the un-conscientious people." Also, "your academic rank is who you are." Hank's description of his experiences perhaps best represents the meeting place where autonomy and hierarchy are forced to work together. A hierarchic structure exists, but sometimes the roles are filled by rotation, and other times by volunteers.

Aspects of lived experiences falling under the theme *autonomy* often happened in committee work. Pete, Mary, Larry, and others explain how they or colleagues have autonomy and cannot be forced to go along with a certain decision. Throughout the interviews, it was clear that participants experience committee work as a space where authority is muddled. Committees are ostensively organized in a hierarchy, with a head of the committee, or the president of the university, leading the meeting, for example. However, often times these leaders lack real authority or responsibility, as positions often rotate and work is mainly done by members volunteering. These experiences show the uncomfortable mixture of autonomy and hierarchic structure combining in the administrative-work life of professors. In explaining ways of organizing work that are not

bureaucratic hierarchies, Jaques (1976, p. 90) explains how professionals can be organized in an association. His description of an association, not a hierarchy, could act as a description of participants' work on committees:

> "While members of associations may seek to influence one another and to combine in voting, no individual member has the authority to instruct any other member to do anything, nor can he be held individually accountable for the activities of any other member."

In looking directly at participants' descriptions and reflections of their administrative work on committees, a direct question comes to mind: Is administrative work organized in a hierarchy or an association? The lived experiences detailed in this study suggest that participants' administrative work takes place in a location that is a blend of these two types of organizational structure, often resulting in confusion and anxiety. It has been argued that neoliberal ideologies are increasingly taking over the mindsets of stakeholders in HEIs around the world, resulting in "universities becoming more managerial and bureaucratic, at the same time reducing the collegial influence in university decision-making" (Sahlin, 2012, as cited in Maassen & Stensaker, 2019, p. 458). The present study reveals from the insider perspective of professors in the Japan context how this dichotomous tension works its way into various aspects of administrative work.

4.5 Category 2: Cultural Mediator

Research Question 3: In what ways do TFELP perceive and interpret their administrative work as intercultural experiences?

Cultural Mediator answers Research Question 3, and the lived experiences that make up the category consist of three themes: *Japanese way*, *different cultural perspective*, and *cultural liaison*. *Japanese way* refers to the work behaviors and communication styles of participants. It also contains the experiences of not receiving any special treatment for being a foreigner. The meaning of these experiences for participants is rooted in an idea of how things are done and communicated in Japanese HEIs. While *Japanese way* reflects the ways in which participants embody a Japanese cultural worldview, the opposite theme of *different cultural perspective* reveals their home-culture worldview. The same types of

experiences of work behaviors and communication styles will be discussed. Also, the way in which participants introduce different ideas will be presented.

Participants embody and work to hold together two different cultural ways of approaching administrative work. The position that often offers participants the best way to deal with holding these polar opposites together in harmony is the final theme: *cultural liaison*. Participants are in a central position as a liaison in three important ways. They are a bridge to the community, sometimes as the face of the university. They are liaisons at home, creating opportunities for both students and colleagues from different cultures to build relationships. They are also liaisons abroad, connecting students, and in some cases colleagues, from various cultures.

4.6 Japanese way

The theme *Japanese way* is built out of three basic types of experiences, which together reveal the way in which participants embody Japanese cultural practices in how they make sense of and carry out administrative work. The three ways of understanding *Japanese way* that will be discussed are: no special treatment for being a foreigner, Japanese work behavior, and Japanese communication style.

4.6.1 No special treatment

Ed talked about how when he officially received tenure he was told by Japanese colleagues, "You have tenure now, but no special treatment, no special treatment for being a foreigner." He explains that one meaning of this realization was "doing all the things we had to do," including things like doing all the committee work, giving a prayer at chapel, going caroling during Christmas, and even doing things like joining a faculty bowling league, and playing on the faculty sports team. Ed points out that in Japan: "There are insiders and then there are outsiders. And sometimes Japanese themselves could be either insiders or outsiders. The ones who speak up or are sometimes critical in faculty meetings, those are the outsiders among the Japanese." Even though he also sees himself as an outsider, in many ways Ed is an insider. He consciously acts in ways that ensure he is an insider.

Mary also addressed this exact issue. In comparing herself to other foreign tenured professors in her university, she says: "They have chosen to be *soto* (outside), whereas I

have all sorts of Japanese friends. I go out socializing with them." Mary does all she can to do the same type and amount of administrative work as her Japanese colleagues. She paints the picture with words: "I never wanted to be treated kind of like a pet...like a foreign pet, you know." Just as Ed reveals his two sides of Japanese and not Japanese, Mary, after explaining that she does not want to be *soto* (outside), says: "But I don't want to turn native either." This type of comment reveals the ultimately unified structure of the duality: Japanese way-*and*-different cultural perspective.

Although quantitative survey studies have shown to be mostly ineffective in measuring the final stage of Integration on the DMIS (e.g. Altshuler, Sussman, & Kachur, 2003), the present interview-driven qualitative study suggests that analyzing participants conversational descriptions of their lived experiences may reflect their cultural sensitivity development as being at the level of Integration (M. Bennett 1986, 1993). Ed and Mary are revealing their meta-view of cultural identity creation. They are able to evaluate both their own and others' cultural stance and level of Japanese way adoption. Because being at the intercultural sensitivity level of Integration includes the act of cultural identity creation itself (J. Bennett, 1993), not only can participants articulate their own and their colleagues' cultural behavior, but they are able to experience culture from a meta-perspective, where they consciously behave in Japanese ways, Anglophone-cultural ways (and as will be seen below) a third mediating way that creatively intertwines two or more cultural perspectives.

As seen above in the meanings that make up the category Hierarchy, Pete had a negative experience while he was the head of the English curriculum committee, being seen as "imperialist" and "colonialist" by Japanese colleagues. This episode had come to an end a few months before the interview, and Pete had had time to reflect, realizing that he did not want any special treatment. He thought both that (1) his Japanese colleagues should not have thought of him in terms of being the outside, foreign intruder, and (2) that if he were in their position he might think the same thing: i.e. that he is the outside, foreign intruder. Pete: "I am critical of those comments, but where they are coming from, I'm not critical. I kind of think, yeah, OK, maybe you're right actually." He goes on to explain this in clear terms: "If that's the way things are done in Japan, who am I to go against the system." In reflecting on the experiences and his role in bringing in the curriculum changes, he says: "I think the reason for the negative response is that I hadn't communicated in a Japanese way to my colleagues." Pete's experiences reveal both that he cannot escape being seen as, *and*

actually having, a different cultural perspective, and that he consciously wants to conduct himself in a Japanese way in the future.

Sam explained how he turned down and refused to do too much translating from Japanese into English, or proofreading of English. Sam: "I want to do as much as possible, like normal, kind of professor kind of work." He doesn't want any "foreigner jobs...or just the English jobs." His goal from when he first started his position was to do the same type and amount of work as his Japanese colleagues.

Ultimately, under the theme *no special treatment* for being a foreigner the importance of hierarchy in administrative work of professors can also be seen. Especially Mary, Pete, and Sam are making sense of their experiences with colleagues as taking place at the same status level, that of the role of a tenured professor. Although being from a different cultural background plays into their interactions with their Japanese colleagues, participants place their role in their HEI above their cultural identity, which is in the process of being created reflexively through experience. "Role relationships" refers to:

> the ruling out or exclusion of behaviors, to the setting of the general direction or goals of behavior, and the boundaries within which the individuals involved may behave. Within those boundaries, behavior is free; it is for the individuals to behave as they will, to decide what to do, to assess the meaning of one another's behavior, and to judge how to respond to one another, so long as they do not move outside the boundaries of their role relationships. (Jacques, 1976, p. 25-6)

The lived experiences discussed in this section reveal the way that cultural background can occasionally come to the foreground in participants' experiences working in Japanese HEIs. Although participants cannot divorce themselves from their home culture, they also possess the ability to work in a Japanese way. This cultural way of behaving is fluid. However, participants status as tenure-track/tenured is non-negotiable. They see their role in the hierarchy as static, and expect their colleagues to recognize the same.

4.6.2 Work behavior

Because the themes presented throughout this chapter emerged from the interview data, participants were never asked to explicitly discuss or define what they thought of as "Japanese" ways of approaching administrative work. A few specific examples were brought up by participants, however. Hank, Mary, and Pete all make the point that they are working in Japan, so they have the majority of the burden to adjust and adapt. Hank: "I've always

dealt with Japanese colleagues in Japanese, even when I could barely express what I wanted." In consciously recognizing that he also possesses a different cultural perspective, Hank does his best to override the cultural programing he has as someone from a different culture.

> Hank: "If I ever found myself thinking, this isn't how it should be, I would tell myself, no, this is how it is, you're the minority here, get over it. So very seldom would I say, no no, collectively you are doing it wrong. It would be very much, OK, now I'm learning from you how you see this issue, why you see it's necessary to react in that way."

Referencing both behavior and language, Mary comments:

> "I think we should do most of the adapting. I think it's very colonial to think, I've come in here, and you're going to provide me everything. I feel kind of embarrassed sometimes, the amount that they do provide in English."

Again, Mary's reality of also embodying a foreign perspective becomes clear: "If a Japanese teacher went to the UK, nobody would be translating it into Japanese for them." She finishes her thought on the issue by saying, "We are in Japan, and we have to adapt too."

Pete also explains his trying to approach work in a *Japanese way* by mentioning that "...that's the way things are done in Japan." While discussing the topic of being on the hiring committee, Pete mentions how important it is to personally know the candidate from networking. He mentions how it is, "the Japanese way of recruiting somebody that you know." As for his positive experiences making the English entrance exam, Pete specifically says, "You feel like you're a part, really embedded in the system." To him, this includes being accepted into Japanese culture: "You do feel like, you know, I kind of am a part of this country, a part of this culture." As with all participants, Pete is still aware that he simultaneously possesses a different cultural perspective when he mentions the reason he feels "a part of this culture... Because so many times, you're not a part of the community...there's still many kinds of barriers." He repeats again though, "I'm kind of, accepted into the, a different country's culture. That's a nice sense of satisfaction, I think."

In analyzing these descriptions of their lived experiences qualitatively, it is clear participants exhibit an ethnorelative worldview, and are at least at the developmental level of Adaptation on the DMIS (M. Bennett, 1993). Instead of Japanese ways of working simply being acknowledged as how "they" do it, participants are owning and behaving in ways that

they see as stemming from Japanese culture. Due in part to their status level in the hierarchy, participants of the current study explain their lived experiences differently than part-time foreign adjunct lecturers who “felt exploited for their exoticism as foreigners and their utilitarian value,” while experiencing their purpose in their HEIs as “maintaining a culture of ‘othering’” (Whitsed & Wright, 2011, p. 38). This stark difference in experiences with Japanese cultural ways of working is intimately connected to foreign academics’ roles in the hierarchy.

The seriousness of the English entrance exams hints at one aspect of Japanese work culture, that of staying on task, and giving 100% while maintaining a serious tone. When giving an explanation on why he did not feel that he fit in well with his Japanese colleagues when visiting high schools, Ed says, “It’s kind of odd for Japanese, for someone to bring up something that’s off the subject of exactly what you are doing if it’s in a work situation.” He mentions that Japanese colleagues will “expect you to be right on task and really discussing how you can best do exactly what you’re doing.” Ed consciously knows the *Japanese way* to behave while working, but because he was raised with a different cultural background, he also at times behaves differently, as will be discussed below.

Hank explains the idea of staying on task or doing things with 100% focus as: “That is the way that things are run in this society. If you’re a bird watcher, you have the best binoculars possible. If you’re the president, you do the presidential stuff.” The epitome of this idea can be seen in the popular Japanese term *karoshi,* or death by work. It is well-known in Japan that even internationally Japanese are thought to be serious about work. Warren brought this up when he mentioned that “There was a period, I can remember the dates exactly, May 25th to August 3rd where I didn’t have one single, or I had one single day off, one day.” He summed up his experience of doing all the work that a Japanese colleague would be required to do: “In Japan, like death through work, or by work, right.” Here Warren comments on the way that both teaching and research must take a back seat to administration. The fact that administrative work is prioritized over teaching and research is a sentiment that was also shared by Hank, Larry, Mary, Vern, Rudy, Ed, Harold, and Alex.

4.6.3 Communication style

As hinted at by Hank above, participants also specifically speak about Japanese communication style and using the Japanese language. Out of the 14, only one participant conveyed how he has no problems using Japanese in administrative duties. When he was

asked about his use of Japanese at work, Larry responded simply: “Everything is 100% Japanese. All communication is in Japanese...I have to write Japanese. I have to read Japanese.” When asked if it comes naturally to him, he says, “Yep. I’ve been living here for 15 years...Part of the reason why I got a tenured job was my Japanese ability, I’m sure.” A little less comfortable using Japanese, especially in faculty meetings, is Warren: “In the curriculum committee, that is exclusively in Japanese. I share my opinion the best I can, in Japanese...it can be a little bit of an uncomfortable situation, but I do my best.” Adam conducts FD workshops where he introduces practical teaching techniques to all professors in his department. As for the language he uses, he says, “I was designing it, thinking of it in English and not until the last minute, think about how am I going to put this into Japanese. But yeah, it would be delivered in Japanese most of the time.” As with other work experiences of other participants, Adam mentions how even though he gives his presentations in FD meetings in Japanese, because his native language is English, he does use it as well: “I would use the English in the slides and try to explain it.” When he had difficulty expressing his ideas in Japanese, he would ask his Japanese colleagues for help, “I would throw it to the audience, how would you say that? I’m not sure how to say this.”

Ed explains how when doing work in committees especially, in Japan rather than taking credit for ideas or work it is important to focus on the group as a whole. When asked to explain what this means, he responded: “Make it so it’s not from me, but just from the committee.” He continues, “Generally the Japanese way is you really don’t discuss anything private or [personal].” The idea is that the “Japanese way of doing this” is that “it’s consensual.” Explicitly connecting this theme to hierarchy, Ed says: “Either it has to be the top man’s idea, or has to be just the group’s idea...you have to submerge yourself and make it, turn it into sort of a group initiative...and deemphasize your own role.” Ed gives an example of the words he would use in Japanese: “*watakushi-domo*,” meaning *us* rather than *I*.

A similar example of the indirect nature of communicating in a *Japanese way* was discussed by Rudy. When involved in hiring faculty, he explains that it takes many months to make the decision, so candidates must not be told explicitly where they stand until everything is final. Rudy:

"I think I've kind of adopted the Japanese way of saying it too, like they always sort of say, I see my colleagues saying, I could never tell you 100% until it's final. But they will tell you 95%, I think you're pretty safe. And I will say that as well."

During the conversation, Rudy is reflecting on his perspective and says: "I've sort of taken on their way of framing things...I think I've taken on some of the mannerisms, the type of ways of framing things that my colleagues do." In contemplating his Japanese way of communicating, Rudy even says, "I don't think I could teach overseas anymore," and "The longer you stay over here, I think, I won't sort of fit into another system."

As they have lived through experiences working in Japanese HEIs and using the Japanese language, participants have necessarily approached their work in a Japanese way. One context in which all administrative work takes place in their respective HEIs is Japanese culture. In explicitly referring to the influence of culture in bureaucratic hierarchies, Jacques (1976) depicts contexts where work roles exist as consisting of concentric circles that are contained in larger contexts, where the person's "subjective zone" and "intersubjective zone" are contained within both the "institutional zone" and the "cultural zone" (p. 26). The outer-most layer of culture, within which the other layers of context are contained is "the most pervasive. It contains all the implicit cultural constraints which individuals pick up in the course of socialization" (Jacques, 1976, p. 27). For foreign professors in Japan, both Japanese and Anglophone folkways pervade their lived experiences of administrative work.

4.7 Different Cultural Perspective

The theme *different cultural perspective* is made up of similar types of experiences as *Japanese way*. These experiences can be seen as a type of mirror or alternate way of making meaning of approaches to administrative duties. The ways that participants understand their work behaviors and communication styles as being different or influenced by their home culture will be discussed. This theme is also made up of experiences that can be described as bringing in or introducing different ideas.

4.7.1 Work behaviors

At the very beginning of the interview, after it was explained that the research focuses on internationalization, foreign professors and administrative work, Larry says, "It's

very unique to Japan, the amount of administrative shit you have to do." It is this awareness that suggests his frame of reference includes a perspective that is from outside Japan. Along the same lines, Harold explicitly comments that "The admin stuff is too much." The way that he is using his knowledge and experience of other cultures is explained clearly.

> Harold: "If you were in North America or in England or in Australia, and someone said we need to hire an administrator to be in charge of our language program, that's what they would do...They wouldn't be expected to do lots of research and teaching at the same time."

At another point during the interview, Harold is talking about the workload involved in his job and how he can take a vacation for 10 to 12 days at most, and he comments on the international outlook of his HEI: "I'm lucky that I work in a university that's actively trying to be international. They understand that...people want to go back to their home countries during break time."

Although participants can and sometimes do act in a Japanese way, the fact remains that they are from a different cultural background. Often times, this fact is accentuated and is an asset. As discussed above, Vern became the head of the English section in his department. His dean thought that he would be able to bring together battling factions among the professors. His not being Japanese worked out well and allowed him to be successful in bringing people together.

> Vern: "Because I'm not Japanese, I think it gives me license to be outside of the expectations and the kind of social structure that they have amongst them...So if I make a mistake, for example, they are not nearly as critical as they would be if one of their fellow Japanese had made a mistake."

Vern's role in this position will also be explained below, in terms of being a cultural liaison.

In a similar fashion, mostly because of his being foreign and a native English speaker, Larry is able to choose to remain on the international affairs committee, where he regularly interacts with professors from around the world in Japan and in other countries. He explains his perpetual role on the committee thus: "International stuff, I can do...Basically [because of] my language ability, and my predisposition towards international affairs." Because being on the committee requires multiple trips abroad each year to visit partner universities, Larry has a heavy workload that "is probably three times bigger than most other faculty." However, he would not trade the type of work that he does for any other committee work.

He realizes that his being culturally different and fluent with Japanese “makes me very invaluable to them.”

Another participant who is fluent in speaking and writing Japanese is Ed. He spent a lot of time translating official documents into English in his position. As discussed above, he did often try to do all the same amount and types of tasks that his Japanese colleagues did. However, he made it crystal clear how he was also culturally different. Ed: “I never felt like I was really an insider...despite being the most bilingual person on campus.” He sees himself as “a little bit of a maverick.” Ed consciously chooses to maintain his *different cultural perspective*:

> “It’s one thing to understand a second culture, but it’s another thing to really be bicultural to that extent. I’m about like 33% bicultural, so still mostly a Westerner..., but I’m a specialist in Japanese history and culture. But still, to actually be, really to be like a Japanese is really a bridge too far. I never really wanted to go native. I think the best thing is to be kind of a professional foreigner.”

Ed was looking back over many decades of experience, and perhaps was therefore able to articulate this duality of being in the clearest terms.

Don also had been a professor in Japan for multiple decades at the time of the interview. He gave an example of how he was explicitly reminded by a colleague that he was foreign and an outsider. When he was assigned to be the head of the English entrance exam committee one year, he met the office staff who was the contact person. Don talked about the scene that took place: “When I first showed up and introduced myself, he said, in English, he practiced this, ‘If there is a problem, it’s always the foreigner.’ That’s meeting me for the first time, that’s what he said to me.” Don did not speak Japanese in his work. His experiences of having a different cultural perspective are therefore strongly connected to his communication style and his different ideas.

In an instance of using her different cultural perspective as an asset in making curriculum changes to English courses, Mary introduced a change that she said would only affect the native English-speaking teachers. She was introducing a reading program for students, and to do so, she said to her colleagues that “I would like to introduce it in classes taught by native speakers.” Knowing there is typically a difference in teaching philosophy between Japanese and foreign faculty, she explained: “The native speakers tend to be TESOL people, and so the Japanese teachers were quite happy that [the change] was

nothing to do with them." While Japanese faculty in her department tend to do "grammar translation," she explained to them that her activities are "a completely different thing." It was largely due to her foreign culture, education, and experience that she was able to separate curriculum changes in such a way.

Another example of a participant being consciously aware of his different perspective can be seen in Hank's experiences on the English entrance exam committee. He was the only native English-speaking professor on the committee, with all the others being Japanese. He explained how the test needs to be perfect because it is taken home by students, published, and sent out to private-tutor schools after the test. Often, mistakes on these tests actually make the local news. Hank: "There was a horrendous mistake on the test." They had an immediate emergency meeting after administering the test. On the way to the meeting Hank

> "thought, I'm going to have to take responsibility for this mistake even though it's not really me, because I'm pretty sure that anybody else on the team who got blamed for it would go home and think seriously about taking their life. And I'm not going to kill myself over something so stupid...I took full responsibility for it...although I could have made a good case that it is nothing to do with me. Because I was the one who could go home and laugh about it...My colleagues wouldn't have been able to do that."

When asked specifically if his reaction was because he had a fundamentally different cultural perspective than some of the Japanese working on the test, Hank answered: "Yeah, that's why I was able to take responsibility without too much psychological damage." Even though he fully knew the great seriousness of the test, he was able to bring forth his different cultural perspective and not take the mistake on the test dead seriously. He volunteered "to be the fall guy" on that one.

All participants also pointed out how certain or specific information about the process of the entrance exam is confidential. Don was intermittently involved in making the exams over the years, once being the head of the committee. In a somewhat similar manner to Hank, he could not quite see the exam in the same light as his Japanese colleagues. He explained how the record keeping for the committee had to be kept without any names of professors attached. In summarizing his experiences with the entrance exam, he says "it was just an absurdity, you know. It was so Kafkaesque."

Perhaps the entrance exam system in Japan is a permanent fixture that will go largely unrevised for the foreseeable future. When it comes to other areas of administrative work, though, participants are often change agents because of their different cultural perspective. In discussions over the years with "the president and the chairman of the board" and other professors in his HEI, Ed tried to get his Japanese colleagues and superiors to see how research and service unrelated to the university's administration were also a big part of being a professor. Ed: "I tried to train them over the years, and as a result they could appreciate my academic activities." He experienced some success in bringing in foreign ideas, but all throughout he was also treated as a foreigner, even to the extent that: "Usually it seemed that they would not really listen to me. Whatever I said, because I said it they would not do it. So, I really had a hard time getting anyone to listen to me." This articulation of a different cultural perspective acknowledges the fact that participants' identities are not fully in their control. Often, they do act in a *Japanese way*, sometimes they act in an obviously different way culturally, but always they cannot escape the fact that they are foreign-born.

4.7.2 Communication style

The interviews did not focus extensively on language use or non-verbal communication such as gestures, for example. However, the immense impact language has in all aspects of participants' administrative work was evident. The theme *Japanese way* includes the experiences of using Japanese language and communication style. As for *different cultural perspective*, the explicit discussions of participants using English or being affected by their use of English will be described.

Ed is fluent in Japanese, and always had as one of his main roles that of translating documents from Japanese into English.

> Ed: "The biggest thing that I did over the years, the most unique or hardest job was translating, especially Japanese into English, for the native English-speaking teachers...Something like if they want everyone to get inoculated for something...and very technical kinds of information that I translated for the benefit of non-native speakers of Japanese."

Moments later, Ed explains that foreign faculty who are not adept at using Japanese require special help from their Japanese colleagues: "They talk about foreigners who can't speak Japanese, *onbu suru*. They have to carry them on their back." *Onbu suru* refers to the

traditional way that mothers carry their baby on their back. When used to refer to a foreign adult it carries the meaning of foreigners not being able to handle themselves in Japanese, thus placing an extra burden on the native Japanese speakers. Ed himself seldom needed help with Japanese, but his role as a translator can be seen as a clear connection between his different cultural perspective, which allows him to be a *cultural liaison* between Japanese and other non-Japanese colleagues. Ed points out the necessity of being fluent in Japanese to be actually perceived as equal in status to Japanese professors: “So either you ask to be treated the same as other Japanese or else you should not expect to be tenured.”

The reality for all participants is that one condition of their being hired is that they are native speakers of English. There are positions and tasks that do not actually require participants to be competent in Japanese. The clearest example of using English in all facets of work was discussed by Don. When put on committees, he always needed someone helping him as an interpreter and translator. Don: “I had language services. That’s always the key problem, is being asked to sign documents or participate in discussions where I don’t have language services. So that’s a barrier to full participation.” Don went on to explain further: “And my limited language ability, while not preventing me from filling a seat in a committee that I don’t understand, would prevent me from presenting accurate, easy to understand reports of the committee.” When speaking up in committees or meetings, Don always used English. Some Japanese colleagues could understand him, but some could not. Not being able to fully communicate in Japanese contributes to Don’s and many other participant’s subjectively and objectively created identity as having a different cultural perspective.

One example presented above to describe the theme communication style in a *Japanese way* is Alex’s experience asking the wrong person if the mold on the wall in the English study room could be cleaned. This example can be seen as both *Japanese way* and *different cultural perspective*. While reflecting on the experience, Alex recognized that he needs to communicate with office staff by going through the proper channels, by accepting the hierarchy and reporting to the head of his department, who then communicates with maintenance staff. However, he also cannot escape the way he sees the situation differently: “For me it’s just tedious. For me it’s just, this is dirty. It needs to be clean.” Basically, the way Alex actually communicated in the moment by talking to the office staff out of turn shows his different cultural perspective coming out in his behavior. Later, when

reflecting on the incident he reveals his Japanese perspective on the same incident. Alex: "For me, you know, it's just the way things are done in Japan and the way things are in university...I appreciate that life isn't so straightforward."

Another experience that reveals the two opposite perspectives converging can be seen in Harold's discussion of how certain committees that require reading and writing in Japanese are not done by foreigners.

> Harold: "A non-Japanese will never be asked to do that because it's 100% Japanese. And there's a lot of report writing. And frankly speaking, most non-Japanese can't handle it. They don't even bother. They never ask a non-Japanese to do that, ever. You could argue that it's discriminatory, but I don't think so. Most of the non-Japanese I know would never want to do it, frankly."

Interestingly, Harold sounds sure that spots on these committees are only for Japanese faculty. However, in the very next moment, he says: "They've already told me they think my Japanese level is high enough...So if at some point my colleagues say, hey, we think you can handle it, then I might give it a try." Harold explains that the difficult aspect would be to write reports in Japanese: "I couldn't do it. I could read it. But writing is different." Finally, he sums up the idea that participating in all committee work on an equal footing may not be possible for him by saying: "The Japanese language ability is a real stumbling block, I think." Harold and Alex both explicitly mention how a big part of their jobs is learning more Japanese language.

Mary has similar experiences with language. For her, "it takes a huge amount of time writing." She consciously reminds herself that she does not have to be a completely fluent user of Japanese, because part of her job is to have a *different cultural perspective*: "So, I always think to myself, I'm not employed as a Japanese teacher, I'm employed as an English teacher." She tries to only write simple, short messages when using Japanese, as her spoken ability is much better. A practical aspect of administrative work that Mary thinks could be improved is the way that documents written in Japanese are provided to her at the start of meetings. She thinks that "The staff who are making the materials, they just don't realize that if they sent it by email in advance it would be really helpful for us [foreigners]." Because she also wants to work in a *Japanese way*, and on an equal footing as her Japanese colleagues, however, she has hesitated to ask for these types of special treatment when it comes to language. Mary: "So maybe that's something that I should [mention], you know, in

the beginning you don't want to mention it, because it's almost saying my Japanese isn't good enough." On a similar note, John wishes he could use English in more formal situations. John: "I would like to be able to speak English in faculty meetings because the topics are sometimes heavy. And I feel like my Japanese, when it comes to serious topics is pretty elementary...I'm sure it comes out weird." In part, because participants are employed for their native English-speaking and teaching abilities, their colleagues are often flexible and allow them to use Japanese at whatever level they are capable.

4.7.3 Different ideas

Regardless of the language being used, participants sometimes very obviously embody a *different cultural perspective* and introduce what are clearly considered foreign ideas. Sam summed up these types experiences thus:

> "So when I have an opinion in a meeting or something like that, a lot of times, even though I do say some things that are kind of way out there, people kind of like the different perspective because I do come up sometimes with ideas that people don't really think of."

Rather than giving one specific example of this, Sam mentions that he often feels like this on the PR committee that links to alumni and the community, as well as when working on curriculum issues in departmental meetings. When asked specifically why his ideas are appreciated, he clarified:

> "Having a different perspective, yeah...I guess kind of a different way of thinking about, approaching a problem...People are welcoming to my opinions, and they probably often think, wow, that's kind of out there, but it does kind of add to the discussion."

A concrete example of incorporating a different cultural perspective as a regular part of administrative work is the way that Adam initiated, designed, and managed a study abroad experience to the Philippines for his students. This aspect is an example of being a *cultural liaison* as well. Because of his awareness of differences between countries, he wanted students to think about how to compare Japan with the Philippines. Adam: "I wanted students to look at...the kind of economic conditions in the Philippines. I taught them about PPP, looking at how to compare, how economists compare prices across different countries, and cost of living calculations."

In part, because Don exclusively used English for the committee and other administrative work he was involved in, he most often embodies a different perspective. However, when asked if his lack of Japanese ability is the reason he is kept off some committees, he reiterates: “Well no, because I’m probably going to have radical ideas.” There are times when ideas that are too far out there are not welcome, but traditional approaches are prioritized. One idea that ended up seeming somewhat radical is Rudy’s plan to decorate the hallways in his department. He makes explicit comparisons to other countries in discussing his ideas. His department is typical of many HEIs in Japan, especially public universities, that most often seem to avoid any sort of decoration or ornamentation, especially inside buildings. Rudy: “Our halls are gray and they’re dirty and there’s no pictures on the walls, and every time that somebody comes from overseas they say, oh, this is like a hospital.” In planning to change the interior of his department, Rudy continues to explain his rationale in terms of having a *different cultural perspective*: “When you’ve seen universities overseas, they are much more beautiful. They have hedges. They have malls. They have brick walls. They have ivy.” Rudy’s point is that when seen from the perspective of visiting foreign academics or students, his university is lacking, and more attention needs to be paid to the impression they are making.

In sum, as Ed mentions, sometimes ideas that foreign professors have are clearly different. When discussing bringing in a change to how the department published its in-house journal, Ed’s idea to put it out only in PDF format was received as foreign: “it just sounded like it was from the far side of the moon.” Sometimes ideas are drastically different, but sometimes participants feel like Ed: “Or I was maybe off the script, you know.”

To look at the lived experiences of participants categorized under the themes *Japanese way* and *different cultural perspective*, and exploring the meanings of their lived experiences phenomenologically, it is best to consider all possible aspects of experience. The way participants think and feel about their administrative work is, to some degree, bundled up into the decisions and actions they take. Thinking from a cultural perspective, the most applicable worldview that emerged through the descriptions of participants’ experiences can be described as ethnorelative. More specifically, participants demonstrate intercultural sensitivity with what has been termed Adaptation or Integration (M. Bennett, 2004).

As was clearly the case with many participants, they are often able to possess both a *Japanese way* and a *different cultural perspective*. Mary says both that she does not want to be treated like a pet, nor turn native. Ed explained the same sentiment when explaining himself as about 33% bicultural, and not going native but being a "professional foreigner." These summaries of how participants approach their administrative work in *Japanese* HEIs as *foreigners* points to the difference between cultural assimilation and adaptation. M. Bennett (2004, p. 71) explains the differences while explaining the intercultural sensitivity stage of Adaptation in the DMIS:

> This idea of assimilation is that you should give up who you were before and take on the worldview of your host, or dominant culture. The concept of adaptation offers an alternative to assimilation. Adaptation involves the extension of your repertoire of beliefs and behavior, not a substitution of one set for another. So you don't need to lose your primary cultural identity to operate effectively in a different cultural context.

This study only looked at the experiences of professors who are involved in teaching the English language and culture. It is perhaps this fact which contributes to the dual nature of participants' worldviews. One of the categories that defines their very positions is that they possess an Anglophone perspective. They were hired into positions slotted for native English speakers. The way that they are employed as highly ranked academics carrying out the administration of a Japanese institution requires that they also possess the dominant cultural perspective to a high degree. The stage of Adaptation in intercultural sensitivity is one where, "Maintenance of one's original worldview is encouraged, so the adaptations necessary for effective communication in other cultures extends, rather than replace, one's native skills" (M. Bennett, 1993, p. 52).

The concept of empathy and "perspective taking" as developed by M. Bennett (1998) can also be seen in many of the participants' ways of understanding their administrative work as taking place in a Japanese context. Empathy is defined as: "the imaginative intellectual and emotional participation in another person's experience" (M. Bennett, 1998, p. 207). It is in the ethnorelative intercultural sensitivity stages of Adaptation and Integration that empathy is an apparent skill. The six steps in practicing empathy are the following:

1. Assuming cultural difference

2. Knowing one’s self
3. Suspending the self
4. Allowing guided imagination
5. Allowing empathetic experience
6. Reestablishing self (M. Bennett, 1998)

The reflections many participants went through during the interviews suggest that they intuitively move through all of these steps to some degree.

Mary specifically mentions that she sees both sides, native English speakers and Japanese. She also says she is an insider, but does not want to turn native Japanese. Ed conveyed the same sentiments when describing how he is an expert at Japanese culture and language, but also does not want to turn native. Hank explicitly explained a time when he imaginatively walked through a process much like M. Bennett’s (1998) six steps. He knew how deadly serious a mistake on the entrance exam is, thought and felt from his Japanese colleagues’ perspectives, then chose to be a foreigner in his emotional and practical reaction. He explained how he, as the only non-Japanese on the committee, was able to take full responsibility in a grave circumstance because he could later laugh about it. Rudy also explained how he thinks from what he sees as his Japanese colleagues’ perspectives when talking about his communication style. However, he maintains his own culture and transforms the very appearance of his department by decorating to make the place more beautiful, like universities he has seen abroad.

Pete and Alex both went through a mental process that resembles the six steps of empathy during the interview. Pete regretted the way he communicated to colleagues as the head of the English curriculum committee when they criticized him for being colonialist. He explicitly said that when thinking from his colleagues’ perspectives he thought that they were right. Alex also understood the way that he will need to follow proper channels in the future to make requests of the maintenance staff. To a greater or lesser extent, participants are able to wield their vast experience living and working in Japan to take on a Japanese way of carrying out administrative duties at work, but ultimately, they return to their Anglophone selves by making regular use of their knowledge and experiences of their home-culture perspective. Especially through administrative roles that place participants in positions where they can act as *cultural liaisons*, they are able to capitalize on both their native and their Japanese worldviews.

4.8 Cultural Liaison

The final theme that emerged from the interviews is *cultural liaison*. The multitude of experiences that make up this theme are nearest the core of the category Cultural Mediator. In most cases, cultural liaison can be seen as a point of convergence where the various aspects of both *Japanese way* and *different cultural perspective* come together. Participants are uniquely made up of their background knowledge and experiences, and a complement of perspectives that comes from being a foreigner and living in Japan, that equips them well as *cultural liaisons*. The experiences that demonstrate this theme can be thought of as belonging to three areas, consisting of being a liaison to the community and to students and colleagues both at home, and abroad.

4.8.1 Liaison to the community

Participants act as a link between their HEI and the community in various ways. One example discussed above under the category of Hierarchy and the theme *doing what you are told* is Ed's description of his PR visits to high schools. Ed: "I would just try to make some helpful comment each time, just to show people that I wasn't just like a cigar-store Indian." Ed was also involved in teaching "demonstration classes at high schools." These experiences are perhaps more positive in tone, when he actually taught a lesson as a representative (English teacher) of his university. However, there was no shortage of negative experiences for Ed; his school also would send him places simply as a foreigner, not as an English teacher: "One time we were even like a rent-a-foreigner to a graduation party or something like that at a high school." An experience of a more professional tone was discussed by Alex. Through professional contacts, he became a part of the board of directors at a local international school. Alex: "We are responsible for overseeing the governance of the school, the running of the whole school, and kind of overseeing the head as well." These examples are representative of the ways that participants are involved in internationalization processes through and outside their HEI boarders.

Alex also represents his university to high schools and the community in a superficial way. He is placed on university advertisements: "I'm on all the bloody publicity material. The

biggest photo in the brochure apparently is me." He explains how he understands looking foreign can be one criterion of being hired as a native English speaker:

> "I'm very non-Japanese. It's part of why I'm hired, and I know that. I'm not going to get all upset and start jumping up and down...I'm foreign...My Japanese isn't good enough to be one of the regular staff. On the other hand, I do have the visible foreign bit in my favor, you know...I'm perfectly happy with it."

John also discussed being on the promotional material for his university: "I was on the poster and in the pamphlets...For a while I was promoted...There were only two of us non-native speakers, two native English speakers." John also discussed his role in providing Christmas-themed lessons for children in the neighborhood of the HEI. John: "The idea was to get elementary school-aged kids to come to the university and learn about Christmas, and do it all in English." Somewhat similar to Ed and other participants' experiences visiting high schools, John's Christmas party was a way to use English with students in the wider community. In part, because participants are a kind of representative of internationalization, considering the fact that they are ethnically non-Japanese, and native English speakers, they are publicly shown as being ambassadors for their HEIs. In describing Hierarchy, and negative experiences of *doing what you are told*, Warren and Adam both mentioned how they did not appreciate being involved in PR activities as marketers or salespeople. Thought of from a cultural liaison perspective, the very same experiences can be described as, (Larry): "You are kind of like the face of your university."

4.8.2 Liaison at home (within HEI)

Often a part of the international affairs committee, participants act in a liaison role, bringing together international students and Japanese students for activities or short trips. Sam had recently taken such a trip:

> "We went to a place in Japan. The student exchange trip. The purpose of the trip is for, kind of, to give the exchange students a chance to mix with a few of the Japanese students here, and just to get to know each other better."

Even with this kind of short trip, the Hierarchy is present, as can be seen in the wording Sam uses: "The Ministry of Education gives us some kind of separate budget...They give us enough money to go to a pretty nice *ryokan* (Japanese-style inn)." At his university, Warren is in charge of a similar type of trip.

Warren: "One thing...we do every year is camp, a leadership camp. We take the students camping on an island. We take about 30 to 40 students there, international, so very international: Japanese, Korean, Pilipino, et cetera. And we have like three, four days, like a leadership English camp."

Of course, this experience of Warren's takes place within the administrative work hierarchy as well, and Warren does as he's told:

"I do it all, yeah, so go buy all the food at Costco beforehand. I call up the ferry companies, book the ferries, book the camp site, collect all the money from the students, get permission forms...I get approval from the university...For the last six, seven years I was the head person for that."

When asked in the interview to give a specific example of her experiences acting as a liaison responsible on the international affairs committee, Mary explains her role:

"I am directly in contact with the exchange students...I would be involved in interviewing the students to choose who's going to do the internship abroad. Also, we have lots of our partner universities visiting, so we are always meeting them, welcoming them, taking them out for lunch."

A specific anecdote Mary discussed in some detail is her organizing a party so international students could mix with Japanese students. Mary: "I organized it at a time that we had 20 visiting students from a US university." Mary said, "I was excited because my students would get to meet lots of Americans...That was a really good memory for me, the American students chatting away with the Japanese students." Mary continues to explain how she feels as she reflects on the experience: "I love seeing that interaction between different cultures and the different students."

As a part of her worldview as a *cultural liaison*, Mary also discussed how her understanding of both Japanese and Western ways of teaching inform how she handles curriculum decisions that affect all teachers in her department. Mary: "I see that as my role, trying to make it as good of an atmosphere as possible...bringing people together, and trying to get everybody on the same page, moving towards the same goals." She explains that she tries to switch her frame of reference to understand both Japanese and native-English speaking faculty members. Mary: "It's a difficult balancing act between the Japanese English teachers and the native English teachers. Both of those perspectives are really, really important...I see both sides."

Another participant who acts as a liaison between colleagues is Vern. He was made the head of the English section in his department. Vern says,

> "To be quite honest, there was a lot of politics in the section...there was a lot of trouble between the Japanese teachers, so I was called upon by my dean to try to act as a liaison within the group, because there were two sides on the team, one side was much more based in English pedagogy and another was based in more literature...The dean asked me to be the director of the English section because I seem to get along with everybody and I was not a Japanese person, so I could work with both sides pretty well."

In seems that just as with Mary, Vern's knowledge and experiences over the years had built into him both an in-depth understanding of working in a *Japanese way* while at the same time embodying a *different cultural perspective*. Vern: "I think people on the team who may have felt alienated by the other Japanese, for example, felt much more involved with me because I tried to find each teacher's positive points or merits." Vern needed some help with the Japanese language, which he saw as one aspect of work that actually helped bring his colleagues together around him: "It was challenging for sure in the beginning with my language ability. But the teachers in my group helped me a lot. They helped me write reports for example that I could read at a meeting." This is a case of his foreign perspective, and not being a native Japanese, being a reason he could take a mediating role. Vern himself sums up this experience clearly:

> "Because I wasn't Japanese, it actually gave me an upper hand because it was easy for me to ask for that [language help]. For some reason, I think we as foreigners don't have to adhere to the same kind of standards that the Japanese teachers do."

4.8.3 Liaison abroad

Whereas Mary and Vern discussed examples where they bring together foreign or Japanese colleagues in their own departments, Larry occupies a place on the foreign affairs committee that allows him to be a liaison between his HEI and other institutions abroad. Larry:

> "I'm kind of unique because there are not a lot of linguists and native [English] speakers from Japan...I've made some really interesting contacts, and through that we've created a lot of partnerships and memorandums of understanding with other

universities, which I'm in charge of developing and maintaining and then actually carrying them out."

His job includes "developing connections and partnerships with other universities, figuring out how to do student, staff exchanges."

Larry continued to talk about student exchange programs in more detail: "Another administrative duty that is really big and time consuming is our study abroad programs...We are starting up a graduate two-week study abroad program [at a university abroad] this summer." Larry was the professor in charge: "I was there meeting with people and figuring out how we are going to do that program, tell them about budget, what we could afford." In reflecting on his feelings working on the committee that allows him the chance to travel abroad and connect with universities overseas, Larry says,

> "I enjoy all that stuff. I did study abroad in my junior year in university, so I see the value in it. I see how good it is for students to do. I really believe in it. I love doing it, so it's a really fulfilling part of my job."

Ed also served on the international affairs committee. He talked about trips he took: "I travelled to the US to develop a sister school relationship with a college in the US...I represented the college in the US, and actually set up the functioning sister school relationship." One time, he accompanied students to an HEI in New Zealand. Thinking back on the experience, he says: "I kind of loved it, but at the same time I felt very responsible for the students' welfare." Ed worked as the liaison on these trips between the students from his HEI in Japan and the homestay families abroad.

Sam also works on the international affairs committee and works to set up and maintain partnerships with universities abroad. He discussed the specifics of the committee:

> "...There is another thing called a specialist member. And what the specialist members do, they basically act as liaisons between the exchange university and the committee. And I'm kind of the only foreign teacher here, so I am the connection whenever we get an English-speaking university."

When asked if office staff do much of the work or if he does, he explains: "I'm kind of the main person who connects with them, is in charge of them." His university's students study language, rather than content courses, at partner universities. Sam: "I do a lot of that kind of negotiating." He mentions that they often send students to a university in Canada.

Adam started and runs a trip abroad for students as well. He takes students to the Philippines:

> "At the end of their first year I took the first group. That was basically, it was initiated by me. I wasn't asked to do it or anything like that. But I was looking for ways to get the students outside of school...I had a connection in the Philippines, through an academic association."

When looking back at why he started this study tour, Adam says,

> "It's one of the most rewarding things that I do here and in my life. It is such a big change. Students have never been out of Japan. You kind of get them out of the bubble, and you can just see this kind of, this change in them. They come back and there is just like this drive that wasn't there before."

At his university, Warren is also busy setting up exchange programs abroad. He had been on a trip to continue finding partner schools abroad recently. Warren:

> "At the NAFSA conference last year, I met pretty much all of the representatives from all of the different sister schools...We set up a lot of meetings, and from that, so far we have gotten four MOUs [memorandum of understanding], and one actually concrete exchange program from those contacts."

When asked for more detail on why he is the main person from his HEI to go on these types of trips, Warren says, "They have sent me around Japan to represent the university, and I've just become pretty good at it, so they decided to um, next step, send me to the States, see what I can do there." This specific explanation by Warren points to the way that being a liaison often means both connecting with the community within Japan, and with universities abroad.

Hank was also in charge of partnerships with universities abroad. He mentions the way he initially became a vice president, which he first considered a "nominal" role:

> "This is how I kind of got the role of travelling salesman. The president was not completely confident in his English, so when he went to an international gathering, he liked to have either my American boss or myself with him. That role for me grew into negotiating agreements with sister schools."

Hank visited the US, the UK, as well as multiple countries in Southeast Asia. Hank makes it clear that he was not only used in this role because of his English language ability: "I was willing to create opportunities for students in the Spanish department, the French

department, and so on. It was very much as a representative of the university." In thinking over the different programs he was involved in, Hank talks about one that was his idea: "And one of those programs became my baby. I dreamt it up. I initiated it. I sold our school on it, and then set out to find partners in different countries that could work with us." Just as John, Adam, and others mentioned in the interviews, Hank loves travelling abroad and was all too happy to make it a part of his work and his students' lives. Hank: "So that was not only for the good of the school, that was my baby. I was attached to that, and I led the first group of students who went on that program." Thinking about the students' experiences specifically, Hank says:

> "I had a moment of epiphany where I think I was in London with some students...where I realized that in the last four days I had seen more ah-ha moments with students than in the last four years of teaching."

The following articulation of Hanks could speak for many of the participants: "If you asked me to take a group of students overseas tomorrow, I'll jump at the opportunity because that is such an addictive experience." In their role as a liaison, participants act as a knowledgeable and experienced link between their HEIs and different HEIs and cultures abroad.

Vern's case is no different: "We have a study abroad program in our department, so I have to also coordinate with a university in Canada." When asked for more details about his involvement he explains: "I'm the contact person. I helped actually set up the program." Vern teaches the entire group of students prior to their study abroad experience. Vern: "In preparation to go, I teach those students, the 20 students that are supposed to go to Canada." Vern explained his role thus:

> "I try to prepare them for what they are going to do there...we talk about homestays and... what's going to be expected of them living in a Canadian homestay...along with the types of English they are going to need to really navigate that while they are in Canada."

Vern also explicitly discussed how his knowledge and life experience plays a part in this aspect of his work: "I'm also a North American so I could imagine the types of cultural issues the students will probably be facing when they first start their homestays." This articulation of his *different cultural perspective* could apply equally to all participants. The fact that they grew up and were educated through university in Anglophone countries shapes all

participants experiences of work in a multitude of ways. Like many other participants, Vern also takes the plane trip with students, escorting them to Canada. When asked directly why a professor needs to accompany students all the way there, Vern was able to elaborate his Japanese perspective on the situation:

> "I think, coming from a North American perspective, we think of 18-, 19-year-old students as quite capable and should be responsible, should be able to handle that on their own. But the university still kind of, in a way, treats the students as kids, and wants us to make sure that we take them."

The last example of a participant acting as a liaison abroad that will be presented here is Rudy's experiences. Rudy: "We organize the overseas study tours...I've been the head of that [section on the international affairs committee] for six or seven years." He explains that: "Our job is to send students abroad...but also faculty research, getting researchers to come to us and sending people, researchers abroad." While giving a sort of overview, Rudy says, "We have five different study tours...I've got a hand in all of them." He lists some of the duties involved in this aspect of his work:

> "We do the *setsumeikai* [explanation meeting] and sort of get funding for those. We write grants to get the money from within the university to get scholarships for students and to get the money to send teachers abroad with them. We liaise with the travel agents...we talk with the universities overseas, set up the program, and when it comes time to take them, I do take them as well."

In what could be a summary for this section, Rudy says of the study abroad programs he's involved in: "That's a big part of my job as well."

In most cases presented in this study, participants' HEIs have put them in a position to act as cultural mediators. By being experienced and knowledgeable about the English language and Anglophone culture, participants actively create links that allow their Japanese HEIs to bring in foreign academics, students, language, and ideas. This type of mediating position, referred to as cultural mediator in this study, has been termed "constructive cultural marginal" by J. Bennett (1993). She introduces the concept by explaining the experiences of Barack Obama, who was born to a black Kenyan father and a white American mother. He was the first black president of the Harvard Law Review. Having such an important role in the Harvard Law school shows how he was in a central position of power, but nonetheless not easily categorized culturally. Rather than being white, black, American,

or foreign, however, J. Bennett (1993, p. 110) describes him as typical of a constructive cultural marginal, who is a person that can have “an identity that is beyond any single cultural perspective.”

It is the cultural liaison role that provides participants of this study a sort of all-inclusive position. Not being fully foreign or fully Japanese may be experienced deleteriously in some aspects of their lives, as Pete pointed out: “So many times, you’re not a part of the community...no matter how hard you try, there’s still many kinds of barriers. But I think where I work, they really encourage you to have a role.” By paying attention to the last part of Pete’s statement, it becomes clear that as far as being a professor with relatively high status in the hierarchy is concerned, often barriers are dropped, and participants are operating behind the lines, so to speak. Especially when they head committees or sections, or start and run programs that bring together people of various cultural backgrounds, participants are almost occupying a meta-position, one where they are not on the side of the foreigners or the Japanese, but operate in a third and mediating role, acting as a bridge that connects the two sides.

All participants describe and interpret their lived experiences of academic work in a way that could be explained through the fifth DMIS stage of Adaptation. Also, some participants describe themselves in what would be categorized as Integration on the DMIS, the sixth and final stage. M. Bennett (1993; citing Adler, 1977) describes the defining characteristic separating the intercultural sensitivity stages of Adaptation and Integration. A person in Integration “is ‘always in the process of becoming *a part of* and *apart from* a given cultural context’” (italics in original, p. 59). When operating in a mediating role, participants stand in a position where they are *and* are not fully a part of Japanese culture or their home culture. When participants are consciously aware of this third location where they hold together two or more cultures their level of intercultural sensitivity can be described as Integration. They participate in creating their identity, which partakes in the processes of creating and maintaining the definition of what a cultural mediator is. When participants mention the thought processes they go through to enact a *Japanese way* of communicating and working while also bringing to bear their *different cultural perspective*, they are integrating two or more cultural perspectives to create their identity as a cultural mediator.

Another key aspect of Integration and being a constructive cultural marginal is what J. Bennett (1993, p. 119) calls “commitment within relativism.” By holding two or more

cultural frames of reference, cultural mediators are able to make evaluations and final decisions based on multiple possibilities of interpretation. It is both by way of many years of experience living and working in Japan as a foreigner as well as having a high-ranking position in their Japanese HEIs that participants are able to consider ways forward from two or more perspectives. Not all participants detailed clearly how they consider multiple perspectives before taking action. However, in some cases this skill was obvious. For example, Hank's decision to take full responsibility for a mistake on the entrance exam was made after considering his Japanese colleagues' perspective, as well as the cultural context universities in Japan in general treat the entrance exam as deadly serious. In this situation, it may not even be a possibility that Hank act completely with a different cultural perspective. It is only by way of his knowledge and experience of Japanese ways of doing administrative work that he was able to (1) stand apart and activate his different cultural perspective and (2) decide to take full responsibility and apologize in a Japanese way.

The framework of internationalization of HE around this study seemed to naturally narrow the focus to administrative work. As Knight (2004) stops her definition of internationalization at the level of the institution, it is apparent that the processes and programs that affect HEIs are the most revealing area to investigate. However, after considering ideologies involved in internationalization of HE (Stier, 2004) and the way in which individual actors create rather than merely react to global forces (Cantwell & Maldonado-Maldonado, 2009), the level of the individual (Sanderson, 2008) was added to this study. The *intercultural* aspects of internationalization (Knight, 2004) are perhaps best described and interpreted by way of the concept of the cultural mediator. Participants possess a worldview that allows them to think, feel, and behave in a similar way to their Japanese colleagues, all while remaining knowledgeable of and experienced with their home (and Anglophone) culture. In a similar way, when carrying out administrative duties, participants stand at a crossroads where they must both consider the perspective of their students as well as the perspective of their institutions. Even when considering the experiences of foreign professors at Japanese universities, there is the potential that teaching and research do not fall under the category of internationalization processes. Administrative work is different. Being a foreigner employed as a specialist in the English language and working at a high rank in a Japanese institution results in participants occupying a cultural mediator role within the bureaucratic hierarchy.

4.9 Brief Summary and Research Questions Revisited

The above units of meaning that make up the categories of Hierarchy and Cultural Mediator holistically address the study's research questions. The layout of the Findings and Discussion chapter was determined by following the hermeneutic phenomenological approach, where: "Creating a phenomenological text is the object of the research process. And of course, this purpose stands in the service of the fundamental commitment that animates the research questions" (van Manen, 1990, p. 111). Keeping in mind the fullness of what it means for TFELP to be involved in internationalization processes in Japanese universities, the answers to the research questions will be succinctly summarized below.

The aim of the study was:

> to investigate the lived experiences of tenure-track/tenured foreign English language professors (TFELP) employed at Japanese universities, against the backdrop of internationalization of HE, and within the broader context of the influences of new public management.

Research Question 1. How do TFELP employed at Japanese universities experience curricular, program, and other administrative work of their departments and universities?

In broad terms, participants' administrative work is experienced as taking place in a bureaucratic hierarchy, where they both do what they are told, maintain the structure, and feel tensions between hierarchy and autonomy. Simultaneously, administrative work is experienced as taking place in a central position as a cultural mediator.

Research Question 2. In what ways do TFELP perceive and interpret their administrative work as taking place in a bureaucratic hierarchy?

Ultimately, the practical realities of the intertwined styles of collegium and bureaucracy management models (Hanada, 2013) operating in HEIs both provides structure for and introduces confusion to work relationships. The theme *doing what you are told* is comprised of negative experiences where participants are not given authority over their own work. In faculty meetings, it is necessary to be a "bum on a seat." For university PR events, participants are "slaves," "salespeople," and "cigar-store Indians." In cases where curriculum is handed down from on high, participants "absolutely hate" being told what to

do when they cannot provide feedback. At times, changes to the English curriculum are seen as "colonialist" when TFELP are the head of the committee. Work on entrance exams can be "utter tedium," and a scene where participants' voices are not "being heard, and that logic isn't winning out." At other times, working on the entrance exam is a constructive way to help maintain the structure of the HEI or department. The location where participants manage other teachers and curriculum is where autonomy becomes more intertwined with decisions. It is important that "teachers [under TFELP supervision] are on the ball," and "happy."

Also, within or parallel to hierarchic ranking structures is autonomy in administrative work. Often ambiguity reigns, as when head of committee roles "do not come with some sort of sense of authority." Especially with more experience on the job, participants tend to exert more autonomy and say no to administrative work. These are situations where: "there's no one looking over my shoulder;" and "there's no kind of top-down mandate."

Research Question 3. In what ways do TFELP perceive and interpret their administrative work as intercultural experiences?

Throughout their work-life participants are able to enact both a *Japanese way*, a *different cultural perspective*, and be *cultural liaisons* within their HEIs, in their communities, and with partner HEIs abroad. With regards to communicating and making decisions in their Japan context, participants often explain how: "I think we should do most of the adapting;" and "that's the way things are done in Japan." A specific example in language is the phrase "*watakushi-domo,"* which is used to avoid having any one person take credit for something, but to attribute completed work ambiguously to the group. After years of working in Japanese HEIs, participants function consciously in Japanese ways, and feel that they may not even be able to "teach overseas anymore." As for maintaining a different cultural perspective, TFELP are often able to compare their Japanese HEI experiences with their home country HEI experience and knowledge. Participants feel that they are at times outside the "social structure that [Japanese] have amongst them." Growing up and maturating in Anglophone cultures, means that participants have in-built "a different way of thinking about, approaching a problem," for example.

The theme *cultural liaison* best encapsulates the intercultural aspects of participants' experiences of administrative work. TFELP connect to the community via public events on

holidays, and at PR events open to the public they are often “the face of the university.” As liaisons bringing together people from different cultures within their HEIs, it is common to host international events and weekend retreats. Also, participants are in a position to act as mediator between colleagues within their HEIs and abroad through study abroad programs. As common experience among participants can be summarized thus: They are busy “developing connections and partnerships with other universities.”

Research Question 4 will be addressed in detail below.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

Many universities throughout Japan have chosen to actively develop internationalization through practices such as offering degrees entirely in English and by opening up to more international students and faculty. There are multiple studies that investigate the intercultural experiences of Japanese students (e.g. Nowlan & Wang, 2018) or international students in Japan (e.g. Breaden, 2014). The literature looking at the role that foreign faculty members play is lacking. Whitsed and colleagues learned a great deal and present a robust picture of how foreign part-time adjunct lecturers of English see their place in internationalization of HE processes (Whitsed & Volet, 2011; Whitsed & Wright, 2011). The current project launched after a consideration of these findings. Also, pilot interviews, the picture of the work-life of Japanese professors presented in Poole (2010), and the emerging influence of NPM in HEIs (Hanada, 2013) strongly suggested the area of administrative work as the location of meaningful internationalization of HE. Knight (2004) and Sanderson (2008) lay out the different levels of analysis where internationalization takes place. By focusing on tenure-track and tenured professors who are involved in administrative work, this study happened at the meeting point of two levels, the institution and the individual. Administrative work is where professors are reflexively involved in building and maintaining the institution.

In many cases, participants are able to empathize with the *Japanese way* of communicating and behaving while carrying out administrative work. Being interculturally sensitive includes embodying two or more cultural sets of practices, depending on the formality of the role, time and situation. In cultural terms, participants are neither wholly outsiders nor wholly Japanese. They are able to mostly enact one perspective, then another. This finding highlights a major difference between this study and the study lead by Whitsed (Whitsed & Volet, 2011; Whitsed & Wright, 2011). Part-time adjunct participants experienced their place in Japanese HEIs as being *soto* and *omote*, or outside and front/peripheral.

In their phenomenological look at part-time adjunct foreign lecturers, Whitsed and Volet (2011) invoke the historically-grounded ideology of internationalization as Japanization (Hashimoto, 2000), which includes the process of highlighting, and thus further alienating, the differences of non-Japanese. Often, their participants experienced their role

in “the institutional implementation of internationalization...as *omote* [visible, public] rhetoric and understood [it] to represent a form of propaganda” (Whitsed & Volet, 2011, p. 159). They remind the reader that it is also imperative to recognize that: “It has been well established that in Japan people labelled *soto* (or outsiders such as foreigners) are not permitted full entry into an *uchi* or in-group” (Whitsed & Volet, 2011, p. 161). As their study focused on the role of part-time adjunct foreign lecturers, the status and rank of their participants is necessarily a key component to how they understand their experiences.

In many ways, the fact that tenure-track and tenured professors are decidedly not *soto* (outside), but are rather *uchi* (inside) to their HEIs, and thereby this aspect of Japanese society, can be understood by looking over a list of their responsibilities. Hank became the president of his university. Vern became the head of his English section. Don, Pete, and Harold served as the head of the entrance exam committee. Larry, Ed, Hank, Warren, Rudy, Adam, Sam, and Vern all have the experience of setting up study abroad programs and being the person in charge of maintaining relationships with universities abroad. At times, these decisions come from above, as in the instance of Vern’s dean asking him to head the English section. At other times, participants are delegating work to others on their committees or in their departments. In part, the institutional status or rank, of participants determines the level to which they are or are not included in the central and vital functions of their departments.

However, when seeing participants’ experiences through the lens of the DMIS, and specifically the stage of Adaptation, it becomes necessary to include the interpretation of dualism. Participants are both *uchi* and *soto*. They have a high rank and they are culturally foreign. More specifically, they operate in a territory that allows them a degree of fluidity. At times, such as when they lead a meeting as the head of an entrance exam, participants are *uchi*; they are helping to maintain and create the very structure of their HEIs. At other times, they are *soto*, such as when they are seen as colonialist, or when they consciously decide to not “turn native,” but to be a kind of “professional foreigner.” Rather than choosing cultural sides once and for all, participants can be understood as possessing at least two possible frames of reference. As M. Bennett (2004, p. 71) points out, in describing how individuals with a worldview that includes Adaptation experience “authenticity”: “The answer seems to lie in defining yourself more broadly – in expanding the repertoire of perception and behavior that is ‘yours.’” Because they occupy a high-ranking position in the

HEI hierarchy, participants have a new layer of experiences. Their being foreign does not go away, but onto it is added perceptions and experiences of being in a central position in their institution's culture.

Instead of only thinking in terms of dichotomies such as insider (*uchi*) and/or outsider (*soto*), the overwhelming evidence presented in the Findings and Discussion chapter of this study point towards a third option: the cultural mediator. To consider participants' experiences holistically, often a position as a mediator is one that allows them to keep a foot in both their home culture and Japanese culture. Participants are involved in constructing and maintaining programs and opportunities for foreign language learning and intercultural interactions. The ways in which the HEIs provide an educational context for participants' decisions and actions needs to be reiterated here. As Bochner (1980, p. 13) points out, mediating persons "act as links between only certain segments of the two societies they straddle: those segments that they are sufficiently familiar with and have entry to." It is by remaining focused on internationalization of higher education, and not all of Japanese society, that participants can be seen as performing an important type of intercultural and international role. By way of entering into a high level of the HEI hierarchy, participants are actively internationalizing their departments.

5.1 Implications for Practice & Theory

5.1.1 Recommendations for professional practice

Research Question 4. In what ways can the administrative work life of TFELP be improved?

This fourth and final research question will be answered by recommending a way forward for professors involved in administration of their departments: engaging in critical, systematic reflection and evaluation of administrative work processes. Traditionally, professors have been involved in three broad areas of work: teaching, research, and administration. It is a long-established practice to incorporate critical and reflective practices aimed at evaluating and periodically improving the areas of teaching and research. At the end of courses, students complete course surveys, giving feedback on various aspects of the class. Often included are ways of improving the content, environment, or teaching style. The evolving nature of student bodies, as well as the ever-changing aspects of our

environments, such as technology or content knowledge itself, make this a vital aspect of the process of teaching and learning. Research also undergoes standard evaluation and review. Institutional Review Boards strictly follow legal, medical and psychological, and other best practices to ensure that all steps of the research process are ethical. In addition, publishing follows peer-review, where experts are consulted, offering their advice and judgement on the quality of research and writing. Various aspects of teaching and research are also a part of regular FD programs where academics share innovative ideas on teaching, or research project results, for instance. Especially in the Japanese context, when it comes to the area of administrative work, many professors operate in an environment where reflection, evaluation, and procedures to implement change are non-existent.

After describing and analyzing the lived experiences related to administrative work of tenure-track and tenured professors in the Japanese HEI context, it is clear that this aspect of work is handled differently from teaching and research. There seems to be a tacit acceptance of unreflective, uncritical, and ambiguous practices. As professors are working within systems that often take for granted neoliberal ideologies underpinning the globalized knowledge-based economy, the manifestations of prioritizing incoming funding through top-down management structures ought to be articulated and subjected to a critical lens. In keeping with the overall approach of the current study, where the primary level of focus is the individuals involved in a wider context, the heart of a critical reflection on the processes involved in administrative work must be the individuals involved: the tenure-track/tenured professors.

There can be a danger with neoliberal practices such as NPM in HE to overshadow and overpower any individual action. However, with the *yin* that is the strengthening of the top-down NPM structures in HEIs around the world and in Japan (Hanada, 2013; Lind, 2019; Maassen & Stensaker, 2019), must come the *yang* of the autonomous individual professors' perspectives, who still also adhere to the "republic of scholars" accountability tradition in much of their work (Bleiklie, 2018). Even in situations where professors are fulfilling a role in a hierarchy and administering their department's curriculums and programs, they obviously are "more than just a small cog in a wheel; they are a person, who comes with a history, a unique place in the world and a sense of the future" (Appleby & Pilkington, 2014, p. 36).

Rather than providing ideas of detailed outlines of programs or training sessions for critical reflection on administrative practices, it is recognized by the current study that each

context would address administrative work processes specific to its environment. By keeping individuals (professors) at the center of the process, the HE and the wider education policy context are both considered a part of the whole picture in all cases. Examples of processes to submit to critical investigation might be when the "Ministry of Education" is pushing certain curriculum outcomes, or when an individual head of a committee realizes that they have zero actual authority over committee members.

Starting with professors involved in administrative work, development through critical reflection could consist of workshops, courses, projects, or informal discussion groups. Depending on the specific situations of a given department, it could be beneficial to launch new reflective project or workshops. However, rather than adding to existing workloads, it is recommended that the already in-place system for FD would be an ideal location to make the focus processes involved in administrative work of professors. In discussing policy developments in the field of FD, Kano (2015) explains the Central Council for Education report in 2000 that helped to cement the requirement for all Japanese HEIs to undergo FD. In later revisions, the council stipulated that universities "shall implement institutional training and research for improving class content and teaching methods." Also: "With this change, FD, which had heretofore been a non-binding policy, became mandatory in practice" (Kano, 2015, p. 33). The present study recommends turning the critical and reflective powers of professional academics on the very processes of administration of their departments and institutions. Ideally, the content of focus of already mandatory FD projects/workshops/etc. could be shifted onto reflecting on the tasks and activities of administrative work.

Throughout the Findings and Discussion chapter there were numerous experiences of administrative work presented that would benefit from critical reflection through something like action research, workshops, or discussions among faculty (Appleby & Pilkington, 2014, p. 18). Potential topics emerging from the present study that could be the focus of FD sessions for professors include:

- Implementing curriculum changes;
- Revising the structure of entrance exams;
- Focusing on externally determined, quantitative measures such as standardized tests to measure students' learning;

- Visiting high schools and other PR activities;
- Working with HEIs abroad;
- Authority and accountability in committees;
- Managing part-time teachers

Often, by leaving administrative work up to the semi-autonomous activity of professors involved, ambiguity, confusion, frustration, and ultimately wasting time often results. By articulating processes together in FD meetings, for instance, professors could learn from each other's experiences and knowledge. Ultimately, the question of why certain work is done at all or in a certain way needs to be asked. As pressure mounts from neoliberal forces that seep into universities and NPM becomes standard and concretized, the ways in which these ideologies are manifesting needs to be under the critical eye of those who are often directly involved, professors. The process of developing as critical professionals "needs to incorporate reflection on underlying power structures, questioning established beliefs that are being played out within their practice domain" (Appleby & Pilkington, 2014, p. 19).

5.1.2 Implications for theory – the DMIS

According to the DMIS (M. Bennett, 1986, 2004) individuals at the end of the ethnorelative scale in Integration are in danger of becoming marginalized, or encapsulated marginals (J. Bennett, 1993). By being aware of this third space of a cultural mediator, foreign academics have another option for creating their identity. When living for extended periods in a dominant culture where one's background is very different, the chance of not feeling at home anywhere is a real one (J. Bennett, 1993). By being aware that people in this position are actively involved in creating their own identity, the ways in which international or intercultural individuals are both alike and different is strengthened. Having the opportunities in work to be a cultural mediator means that peaceful connections are being fostered. Participants of this study represent a professional position where not only are they involved in peaceful relationships with people from various cultures, but they are building and managing programs that expand the opportunities of other colleagues and students to interact and exchange language and culture peacefully. Rather than underplay this role of foreign professors in HE, it is hoped that the present study works to raise awareness of how these roles function.

The current study also presents a unique application of the DMIS, where the model's underlying presuppositions and worldview were melded to the overall methodology and used to aid in analyzing conversational interviews in the hermeneutic phenomenology tradition. By starting with participants who have second-language proficiency and experience living in abroad for long periods of time (e.g. Lee Olson & Kroeger, 2001), it became apparent that they would be placed in the final two stages of Adaptation and Integration. By discussing anecdotes and reflecting on lived experiences, participants aurally depicted cases when they engaged in empathy (M. Bennett, 1998) and seeing things from their second cultural worldview. It was learned that empathetic thought and behavioral processes are one method for acting in a mediating position.

5.2 Limitations of the Study & Suggestions for Further Research

The focus of this study is on English-language professors in Japan. As Dlaska (2013) posits, academics in language education have a central role to play in internationalizing HE. When employed at a high rank, professors of foreign language and culture are actively involved in international and intercultural processes. However, this narrow focus leaves open the question of in what ways are non-language related foreign professors involved? This study presents a phenomenological look at Cultural Mediators who are Anglophone in background. The experiences of foreign tenure-track and tenured professors in Japan who are from other language backgrounds could present a different picture.

A related limitation of this study is the lack of perspective from Japanese colleagues. Although historical figures involved in introducing the outside world and systematic schooling and HE to Japan after the end of *sakoku* (closed country) and feudalism were discussed in the introduction, the perspective of Japanese academics and their relationships with participants today was excluded. To broaden our understanding of the impact that intercultural curriculum and programs led by foreign professors have on HEIs, future studies might focus on the lived experiences of Japanese colleagues who work closely with foreign professors.

Where the overall design of this study is concerned, one limitation is that the area of focus is broad. Being one of the first studies of its kind, the area of academic work that is most involved with internationalization was chosen. A more narrowly focused study may

give more insight to how individuals are affected by intercultural programs such as study abroad, for instance. The role foreign professors play in the creation, design, and management of study abroad programs would be one clear option for the focus of a future study. Likewise, a study with a narrow focus on committee work alone could be informative, especially when more closely considering interpersonal issues, and issues of language, race, and power dynamics.

A final limitation that became apparent in the data analysis stage of the study is the way that participants' years in their position ranged from 2 to 30. This decision was made for two reasons. First, in the early stages of the project the number of professors who would be willing to participate was unknown. It was decided that the criteria decided upon were sufficient, and as long as participants were of tenure-track status they qualified. The choice to include participants with any number of years of experience was also arrived at after carefully considering the methodological approach of hermeneutic phenomenology. To investigate administrative work means in reality that any rank at or above tenure-track qualifies, as this type of position is defined by the additional set of administrative duties professors must carry out. However, it is clear that early career academics have the added pressure of trying to understand the system that is new to them. Future research limited to this group of tenure-track professors in the first few years of their position could reveal a more nuanced set of experiences.

Overall, it should be realized that the underlying structure and founding philosophy of modern HE in Japan is similar to Western models. The more recent cries to foster internationalization of Japanese HE, especially in the face of increased competition for students and the growing importance placed on global HEI ranking regimes, can be over-exaggerated. It is imperative that our considerations of internationalization of HE in Japan are grounded in an understanding of the ways that German and US HEI systems were brought in only a little over a century ago. By displacing the traditional culture of education, HE set itself down the path it continues on today. This study's close look at foreign English-language professors' experiences offers a window into the complex nature of internationalization of HE in Japan more broadly. Both a Japanese way and a different cultural perspective will likely always be present. When considering how these disparate perspectives can be reconciled, the role of Cultural Mediators is indispensable. Participants of this study embody two or more cultures and act as *points of potential*, through which

new or different cultural perspectives are introduced to colleagues, students, and thereby Japanese HEIs.

5.3 Ethical Considerations and Professional and Personal Impact

Throughout the research, one of the greatest challenges was to balance attempting to allow the participants to speak for themselves while still retaining and enacting an analytical and critical perspective. Originally, the results of the data analysis as written up erred on the side of allowing participants to present their stories without placing their lived experience in the light of theory and a wider perspective. One of the foundational principles of my approach is to place and keep individuals at the center of the research. Too often, policies, trends, or ideologies affecting HE are written about as if people are not involved at all in the processes. At times, the present study tended to overcompensate for this and make the lived experiences of participants the sole focus. The degree to which the greater context needed to be incorporated was a constant struggle throughout. Ultimately, I attempted to anchor any discussion of the wider context, ideologies, and theory in the every-day experiences of professors.

A further ethical consideration that was at play throughout all stages of the research was the importance of confidentiality. Initially, when asking volunteers to participate, one professor replied that they would not be comfortable talking about their job. To talk about one’s own experiences, especially in work that intimately involves colleagues can seem like a breach of privacy. Also, for reasons of lack of language ability, or perhaps shaky relationships with colleagues, there were at times aspects of administrative work that participants avoided. Overall, it was my responsibility to make participants feel comfortable. I had to make sure that I carefully monitored how participants were feeling about certain topics. I made sure that topics that were sensitive were avoided. This was a skill I had to develop over the course of the interviews. I improved as the interviews progressed. After the first four interviews I felt that I had become much better at gauging participants level of willingness to talk about certain aspects of work. Because of the immense amount of administrative work that participants are involved in, it was not difficult to avoid any specific tasks that they did not feel comfortable discussing. Luckily, it was always the case that there

was plenty to talk about. There were also a few cases where participants asked for certain parts of the transcriptions to be removed and not included in the analysis.

Professionally, I have become increasingly aware of the hierarchy that structures our HEIs. After describing participants' experiences, analyzing all of the interviews, and connecting their stories to the wider context in Japan and across the world, my aversion to being involved in administration has only been reinforced. Working in a second language and culture certainly adds a layer of difficulty to administrative work for foreign professors in Japanese HEIs. At the end of the research process, I do not feel attracted to positions of higher rank. In my professional life, I hope to put my teaching and research skills to use in increasingly efficient, innovative, and helpful ways. However, without administrative work processes themselves being submitted to the type of critical reflection discussed above, this is one area of the academic profession that I will attempt to avoid. Perhaps this sentiment was best expressed by the novelist Herman Hesse when talking of the "Order," which was a scholarly society, and the hierarchy that shaped it: "If the High Board summons you to a post...know this: Each upward step on the ladder of officialdom is not a step into freedom, but into constraint. The greater the power of the office, the stricter the servitude" (1943, p. 357).

The most edifying aspect of the research process for me personally over the long run has been the way my mind has been trained to focus on meaning. Hermeneutic phenomenology as a methodology has a lot to teach those who believe a quantitative aspect to studies is a requirement. To take situated lived experience as the object of study has been an amazing journey in my development as a researcher and thinker. Although learning about hierarchy and culture will never end for me, it is through a worldview that places meaning at the center that I have been able to develop what has been called "thoughtfulness" as a researcher, which means "not that we have a whole lot on our mind, but rather that we recognize our lot of minding the Whole – that which renders fullness or wholeness to life" (van Manen, 1990, p. 31). Throughout the process of researching, I was also able to develop more strongly my belief in the people involved in maintaining HEIs. I learned that it would behoove all stakeholders in HEIs to remember in practice to hold the center, which is the individuals doing the studying and the work. Ideologies, policies, curriculums, and programs are skeletal structures that have no existence without those who embody them in practice, in the end.

References

Agnew, M. (2012). A false dichotomy of serving either the local or the global community and its impact on internationalization of the university. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 34*(5), 473-489.

Altbach, P. G. (2006). Globalization and the university: Realities in an unequal world. In J. J. F. Forest & P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *International Handbook of Higher Education* (pp. 347–375). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Altbach, P. G. and Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3-4), 290-305.

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. UNESCO.

Altman, A. A. (1971). A Recently Discovered Document on Early Meiji Press Censorship Legislation. *Gazette (Leiden, Netherlands), 17*(4), 216-223.

Altshuler, L., Sussman, N. M., Kachur, E. (2003). Assessing changes in intercultural sensitivity among physician trainees using the intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*, 387-401.

Anzai, S., & Matsuzawa, C. (2013). Missions of the Japanese national university corporations in the 21st century: Content analysis of mission statements. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 2*(3), 197-207.

Appleby, Y., & Pilkington, R. (2014). *Developing critical professional practice in education*. National Institute of Adult Continuing Education: Leicester, England.

Arimoto, A. (2010). Japan's internationalization of higher education: A response to the pressures of globalization. In E. W. Chapman, W. K. Cummings, & G. A. Postiglione (Eds.). *Crossing Borders in East-Asian Higher Education*. 195-210. Hong Kong: Springer.

Asaoka, T., Yano, J. (2009). The contribution of "study abroad" programs to Japanese internationalization, *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13*(2), 174-188.

Barnlund, D. C. (1975). *Public and private self in Japan and the United States*. Intercultural Press: Tokyo.

Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework.

Higher Education, 45, 43-70.

Beauchamp, E. R. (1976). An American teacher in early Meiji Japan. University of Hawaii Press. Bennett, J. M. (1993). Cultural marginality: Identity issues in intercultural training. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 109–136). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Bennett, M. J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10*, 179-196.

Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Bennett, M. J. (1998). Overcoming the golden rule: Sympathy and empathy. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.), *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp. 191-214). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Bennett, M. J. (2004). Becoming interculturally competent. In J. Wurzel (Ed.). *Toward multiculturalism: A reader in multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 62-77). Newton, MA: Intercultural Resource Corporation.

Binswanger, L. (1963). *Being in the world*. New York: Basic Books.

Bleiklie, I. (2018). New public management or neoliberalism, higher education. In J.C. Shin, & P. Teixeira (eds.), *Encyclopedia of international higher education systems and institutions* (pp. 1-6).

Bochner, S. (1981). The social psychology of cultural mediation. In S. Bochner, (Ed.), *The mediating person: Bridges between cultures* (pp. 6-36). Boston, MA: Schenkman Publishing Company.

Breaden, J. (2012). Internationalization and paternalistic micro-management in a Japanese university. *Japanese Studies, 32*(1), 21-37.

Brotherhood, T., Hammond, C. D., & Kim, Y. (2019). Towards an actor-centered typology of internationalization: A study of junior international faculty in Japanese universities. *Higher Education, 79*, 497-514.

Brown, C. A. (2019). Foreign faculty tokenism, English, and “internationalization” in a Japanese university. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education 39*(3), 404-416.

Butler, N. M. (1912). The international mind. The Advocate of Peace (1894-1920), 74(6), 143-146.

Burgess, C., Gibson, I., Klaphake, J., & Selzer, M. (2010). The ‘Global 30’ Project and Japanese higher education reform: An example of a ‘closing in’ or an ‘opening up’?, *Globalization, Societies and Education, 8*(4), 461-475.

Cantwell, B. & Maldonado-Maldonado, A. (2009). Four stories: Confronting contemporary ideas about globalization and internationalization in higher education. *Globalization, Societies and Education, 7*(3), 289-306.

Caruana, V. (2016). Researching the transnational higher education policy landscape: Exploring network power and dissensus in a globalizing system. *London Review of Education, 14*(1), 56-69.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). London, UK: Routledge.

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (4th ed.). London: Sage.

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. London: Sage.

Duke, B. C. (2008). *The history of modern Japanese education: Constructing the national school system, 1872-1890*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Duke, B. C. (Ed.). (1989). *Ten great educators of modern Japan*. University of Tokyo Press.

Enders, J. (2004). Higher education, internationalization, and the nation-state: Recent developments and challenges to governance theory. *Higher Education, 47*, 361-382.

Endicott, L., Bock, T, & Narvaez, D. (2003). Moral reasoning, intercultural development, and multicultural experiences: relations and cognitive underpinnings. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*, 403-419.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* London, UK: Aldine Transaction.

Glassman, M., Erdem, G., & Bartholomew, M. (2012). Action research and its history as an adult education movement for social change. *Adult Education Quarterly, 63*(3), 272-288.

Goodin, C. C. (1994). Tengu: The legendary mountain goblins of Japan. *Furyu: The Budo Journal, 2*. Retrieved from http://www.seinenkai.com/articles/tengu.html

Goodman, R. (2007). The concept of kokusaika and Japanese education reform. *Globalization, Societies and Education, 5*(1), 71-87.

Green, W., & Mertova, P. (2016). Transformalists and transactionists: Toward a more comprehensive understanding of academics' engagement with 'internationalization of the curriculum.' *Research in Comparative & International Education, 11*(3), 229-246.

Hall, E. T. (1959). *The silent language*. New York: Anchor Books.

Hall, I. P. (1998). *Cartels of the mind: Japan's intellectual closed shop*. New York: Norton & Company.

Hammer Holdings Incorporated. (2018). Intercultural Development Inventory. Retrieved https://idiinventory.com/

Hammer, M. (2011). Additional cross-cultural validity testing of the Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35*, 474-487.

Hammer, M.R., Bennett, & M.J., Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*, 421-443.

Hamza, A. (2010). International experience: An opportunity for professional development in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 14*(1), 50-69.

Hanada, S. (2013). Japan's higher education incorporation policy: A comparative analysis of three stages of national university governance. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 35*(5), 537-552.

Hashimoto, K. (2000). 'Internationalization' is 'Japanization': Japan's foreign education and national identity. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 21*(1), 39-51.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings.* Albany, NY: SUNY.

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time*. New York: Harper.

Hesse, H. (1943). *The glass bead game.* London: Random House.

Horback, S. & Rothery-Jackson, C. (2007). Cultural marginality: Exploration of self-esteem and cross-cultural adaptation of the marginalized individual: An investigation of the second generation Hare Krishnas. *Journal of Intercultural Communication, 14* (2-21).

Huang, F. (2009). The internationalization of the academic profession in Japan: A quantitative perspective. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13*(2), 143-158.

Hycner, R. H. (1985). Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. *Human Studies, 8*, 279-303.

Ishikawa, M. (2009). University rankings, global models, and emerging hegemony: A critical analysis from Japan. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13* (2).

Japan Student Services Organization (JASSO), (2019). International Students in Japan 2018. Retrieved from https://www.jasso.go.jp/en/about/statistics/intl_student_e/2018/index.html

Jaques, E. (1976). *A general theory of bureaucracy*. London: Heinemann.

Jaques, E. (2006). *Requisite organization: A total system for effective managerial organization and managerial leadership for the 21st century*. Florida: Cason Hall & Co.

Jones, H. J. (1980). *Live machines: Hired foreigners and Meiji Japan*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Kameda, M. (2013, May 23). Education panel urges Japanese universities to reach outside. The Japan Times. Retrieved http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2013/05/23/national/education-panel-urges-japanese-colleges-to-reach-outside/#.VVs4taaPAno"

Killick, D. (2018). *Developing intercultural practice: Academic development in a multicultural and globalizing world*. New York: Routledge.

Kim, E. C. (2015). International professors in China: Prestige maintenance and making sense of teaching abroad. *Current Sociology 63(4)*, 1-17.

Kim, S. K. (2016). Western faculty ‘flight risk’ at a Korean university and the complexities of internationalization in Asian higher education. *Comparative Education*, 1-13.

King, R. (2010). Policy internationalization, national variety and governance: Global models and network power in higher education states. *Higher Education, 60*, (583-594).

Kelly, G. (1963). *A theory of personality*. New York: Norton.

Klak, T., & Martin, P. (2003). Do university-sponsored international cultural events help students to appreciate “difference”? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*, 445-465.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in Intercultural Education, 8*(1), 5-31.

Kubota, R. (1998). Ideologies of English in Japan. *World Englishes, 17*(3), 295-306.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leask, B., & Bridge, C. (2013). Comparing internationalization of the curriculum in action across disciplines: Theoretical and practical perspectives. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 43*(1), 79-101.

Lebra, T. S. [Ed]. (1992). *Japanese social organization*. University of Hawaii Press.

Lebra, T. S. (2004). *The Japanese self in cultural logic*. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.

Lee Olson, C., & Kroeger, K. R. (2001). Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 5*(2), 116-137.

Lind, J. K. (2019). Resource environment and hierarchy in universities. *Science and Public Policy*, 1-10.

Maassen, P., & Stensaker, B. (2019). From organized anarchy to de-coupled bureaucracy: The transformation of university organization. *Higher Education Quarterly, 73*, (456-468)

Marginson, S. (2014). University rankings and social science. *European Journal of Education, 49*(1), 45-59.

Marshall, B. K. (1994). Learning to be modern: Japanese political discourse on education. San Francisco: Westview Press.

McConnell, D. L. (2000). *Importing diversity: Inside Japan's JET Program*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

McNay, I. (1995). From the collegial academy to corporate enterprise: The changing cultures of universities. In T. Shuller (Ed.), *The changing universities?* (pp. 105-115). Bristol, PA: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

McVeigh, B. J. (2002). *Japanese higher education as myth.* London: M.E. Sharpe.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), Higher Education Bureau. (2012). Higher education in Japan. Author.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2013). Gurobaru jinzai ikusei suisin jigyou [Project for the development of global human resources]. Retrieved

http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/24/09/attach/1326084.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), (2014). Top University Project (2014-2023). Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/component/english/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2017/09/13/1395487_001.pdf

Morikawa, T. (1989). Mori Arinori. In B. C. Duke (Ed.), *Ten great educators of modern Japan*, (pp. 39-66). University of Tokyo Press.

Morozumi, A. (2019). Higher education reform: Focusing on national university reform. In Y. Kitamura et al. (Eds.), *Education in Japan: Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects, 47*, (pp. 197-209). Springer.

Moses, J. & Knutsen, T. (2012). *Ways of knowing: Competing methodologies in social and political research* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Munene, I. I. (2014). Outsiders within: Isolation of international faculty in an American university. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education, 19*(4), 450-467.

Ninomiya, A. Knight, & J. Watanabe, A. (2009). The past, present, and future of internationalization in Japan. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13*(2), 117-124.

Nowlan, A. & Wang, R. (2018). Study abroad self-selection amongst first-year Japanese university students. *Journal of International and Comparative Education, 7*(2), 65-81.

Packwood, T. (1989). Return to the hierarchy! *Educational Management and Administration, 17*, 9-15.

Paige, R. M., Jacobs-Cassuto, M., Yershova, Y. A., & DeJaeghere, J. (2003). Assessing intercultural sensitivity: an empirical analysis of the Hammer and Bennett Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*, 467-486.

Park, R. E. (1928). Human migration and the marginal man. *American Journal of Sociology, 33* (6), 881-893.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd Ed.). London: Sage.

Peterson, J. B. (1999). *Maps of meaning: The architecture of belief*. London: Routledge.

Pherali, T. J. (2012). Academic mobility, language, and cultural capital: The experience of transnational academics in British higher education institutions. *Journal of Studies in*

International Education, 16(4), 313-333.

Poole, G. S. (2010). *The Japanese professor: An ethnography of a university faculty*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Pyle, K. B. (2006). Profound forces in the making of modern Japan. *The Journal of Japanese Studies, 32*(2), 393-418.

Quigley, C. (1966). *Tragedy and hope: A history of the world in our time*. New York: Macmillan.

Renc-Roe, J., & Roxa, T. (2014). The internationalization of a university as local practices: A case study. *Education Inquiry, 5*(1), 127-148.

Robson, S. (2011). Internationalization: A transformative agenda for higher education? Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 17(6), 619-630.

Roberson, L., Kulik, C. T., & Pepper, M. B. (2002). Assessing instructor cultural competence in the classroom: An instrument and development process. *Journal of Management Education, 26*(1), 40-55.

Rubinger, R. (1986). Education: From one room to one system. In M. B. Jansen & G. Rozman (Eds.), *Japan in transition from Tokugawa to Meiji* (pp. 195-230). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sanderson, G. (2008). A foundation for the internationalization of the academic self. Journal of Studies in International Education, 12(3), 276-307.

Shimmi, Y., & Yonezawa, A. (2015). Japan's "Top Global University" Project. *International Higher Education, 81*, 27-28.

Stier, J. (2004). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: Idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 2*(1), 1-28.

Stonequist, E. V. (1935). The problem of the marginal man. American Journal of Sociology, 41 (1), 1-12.

Stonequist, E. V. (1937). The marginal man: A study in personality and culture conflict. New York: Russell & Russell.

Straffon, D. A. (2003). Assessing the intercultural sensitivity of high school students attending an international school. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*, 487-501.

Times Higher Education (THE). (2017). World university rankings 2018 methodology.

Retrieved from https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/methodology-world-university-rankings-2018

Tsuneyoshi, R. (2005). Internationalization strategies in Japan: The dilemmas and possibilities of study abroad programs using English. *Journal of Research in International Education, 4* (1), 65-86.

van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Albany, NY: SUNY.

Whitsed, C., & Volet, S. (2011). Fostering the intercultural dimensions of internationalization in higher education: Metaphors and challenges in the Japanese context. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 15*(2), 146-170).

Whitsed, C., & Volet, S. (2013). Positioning foreign English language teachers in the Japanese university context. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 19*(6), 717-735.

Whitsed, C., & Wright, P. (2011). Perspectives from within: Adjunct, foreign, English-language teachers in the internationalization of Japanese universities. *Journal of Research in International Education, 10*, 28-45.

Whitsed, C., & Wright, P. (2013). English language learning in the Japanese higher education sector: Towards internationalization*. Intercultural Education*, 1-15.

Whitsed, C., & Wright, P. (2016). A bricolage exploration in genkan space: Tengu and adjunct TEFL in the Japanese university context. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education 29*(4), 594-615.

Yamada, H. (1997). *Different games different rules: Why Japanese Americans and Japanese misunderstand each other.* Oxford University Press.

Yasukawa, J. (1989). Fukuzawa Yukichi. In B. C. Duke (Ed.), *Ten great educators of modern Japan* (pp. 17-38). University of Tokyo Press.

Yonezawa, A. (2006). Japan. In J. J. F. Forest & P.G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Yonezawa, A. (2010). Much ado about ranking: Why can't Japanese universities internationalize? *Japan Forum, 22*(1-2). 121-137.

Yonezawa, A., & Meerman, A. (2012). Multilateral initiatives in the East Asian arena and the challenges for Japanese higher education. *Asian Education and Development Studies, 1*(1), 57-66.

Yonezawa, A. (2013). Challenges for top Japanese universities when establishing a new global identity: Seeking a new paradigm after "world class." In J. C. Shin & B. M. Kehm (Eds.) *Institutionalization of World-Class University in Global Competition,* (pp. 125-143). Springer Science.

Appendix 1: Interview Guide

Interview guide (Updated 11/24/2015)

Introduction to the study

I am a doctoral student in an EdD program with the University of Liverpool, studying higher education. My research focuses on internationalization in Japanese higher education, and academic work-life. I am interested in learning about your experiences as a foreign faculty member. The specific experiences I will ask you about are those beyond your teaching and personal research. I would also like to know about your use of Japanese at work, especially your interactions with colleagues and staff.

<table>
<tr><th>Interview questions</th></tr>
<tr><td>1. Please tell me about the administrative work that you are involved in. This could include:
committees you head or serve on
involvement in faculty meetings
overseeing other faculty, hiring staff for instance
other administrative duties</td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Please tell me about your involvement at the curriculum level. For example:
if you set course or program requirements
decide textbooks, goals and objectives, or assessments for other teachers
entrance exam work
collaboration with colleagues on curriculum issues
other curriculum-related duties</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. Can you discuss other programs or events you have been involved in? For instance:
open-school or PR events such as high school visits
study abroad (e.g. interviewing or accompanying students on trips)
official events, such as entrance or graduation ceremonies, or required teacher retreats etc.
others</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. Can you talk about your use of Japanese at work with colleagues and staff? For instance:</td></tr>
</table>

• Speaking with staff, colleagues • Reading emails • Reading other institutional documents • Writing emails • Other writing
5. Do you have any questions for me? Anything more you would like to add before we finish?

Appendix 2: Participant Information Sheet

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Title of Study: Being a Foreign Professor in Japan: Experiences of International Academics

Version Number and Date: Version 02 21/12/2015

You are invited to participate in a research study. It is an interview-based project looking at the experiences of foreign English language faculty working in Japan. Before deciding whether or not to participate, please read over the following information and feel free to ask me if you have any further questions. Participation is voluntary. Please choose to take part only if you would like to. Thank you for reading this.

Purpose of the study

The study aims to develop a better understanding of the experiences that foreign faculty working at Japanese universities have. One of the goals of the project is to demonstrate how individuals, in this case tenure-track and tenured faculty, are involved in various internationalization processes at universities.

Invited Participants

The design of the study seeks foreign tenure-track or tenured faculty members who teach English language or similar courses at university level. This group of participants has been chosen based on the assumption that they are in positions that require them to do more than teach their own classes and conduct their own personal research. There is little extant research that has been done with this group of academics. With the increasing importance on internationalization espoused by the Japanese government and many universities, there

is a need for more research on what the reality is for individuals involved. I am hoping to have 15-20 participants in total.

Do I have to take part?

You do not have to take part if you would rather not. Your participation is voluntary. Also, if you should choose to withdraw from the study at any point, I will not use any data you have provided if you so choose. You will be free to withdraw at any time without explanation.

What will happen if I take part?

The study is a qualitative interview-based study. I will be meeting you for one conversational interview, to last approximately one hour. This interview can take place in an agreed upon location, and can be recorded with your permission. We can meet in your office, or in an agreed upon quiet location. If it is more convenient for both parties, an online interview can be conducted from our respective homes/offices. Interviews will take place in at least 7 days from your receiving this invitation, in order to give you sufficient time to think it over and ask questions.

What I will be asking of you is to talk about experiences you have personally had at work. *The specific experiences I would like you to talk about include, for example, your involvement in:*

- meetings
- department or school events
- open-school events
- curriculum development
- ceremonies or official events
- intercultural activities, such as study abroad preparation
- interactions with faculty and staff in your department
- and other programs or administrative duties

The interview questions will not ask you for specific information about your department, university, or other colleagues. Rather than focusing on department or university policy, for example, I will be focusing on what you as a faculty member do, and how you experience work.

Payments

There will not be any payments provided for participation.

Risks

There will not be any risks involved in the research beyond those you face in normal life. The research has no conflicts of interest. This research is being conducted under the auspices of the University of Liverpool and has no connection to my current university of employment in Japan.

The research/researcher will not ask you to waive any legal rights.

Benefits

There are not any benefits available to participants beyond the invaluable contribution they will make to the researcher's project and our knowledge of international faculty members in higher education in Japan. It is hoped that your participation in this research study will help you to gain greater clarity around your own experiences and perceptions of internationalization in HEIs in Japan.

What if I am unhappy or if there is a problem?

If a situation occurs where you are unhappy or if there is a problem related to the research project, you are welcome to contact my supervisor Dr. Hazel Brown at hazel.brown@online.liverpool.ac.uk. You can also contact me at harlan.kellem@online.liverpool.ac.uk or 090-1716-4521 and I will try to help. If you remain unhappy or have a complaint, which you feel you cannot come to me with, you should contact the Research Participant Advocate at USA number 001-612-312-1210 or email address liverpoolethics@ohecampus.com. When contacting the Research participant Advocate please

provide details of the name or description of the study, the researcher involved, and the details of the complaint you wish to make.

Will my participation be kept confidential?

Our conversations in the interview(s) will be kept confidential. The audio recordings will be kept on the researcher's home computer, under password protection. Your information will be anonymous. The anonymity process will begin immediately with the typing of the transcript. The typed transcript will not contain your real name, and all potentially identifying information such as names of individuals or universities will not be included in the transcript. Also, you will have the option of removing any section of our conversation from the transcript that you would not like to be included in my data analysis. Any report that is published related to the study will contain pseudonyms.

The transcript data will be stored for five years on a password protected hard drive, locked in a desk drawer.

The results of the study

Upon completion, the results of the study will be presented to the University of Liverpool as an EdD thesis. It will then be public ally available. Please let me know if you would like to be notified when the results become public. Although some sections of conversations with participants may be quoted in the published reports, pseudonyms will be used and in no way will participants be identifiable.

What will happen if I wish to stop taking part?

You are free to stop taking part at any time, without explanation. Results up to the point of withdrawal may be used, if you are happy for this to be done. Otherwise you may request that all your data is removed and destroyed and no further use is made of them.

For further questions

Please contact the researcher directly if you have any questions at all:

Harlan Kellem

harlan.kellem@online.liverpool.ac.uk

090-1716-4521

3-345-1-701 Nakamozu-cho

Kita-ku, Sakai-shi

Osaka, 591-8023

Or contact the research supervisor:

Dr. Hazel J Brown

Email: hazel.brown@online.liverpool.ac.uk

Sincerely,

Harlan Kellem

Appendix 3: Participant Consent Form

Committee on Research Ethics

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Title of Research Project:	Being a Foreign Professor in Japan: Experiences of International Academics
Researcher(s):	Harlan Kellem

Please initial box

1. I confirm that I have read and have understood the information sheet dated [21/12/2015] for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason, without my rights being affected. In addition, should I not wish to answer any particular question or questions, I am free to decline.

3. I understand that, under the Data Protection Act, I can at any time ask for access to the information I provide and I can also request the destruction of that information if I wish.

4. I understand that confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained and it will not be possible to identify me in any publications.

Participant Name	Date	Signature

Researcher	Date	Signature

EdD Researcher:

Harlan Kellem

harlan.kellem@online.liverpool.ac.uk

Research Supervisor:

Dr. Hazel Brown

hazel.brown@online.liverpool.ac.uk