Unpacking Faculty Development in Japan:

an ethnography of faculty development practitioners

Machi Sato

St Antony's College

University of Oxford

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of DPhil in Education in the Social Science Division of the University of Oxford

Table of Contents

Unpacking Faculty Development in Japan: **1**

Abstract **7**

List of Selected Abbreviations **9**

List of Selected Key Japanese Terms **10**

Introduction **11**

Background 12

An Overview of the Thesis 16

A note on the use of 'faculty development', Japanese terms and names 21

Chapter One: In Search of Faculty Development **22**

Introduction 22

1.1 Overview of the Evolution of Faculty Development 26

1.2 Voices of Faculty Development Practitioners 41

1.2.1 Emerging Confidence and Underlying Concerns 42

1.2.2 Role and Identity of Faculty Development Practitioners 47

1.3 Emerging Key Terms 51

Conclusion 59

Chapter Two: From 'Faculty Development' to '*FD*' in Japan **62**

Introduction 62

2.1 Two Major Post-WWII Changes in Universities 65

2.1.1 Introduction of *Shinsei Daigaku* and its Impacts 65

2.1.2 Impact of the Expansion of HE 70

2.2 Responses 75

2.2.1 LGES and Faculty Development 78

2.2.2 Negotiations between the University Council and LGES 88

2.2.3 From *Ippan Kyōiku Gakkai* to *Daigaku Kyōiku Gakkai* 92

2.2.4 HE Research 95

2.3 New Policy and Universities' Response 104

2.3.1 Introduction of New Concepts 104

2.3.2 The Academic Profession in Japan 107

2.3.3 Response of Universities and *FD* Practitioners 111

Conclusion 117

Chapter Three: Research Design 122
Introduction 122
3.1 Research Question 122
3.2 Research Strategy 128
3.2.1 The Ethnographic Approach to Research 128
3.2.2 Limitations of Ethnography 135
3.3 Ethnographic Research Design 138
3.3.1 The Researcher as a Research Instrument 142
3.4 Fieldwork 148
3.4.1 Selecting the Site 148
3.4.2 Access 149
3.4.3 Recording Data 153
3.4.4 Collecting Data 155
3.4.5 Research Ethics 158
Conclusion 162
Chapter Four: The Case of Sakura University 164
Introduction 164
4.1 The Field in Context 165
4.1.1 The University 165
4.1.2 The *Sentā* and its Staff 171
4.2 ICT-FD Project 185
4.2.1 Overview of the Project 185
4.2.2 The Project Member 188
4.2.3 Understanding the Government Funding 190
4.3 The University and FD 193
4.3.1 The Mystery of *FD* Committee 193
4.3.2 The University's Attitude to *FD* 196
4.4 Impact of the Peripheral Position of the Sentā on the Project 202
4.4.1 The Library Incident 203
4.4.2 Discussion 210
Conclusion 213
Chapter Five: Personal Trajectory, Professional Values, and Career Prospects . 217
Introduction 217
5.1 Confusion about Appropriate Positions 222
5.1.1 Understanding the Project and Role 222

5.1.2 Confusion Regarding Appropriate Positions within the *Sentā* 226
5.1.3 Administrator's boundary 230
5.2 Impact of Lived Experiences 238
5.2.1 Handouts and the Help Desk 238
5.2.2 Discussion 242
5.3 Career Prospects and Professional Identity 245
5.3.1 Uncertainty about the Future of the Project and Motivations 245
5.3.2 Lived Experiences and Professional Values 250
Conclusion 255

Chapter Six: Identity and Career Issues of Junior Academics as *FD Tantōsha* ...259
Introduction 259
6.1 Makino's Story 262
6.2 Situation of Junior Academics 267
6.2.1 Making Sense of the Status Quo and Shared Experiences 267
6.2.2 '*On*' and '*Shigarami*' 275
6.3 FDer: Creating a New Career Path 280
6.3.1 Wada's Story 280
6.3.2 Establishment of a Community for *FDer* 289
6.3.3 The Mixed Reaction of Junior Academics 290
6.4 FD Senmonka: A Given Label 295
6.4.1 Implications of *FD Senmonka* 296
6.4.2 Disciplinary Background: Educational Technology 299
6.5 JFDN Jr: Staying Open to Options 303
Conclusion 309

Chapter Seven: From FD practitioner to '*FD tantōsha*' 312
Introduction 312
7.1 Overview of Preceding Chapters 315
7.2 Choosing to Stay a 'Tantōsha' 320
7.2.1 Importance of Institutional Communities and *'Tantōsha'* 320
7.2.2 Discipline and Identity 325
7.3 Concept of FD 332
7.4 Role of the Practitioners' Community 336
Conclusion 341

Conclusion 343

Current situation....345
Reflections on Research Strategy....348
Implications for Future Investigations....349
Appendix 1: Consent letter....352
Appendix 2: Part of the research proposal....353
Appendix 3: Sample of substantive field note....354
Appendix 4: Sample of analytic field note....358
Appendix 5: List of interviewees....359
Selected Bibliography....362
Website....380

Abstract

This thesis provides an ethnographic account of the lived experiences of faculty development practitioners in Japan. Through participatory observation and ethnographic interviews, it seeks to understand the following research question:

> "How do faculty development practitioners make sense of the concept of faculty development as a professional identity and a lived experience in Japan?"

The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, MEXT, introduced and recommended institutional '*fakaruthī diberoppumento* (faculty development)' or '*FD*' in 1999 and later mandated it in 2008. As a result, universities created the role and position of *FD* practitioner. Those *FD* practitioners have been involved in crafting a genre of faculty development that reconcile policy requirements, university's requirements, and their personal understanding. This leads to a daily struggle between acting as *FD* practitioner according to external requirements and sustaining or constructing one's own professional identity and values especially as an academic. By incorporating notions of 'identity' and 'community', I describe practitioners' constant negotiation of their position between an academic and a *FD* practitioner.

I have three arguments. First, the title of '*FD tantōsha*' that is most commonly used in Japan creates a semantic space for negotiations to take place between different types of identities, both practiced and/or idealized. '*Tantōsha*' literally means the person in charge and it is relatively

neutral label to describe the position. Second, alphabetically written '*FD*' prevents the evolution of the concept. The term '*FD*' is just a symbolic noun therefore it allows various interpretations but it does not allow evolution of the concept like in the USA and the UK. As an English term, 'faculty development' means 'to develop' 'faculty'. As the focus of faculty development shifted, the term also changed, leading to terms such as 'educational development'. Third, the temporariness of the position prevents practitioners to engage with the community for faculty development practitioners in Japan and in other countries. Therefore interpretation of the concept of faculty development, creation of the common language and knowledge base as a field, and construction of professional identity have yet to be observed.

Word count: approx. 83,000

List of Selected Abbreviations

FD	Faculty Development
HE	Higher education
HEA	Higher Education Academy
HERDSA	Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia
ICED	International Consortium for Educational Development
ICU	International Christian University
IJAD	International Journal for Academic Development
JAES	Japan Association of Educational Sociology
JAHER	Japan Association of Higher Education Research
JAED	Japan Association of Educational Development
JSET	Japan Society of Educational Technology
JUAA	Japan University Accreditation Association
LGES	Liberal and General Education Society of Japan
MEXT	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology
POD	Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency
RAE	Research Assessment Exercise
RIHE	Research Institute for Higher Education at Hiroshima University
SD	Staff Development
SEDA	Staff and Educational Development Association
SoTL	Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
The Standards	The Standards for Establishment of Universities

List of Selected Key Japanese Terms

Here is the list of selected Japanese terms that I repeatedly use in this thesis. The English translation given here is the general one. My decision of leaving those terms in Japanese is based on the analysis of my ethnographic data. Thus, although I put corresponding English translation in this list, those terms embed cultural meanings, which I unpack in the thesis.

daigaku	university
fakaruthī diberoppumento	faculty development
FD tantōsha	FD practitioner
gakkai	academic society
gakubu	Faculties and departments
gyōmu	duties
ippan kyōiku	general education
jissen	practice
kenkyū	research
kyōiku	teaching / education
kyōin	faculty member
senmonka	expert
senmon kyōiku	specialized education
sentā	centre
tetsuzuki	formalities

Introduction

In June 2006, I visited a professor at a centre for higher education (HE) research in Japan. I had just quit my job as an international program coordinator at a private university and was preparing to leave for Oxford to read for a Master's in higher education studies. As a research topic for my master's thesis, I had planned to explore the internationalization of HE. I decided to visit an expert in HE studies for advice about my choice of topic. Despite my sudden email, this professor generously agreed to meet me. He talked about various issues Japanese universities were facing related to the internationalization of HE. It was towards the end of our meeting he mentioned the word '*fakaruthī diberoppumento*'. I asked him, "What is *fakaruthī diberoppumento*?" He laughed and said, "We aren't exactly sure what it means but it is about professional training for faculty members to improve teaching skills." I said, "That's a good idea. It must be useful for the faculty members." He smiled cynically said, "I am involved with promoting *fakaruthī diberoppumento* and I tell you it is filled with tensions. I also think it is a good idea to have a training opportunity but they (faculty members) do not like it." Without having any background knowledge of Japanese HE policies, I vividly remember wondering why faculty members did not take the opportunity to join training sessions, what kind of conflicts there were, and why the university used an English term 'faculty development' instead of using

a Japanese term such as '*kyōiku kaizen*' (improvement of education) or '*kyōin kenshū*' (a training for the faculty members). Later I learnt universities were in turmoil of major policy changes and '*fakaruthī diberoppumento*' was one of the government-led initiatives to push university reform. 2006 was the time those who were involved with offering *fakaruthī diberoppumento* to be totally exhausted in organizing various events to meet the government's requirement (Tanaka 2011). The person I visited in 2006 was one of such people.

The conversation with him gave me the idea of looking into the topic of faculty development.

Background

Interpretation of faculty development as practice has been a topic of discussion among researchers in HE studies in Japan. In 1999, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, MEXT, amended the 'Standards for Establishment of Universities' (the Standards) to introduce and recommend the practice of institutional '*fakaruthī diberoppumento*' (faculty development) commonly known as '*FD*' to universities in Japan. The Standards set conditions for a new university to be set up and to follow after their establishment. This decision was based on the recommendation of the University Council Report 'A Vision for Universities in the 21st Century and Reform Measures – To Be Distinctive Universities in a Competitive

Environment'. This report emphasized the importance of '*fakaruthī diberoppumento*' to improve educational activities of individual faculty members. In the section entitled 'Improvement of individual faculty members' course contents and teaching methods', '*fakaruthī diberoppumento*' is defined:

> institutional research (*kenkyū*) and training (*kenshū*) about the mission or purpose of the university, education, and teaching methods (MEXT 1998)

Hata (2009) argues this definition of the Council Report created a general understanding that '*fakaruthī diberoppumento*' is '*kenshū*' (training), which means in the language of administrative law that an employer (in this case the university) gives an order to the employees to develop professional (or occupational) abilities by attending training. He suggests it has created the image of *FD* among the faculty members as a top-down measurement with an emphasis on transmission of information and knowledge (Hata 2009). Universities began offering seminars and symposiums about the meaning of faculty development, the mission of the university, university policy about educational reform, and university regulations about harassment and ethics.

By 2002, 75% of universities began offering institutional *FD* (MEXT 2004). The MEXT further

amended the Standards and made institutional *FD* obligatory from the academic year 2008[1]. By this time 90% of universities were carrying out institutional *FD* (MEXT 2009). However, the focus of institutional *FD* on the improvement of *jugyō* (lecture) expressed in the Standards created concerns among researchers in higher education studies. The Clause 25-3 of the Standards that set the definition of *FD* states:

> The university should offer institutional training (*kenshū*) and carry out research (*kenkyū*) to improve contents of lectures (*jugyō*) and educational methods

Terasaki (2006) criticizes this Clause because it gives the idea that *FD* is about improving one's *jugyō* (lecture). By making reference to the discussions in the USA and the UK, Terasaki (2006) emphasizes that *FD* is a broad idea and can be carried out in various forms. In his commentary article in the *Nikkei* newspaper, Terasaki (2007) encourages universities not to be tied to the preconception that institutional *FD* should be about improving lectures and they should offer seminars and conduct students' evaluation of teaching, but to be creative about interpreting the concept and approaches to *FD*. Similarly other researchers in higher education expressed criticisms and argued for broader ways of understanding the concept (Arimoto 2005, Hata 2009, and Inoshita 2008b). Confusions with the definition of faculty development were partly led by the fact that it is an introduced foreign concept. The term faculty development was introduced to Japanese HE in the 1980s. Since then, attempts were made to translate the concept into Japanese.

[1] In Japan, the academic year starts in April.

However, without having an appropriate Japanese translation, '*FD*' became widely accepted (Taguchi, 2011). Osaki (2008) questions:

> The fact (MEXT) continues to use *katakana*[2] written '*fakaruthī diberoppumento*' must indicate there is something about this concept that can't be translated into Japanese. Therefore by defining the term as the Standards does, something must be overlooked or lost.

This explains why the definition of the Clause had great impact on deciding the direction of institutional *FD* in Japan.

I now go back to Terasaki's (2006) discussion. Terasaki (2006) criticizes the Clause but also argues that the description of the Clause is still vague. For example it does not give clear explanation about the distinction between training (*kenshū*) and research (*kenkyū*) (Terasaki, 2006). He argues there is no explanation of the reason why MEXT decided to use two terms (Terasaki 2006). Drawing on vagueness with the Clause he makes a provocative comment about the concept of *FD*:

> In a way, universities might be able to interpret and change the concept of *FD* by carrying out *FD* activities that are critical and necessary for themselves (Terasaki, 2006, p.9).

It is the *FD* practitioners who are caught in such a complex situation. Since the introduction of institutional *FD* in 1999, a growing number of people have become involved with offering

[2] In Japanese language, there are three types of characters: *hiragana*, *katakana*, and *kanji*. Katakana is used for vocabularies that are adapted from foreign languages especially from English and other European languages.

institutional *FD*. Their academic and occupational backgrounds, positions in the university, and type of contracts are all varied. Those *FD* practitioners who are not necessarily familiar with discussions in HE studies have to understand the university's requirements and the faculty member's needs, to interpret the concept of *FD* into activities, and to meet the requirements of the accreditation agencies. Hence their everyday activities can be seen as a part of interpretation of the policy and the localization of *FD*. Their activities may also reflect institutional and academic culture. What do they experience on a day-to-day basis? How do they make sense of their experiences? Often *FD* practitioners are themselves a faculty member in Japan. How do the experiences as a *FD* practitioner affect their professional identity? Combining these questions this thesis explores how faculty development practitioners make sense of the concept of faculty development as a professional identity and a lived experience.

Hereafter I give an overview of the contents and objectives of each chapter to answer this research question.

An Overview of the Thesis

There are seven chapters in this study. Chapter 1 provides an overview of the evolution of faculty development in English-speaking countries, especially in the USA and the UK, in order

to understand what faculty development means because Japanese researchers introduced the concept and discussions from those countries. This review highlights the periodical evolution that the concept and practices of faculty development took in the USA as a response to changes universities encountered from within and without. With the understanding of the historical background, I turn to listen to the voice of those who are involved with faculty development to understand their concerns and prospects. They discuss the growing confidence, and anxieties of the field of faculty development and the role of faculty development practitioner as an emerging new profession. Even in countries where faculty development seems to be established, the faculty development practitioners raise questions about their professional identity because of challenges they face in dealing with discipline-based faculties. I introduce a framework to help me understand faculty development practitioners' experiences: 'Academic Tribes and Territories' (Becher 1989).

The aim of Chapter 2 is to give historical background of *FD* and historical elements that have impact on current *FD* practitioners work in Japan. It has two parts. The first part provides an overview of the history of Japanese HE with particular reference to university educational reforms since after the World War II (WWII). These events that took place after the WWII are very much part of the life to majority of people who are involved with *FD*. It is important to

recognize the role the Liberal and General Education Society of Japan (LGES), an academic society for general education, plays to offer a platform for discussions about *FD*. They actively introduced the concept of faculty development in the 1980s before the government's decision to promote *FD* and many of LGES members act as *FD* practitioners today. They had their own issues with professional identity but those are marginalized with the issues they face as *FD* practitioners. The second part focuses on post 1991. The introduction of institutional *FD* in 1999 pushed universities to establish a section responsible for *FD* and appointed faculty members to act as *FD* practitioners. I divided the period after 1999 to today into three named Ages: the Age of Transmission, the Age of Charismatic Developer, and the Age of Network.

In Chapter 3 I explain how I designed my research strategy to answer my research question "How do faculty development practitioners make sense of the concept of faculty development as a professional identity and a lived experience in Japan?" My choice of ethnography as my research strategy is informed by the review of the literature I conducted in Chapter 1 and 2.

Chapter 4, 5 and 6 engage with lived experience of *FD* practitioners in Japan through ethnographic accounts of the ICT-FD Project at Sakura University and ethnographic interviews with *FD* practitioners and HE researchers from various different universities. The role of

Chapter 4 is to introduce the Centre where I carried out my ethnographic fieldwork. It identifies the lack of university's strategy about *FD* and its effect on ICT-FD Project. It also describes exclusion of the Project members from the community of Sakura University. In such an undesirable environment, the members attempt to develop and promote the Project by relying on their own experiences and professional values, which I discuss in Chapter 5. The impact of their experiences in dealing with faculty and non-faculty members, and their own career prospects influenced their discussions about professional identity. Finally, Chapter 6 explores three different terms or labels that describe *FD* practitioners: *FD tantōsha* (a person responsible for *FD*), *FD senmonka* (*FD* expert), and *FDer* (faculty developer). Each term offer different stories related with professional identity. Here, again, career prospect, community, and identity offer lenses through which to investigate experiences of *FD* practitioners.

Chapter 7 brings together the findings of the preceding chapters and makes three arguments. First, I argue that the title of '*FD tantōsha*' that is most commonly used in Japan creates a semantic space for negotiations between different types of practiced or idealized identities. '*Tantōsha*' literally means the person in charge; it is relatively neutral label. This term allow *FD* practitioners to stay open about their professional identity and career path. It also lets them decide how much commitment they wish to make to the practice of institutional *FD*. Second,

the term '*FD*' in Japan connotes a diverse list of activities. In other words, '*FD*' is not treated as concept that might trigger transformative changes to HE. As a result, *FD* practitioners tend to have a set list of activities that are commonly practiced at other universities in Japan and other countries without paying much attention to what *FD* may mean to their own institution. In addition, once this set of associations and meanings of *FD* is fixed, it becomes difficult to change. Thirdly, communities for *FD* practitioners in Japan express their collective voice much less than those in English speaking countries. Everyday experiences of faculty development practitioners are similar regardless of contextual differences and countries and in principle it would be possible to share ideas and information with other practitioners. In countries where faculty development is widely practiced such as Australia, the USA, and the UK, faculty development practitioners have formed communities to exchange ideas and information, which are distributed through their own journals and conferences. The existence of these communities seems to support construction of professional identity and the field of faculty development in those countries. However, in Japan, the temporariness of the position prevents practitioners to engage with the community therefore interpretation of the concept of *FD*, creation of the common language and knowledge base, and construction of professional identity in Japan has yet to be observed.

A note on the use of 'faculty development', Japanese terms and names

There are various terms that are used to describe the concept and practices to support and improve performance of faculty members such as 'faculty development', 'staff development', 'educational development', 'academic development', 'organizational development', and 'instructional development'. These terms offer different scopes and core purposes therefore to call all these terms 'faculty development' is indeed inaccurate. However, to avoid confusion, I use 'faculty development' when I discuss various endeavours in English-speaking countries except in quotes and '*fakaruthī diberoppumento*' or '*FD*' for Japanese practices.

Japanese terms are written in *italic* style except names. English translations are provided where appropriate. I made deliberate decision which term should stay in Japanese based on the analysis of my ethnographic fieldwork. To denote long vowels in Japanese words, macrons are used throughout.

Chapter One: In Search of Faculty Development

Introduction

"What is faculty development?"

When a HE researcher tries to answer this question in Japan, one almost always starts talking about discussions in English-speaking countries (see Terasaki 2006, Hata 2009). This is because the term 'faculty development' was brought into Japan from the USA and the UK. Therefore faculty development in Japan is discussed on the basis of discussions in the USA and the UK. Then how did faculty development emerge and evolve in English-speaking countries and what do practitioners discuss about? Internationally, there are various terms that describe concepts similar to faculty development, such as educational development, staff development, academic development, professional development, organizational development, and instructional development. Some countries use particular terms and some do not. A review of the literature in English shows that the emergence of various terms reflects the multiplicity of faculty development programmes, the advancement of practices, and the evolution of academic discussions related to teaching and learning in HE, the academic profession, and the role of the university.

As I show in this chapter, there are two types of literature on faculty development: research-based literature and 'how-to' literature. There is also a reciprocal relationship among research-based literature, 'how-to' literature, and actual practices. Faculty development practitioners refer to research-based and 'how-to' literature to inform their decisions about practices, and the impact of practices inform both types of literature's further development. The research-based literature covers various topics. Some examine the concept and its function from political and philosophical perspectives, such as those by Camblin and Steger (2000), D'Andrea and Gosling (2005), McDonald and Stockley (2008), Rowland (2007), and Webb (1996). These research-based studies display how complex the discussions of faculty development can be. Some focus on student learning and teaching in HE, such as Marton et al. (1993), Prosser et al. (1995), Prosser and Trigwell (1999), and Walker (2001). Those studies have had a great impact on the way faculty development practitioners think about teaching and learning. The other type of literature can be characterized as having a 'how-to' orientation. This literature introduces various models, methods, and approaches and provides practical guidance to practitioners. Here I include work by Gillespie et al. (2002), Leaming (1998), Macdonald and Wisdom (2002), Millis (1994), Ramsden (2003), and Sheldin (1997). Both types of literature evolved hand-in-hand and have together formed an integral part of the way scholarly discussion and practices of faculty development are maturing in countries such as the USA, the UK, Canada,

and Australia.

In between those two types of literature stand the practitioners of faculty development. For decades, faculty development practitioners have contributed to and based their practices on the research literature (Sorcinelli et al. 2006). Without their activities and voices, the literature related to faculty development would not have evolved. There are various spaces for practitioners to share experiences and discuss issues and concerns, such as journals, professional networks and associations, conferences, mailing list, and online social network. They discuss not only practice and research but also professional identity and faculty development as a field. These questions about the identity and the field are the two critical questions they seem to ask regardless of the countries. Why do they need to discuss their professional identity and the field of faculty development? I use this question to lead my review of the literature.

The purpose of this chapter is to understand how faculty development evolved in English-speaking countries and what practitioners discuss about, and to identify key terms to look at Japanese case in Chapter Two. There are three sections. The first section gives an overview of the evolution of faculty development in English-speaking countries. It is not in the scope of this study to carry out a comprehensive comparative study of countries that are

considered advanced in terms of faculty development, such as Australia, Canada, the UK and the USA. Instead, I mainly focus on the case of the USA and refer to different approaches and evolution in other countries when appropriate. The second section introduces the voices of faculty development practitioners themselves. I draw here on contributions from the International Journal for Academic Development (IJAD), an academic journal established in 1993 by the International Consortium for Educational Development (ICED). An overview of the studies in IJAD identified both confidence in and anxieties about the field of faculty development and the role and identity of practitioners as underlying themes. This section shows that, even in countries considered to be advanced and which have established a position of faculty developer, there are ongoing discussions about the identity. It gives a glimpse of faculty development practitioners' everyday experiences. The third section identifies key terms such as disciplinarization of the field, new institutional space, and role and identity, and introduces frameworks to help understand the question about the identity and the field. The idea of 'Academic Tribes and Territories' (Becher 1989) helps us see why faculty development practitioners ask about their identity and the field of faculty development. It also discusses how academic journals such as IJAD and professional communities such as POD contribute to the formation of an imagined community or a field of faculty development among practitioners internationally.

1.1 Overview of the Evolution of Faculty Development

The focus of faculty development is shifting and broadening because universities are "pushed and pulled by enlarging, interacting streams of demand" and are "pressured to change their curricula, alter their faculties, and modernize their increasingly expensive physical plant and equipment – and to do so more rapidly than ever" (Clark 1998, 13). Demographic, economic, and political changes in society have affected the role of university and the work of academics, and the relationship between the university and the nation, and the university and the market (Clark and Lewis 1986, Kogan and Hanney 2000, Barnett 2000). It is not the purpose of this study to provide a detailed history of faculty development in countries that are considered in Japan to offer 'advanced' practices such as Australia, Canada, the UK, and the USA, but an overview of the evolution of faculty development indicates that the concept emerged at around the same time in 1960s (Hicks 1999). The goals, practices and structures of faculty development shifted rapidly, especially after the universities began to offer institutional faculty development. Although there are some unique local features, there is gathering evidence that national discussions about faculty development are moving closer to each other and beginning to create a global trend. Sorcinelli et al. (2006) give a comprehensive summary of the evolution of faculty development in the USA in order to foresee the future of faculty development. Hereafter, I place the story of faculty development in the USA at the centre to give a comparative lens to examine

experiences of other countries.

Sorcinelli et al. (2006) review the general history of faculty development and its growth as a profession in the USA and identify five different ages, which they call the Age of the Scholar, the Age of the Teacher, the Age of the Developer, the Age of the Learner, and the Age of the Network. They discuss characteristics of the goals, practices, and structures in each age (Table 1).

	Five Ages	Goal of faculty development
Mid-1950s–1960s	The Age of the Scholar: faculty development efforts were directed entirely toward improving and advancing scholarly competence	To provide opportunities for improvement and advancement in scholarship (content mastery)
Late 1960s–1970s	The Age of the Teacher: faculty development focused on teaching development as key to faculty vitality and renewal	To improve faculty as teachers
1980s	The Age of the Developer: an upsurge in faculty development programmes	To respond to the career span of academic life (holistic development activities)
1990s	The Age of the Learner: changing approaches to teaching and learning	To provide support for new priorities (educational technology, assessment, multiculturalism)
2000s	The Age of the Network: faculty, developers, and institutions require a collaborative effort among all stakeholders in HE	To reward good teaching and promote best practices

Table 1: The Ages of Faculty Development, extracted from Sorcinelli et al. (2006)

In the USA, faculty development was originally concerned with supporting the development of individual academics by helping them rise in their professions through research activities (Riegle 1987). There was a shared belief that content mastery was the key to teaching (Sorcinelli et al. 2006). Therefore, the university offered faculty development in the form of sabbaticals and paid leave to support the self-renewal of faculty members (Sorcinelli et al. 2006). This is the key feature of what they call the 'Age of the Scholar'.

In this periodization, the 'Age of the Teacher' replaced the 'Age of the Scholar'. The focus and practices of faculty development shifted to put more emphasis on the improvement of educational activities as a response to changes led by the massification of HE. The first faculty development unit in the USA was the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching at the University of Michigan, which opened in 1962 (Sorcinelli et al. 2006). As we can see from the name of the centre, learning and teaching became an important focus of faculty development. At that time, each department and faculty carried out faculty development programmes instead of the university (Gaff and Simpson 1994). Another important aspect to pay attention to is that universities in the USA responded to the rapid growth of undergraduate students and other issues by introducing the teaching assistant structure in which students in graduate programmes taught undergraduate students in the 1970s (Austin and Wulff 2004). This caused concerns

among parents and students about the quality of university education, as teaching assistants were not well prepared for teaching (Austin and Wulff 2004). This led to the establishment of centres at various universities to train graduate students to provide teaching assistance, such as the Graduate Teacher Program at the University of Colorado at Boulder in 1985. As such, the massification of HE brought out various issues related to university education. It was the same in the UK and Japan. The first generation of faculty development practitioners came to exist during this period.

Scholars began to examine the impact of massification on HE. Martin Trow's discussion offers one of the frameworks to understand the impact of massification, which discusses how the nature of American HE is shifting according to the rise in the enrolment rate (1974). It shows the changing relationship between the university, the government, and society. Massification of HE has also triggered the new culture of manegerialism and accountability (Kogan and Hanney 2000). For example, in the UK, the government led by Margaret Thatcher promoted the idea of small government, increased efficiency, accountability, and manegerialism in public services (including education) and ideas such as corporate planning, performance indicators, institutional leadership, and quality assurance were brought in (Kogan and Hanney 2000). In short, pressure on the university to justify the use of public money became stronger. In 'On Higher Education:

the Academic Enterprise in an Era of Rising Student Consumerism', Riesman (1980) analysed the changes with HE in the USA in the 1960s and 70s. He observes that there is a decline of faculty influence at the university and an emergence of the new supremacy of the student market (Riesman 1980). Therefore Riesman (1980) emphasized the importance of empowering students as 'active consumers' instead of leaving them as 'receptive consumers.' In other words, he suggested the university change from faculty-centred research institutions to student-centred educational institutions, with the role of faculty members being to support students as active learners (Riesman 1980). I argue that those studies offer a framework to understand the impact of massification and to think about the future of the university at a practical level. To meet fundamental changes in the purpose of university education and the role of faculty members, researchers suggested combining multiple types of activities for effective faculty development (Sorcinelli et al. 2006). For example, Clark et al. (1986) emphasized the importance of creating an institutional environment that enhanced faculty development for an individual, as well as organizational development in the USA. Formalized faculty development programmes and centres for faculty development began to open on campus.

In the 1980s, faculty development was institutionalized and activities that supported the entire academic profession were carried out. Institutionalization of faculty development meant that the

institution supports faculty development (a) by providing personnel, funds and support services, (b) by moral support for the aims and activities, and (c) by delegation of authority (Moses 1987, 454). Behind the move towards institutionalization of faculty development is the impact of the introduction of a new culture. As mentioned, the governments in various countries began to question the cost and the value of HE (Coffield and Williamson 1997). Industrialization of the language of education began to take place, introducing terms such as students as 'consumers', the head of a university as a 'chief executive', and students' achievements as a 'learning outcome' (Coffield and Williamson, 1997). In case of the USA they had to deal with other challenges such as ensuring diversity in the curriculum and finding out the implication of advancement of technology on teaching and learning (Gaff and Simpson 1994). Sorcinelli et al. (2006) name this upsurge of faculty development programmes the Age of the Developer. It should be noted that various foundations such as Bush, Ford, and Lilly played a critical role in promoting the institutionalization of faculty development and steering the direction of their activities by making major investments in faculty development in the USA (Sorcinelli et al. 2006).

In Japan and the UK, it was mainly the government that promoted institutionalization of faculty development in the 1990s, which I discuss later in this chapter. As the scope of faculty

development expanded and the number of formalized faculty development programmes grew, staff in faculty development units or centres began to pay attention to professional identity (Sorcinelli et al. 2006). The establishment of a national network for staff in faculty development units reflected the growing need to share experiences and information. The Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD) was formed in 1974. The Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA) was established in 1977 for staff in faculty development units in Australia and New Zealand. In 1981, the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE) was founded in Canada. These networks and organizations support those who are involved with promoting faculty development and those who are interested in teaching and learning in HE through conferences, seminars, publications, and grants. During the 1980s, faculty development solidified its professional base and expanded its activities in the USA (Sorcinelli et al. 2006) and it is a matter of conjecture that it was similar in Australia and Canada.

The 'Age of the Learner' (Sorcinelli et al. 2006) saw an increasing interest in understanding how students learn and how faculty members can facilitate students' learning in the 1990s. Growing number of research supported the advancement of faculty development. For example, a number of researchers published critical scholarly works on students' learning and teaching in

HE (e.g. Marton et al. 1993, Prosser and Trigwell 1999, Biggs 1999, and Rowland 2000), which contributed to understanding about how students learn and to developing faculty development initiatives to enhance teaching and learning. For example, Marton et al. (1993) identified six qualitatively different student conceptions of learning, including reproducing, understanding, and applying. They indicated that the role of faculty members is to support students to develop more advanced conceptions of learning (1993). This literature informs faculty development practitioners and faculty members about teaching and learning.

The emphasis on students' learning is related to the changing relationship between knowledge, HE, and society (Barnett 1997). Previously it was HE that produced and defined knowledge and disseminated it to society. Today, according to Barnett, society looks to "impose its definition of knowledge on the academy and to see it shaping the student experience" (Barnett 1997, 30). As a result, "more operational, pragmatic and action-oriented forms of knowing are called for" (*Ibid.*). Faculty development practitioners would be able to explain the importance of thinking about students' learning by referring to these kind of research-based literature and give practical support and infromation by using 'how-to' genre literature.

The demand for faculty development programmes grew to anticipate and provide support for

emerging challenges, such as the use of technology, dealing with multiculturalism, student-centred teaching and assessment (Sorcinelli et al. 2006). The number of faculty development programmes concomitantly grew and there was an increasing demand for high-quality staff with expertise in instructional technology, evaluation research, course and programme assessment, and multicultural education to promote inclusivity (Sorcinelli et al. 2006). To cover the broadening focus of faculty development, the university began to provide individual consultations, university-wide orientations and workshops, intensive programmes, and grants and awards (*Ibid.*).

One of the biggest challenges for faculty development practitioners was to explain and change the faculty member's perception of the academic profession. Faculty member's strong emphasis on research activities created resistance among faculty members against faculty development that also put an emphasis on teaching activities. Boyer's (1990) discussion on rethinking scholarship, in other words the academic profession, allowed faculty development practitioners to justify their practices. By 1990, faculty members were involved with various activities including research and teaching as part of their work. Boyer asked (1990, 16): "Is it possible to define the work of faculty in ways that reflect more realistically the full range of academic and civic mandates?" He suggested giving broader and more capacious meaning to the term

'scholarship', including four separate, yet overlapping functions: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching (Boyer 1990). If one can accept these four scholarships as integral aspects of academic profession, then the one can accept the importance of having professional development opportunities for all aspects of the profession.

This study stimulated discussions about the nature of academic profession and brought attention to emerging missions of the profession. DiLorenzo and Heppner (1994) state that Boyer's perspective helps them answer the questions of what they do as developers and, based on his perspective, they come up with a definition: "Faculty development is a process of enhancing and promoting any form of academic scholarship in individual faculty members" (DiLorenzo and Heppner 1994, 485). It also led to the development of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) movement in the USA and Canada. SoTL in HE broadly means the systematic study of teaching and learning and sharing of such work through presentations or publications (Kreber and Cranton 2000). This notion promoted activities such as classroom research, peer review of teaching, the use of course and teaching portfolios, and publications about it (Sorcinelli et al. 2006). Boyer's work was also introduced to Japan and had an impact on research on the understanding academic profession (e.g. Arimoto 2005).

So far, we looked at the case of the USA. In summary, faculty development, which meant a support for an individual faculty member in the past, changed over time and was formalized in order to support academics to adjust to evolving academic profession due to transformation of the university. Then how about the case of the UK?

The 1990s saw a rapid growth in faculty development units in the UK. In 1993, the Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA) was formed as a professional association for staff and educational developers[3]. In the case of the UK, the government's involvement promoted institutionalized faculty development, meaning faculty development practitioners are seen as located between discipline and management and are under the influence of managerialism (Land 2004). The global recession in the 1970s changed the mood of HE funding agencies and the Thatcher government promoted the idea of better management in HE (Henkel 2000). The government questioned the quality of HE and its utility to the national economy. According to Henkel (2000, 42), "the government was already signaling that core academic responsibilities were no longer to be assumed to be out of bounds to external intervention". Teaching and learning in HE was no exception. In 1997, the National Committee of Inquiry into

[3] In the UK, 'faculty development' is not in use. Instead they use terms such as 'staff development' and 'educational development'.

Higher Education, known as the Dearing Report, recommended every institution in the UK to develop clear learning and teaching strategies and also to have some form of professional development for all teaching staff, especially for new staff (Gosling 2009). The Dearing Report recommended the creation of the Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (ILTHE) to accredit individual lecturers and institutional training courses, and also a new Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) to strengthen teaching quality. Those institutions transformed over years but characteristics of the evolution of faculty development in the UK since the 1990s can be found in the way quality assurance, funding policy, and support for universities have been loosely connected to form a framework, enabling universities to take faculty development seriously and autonomously (Henkel 2000). For example, the Higher Education Academy (HEA), the replacement for the ILTHE, developed the UK Professional Standards Framework that provides a general description of the roles of teaching and supporting learning. Institutions can apply to get their faculty development programmes and activities accredited[4]. A faculty member can participate in an accredited programme at his/her own university and on completion of the programme an individual would automatically gain fellowship of the HEA. It is up to the university to decide on what kind of faculty development

[4] A detailed information is available in HEA website. http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/ukpsf (accessed on 1 May 2012)

programmes it designs and offers and how they meet the standards the HEA sets. Initially, universities were incentivized, with the promise of additional funding from the Funding Councils as a result. The introduction of various assessment systems led leading managers in the university to seek support from faculty development practitioners (Gosling 2001). Universities created a range of new organizational units to support multiple organizational tasks and a faculty development unit was part of it (Henkel 2000). Some older universities in the UK began to make academic appointments to faculty development units and shifted towards a more research-based form of faculty development, which indicated a shift in thinking about the status and the nature of the work being undertaken (Gosling 2001). Though more recently a number of universities including research-led universities began to bring development provision under the human resources function (Blackmore 2009). This indicates how vulnerable functions of faculty development are to the change of policy and interpretations of it. What is unique to the UK is that educational activities and research activities are separately assessed and funded. The Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) evaluates quality of research every five years and the Funding Councils distribute funding to each institution according to the results. Divided assessment for education and research activities meant faculty development section to focus mostly on supporting educational activities of the faculty. The implication of dealing with two areas of academic work separately resulted in the "patchwork of provision at institutional level"

(Blackmore 2009, 666).

In the same year as the establishment of SEDA, 1993, the International Consortium for Education Development (ICED) was formed with the aims to link national organizations of faculty development in various countries, to share practices and knowledge, and to support countries without a national organization of faculty development. They started the IJAD in 1996, which I discuss below. The formation of the ICED indicates that faculty development has become an international phenomenon. For example, the top five researchers cited between 1982 and 1986 and 2008 and 2010 in Higher Education Research and Development (HERD), a journal from HERDSA, show that the geographical distribution of authors broadened considerably (Kandlbinder 2012). During the earlier years, authors were mainly Australia-based but during the latter period four out of five on the list have non-Australian affiliations, which means the early years of HERD relied heavily on a local group of researchers (Kandlbinder 2012). Although they recognize contextual differences it is evidence that they have something in common to discuss, which has given them the confidence to see faculty development as a new field in HE.

I now go back to the evolution of faculty development in the USA. Today, the demands for

faculty development have expanded ever more in the USA. Sorcinelli et al. (2006) identify three major paradigm shifts that affect the work of faculty development: the changing professoriate; the changing student body; and the changing nature of teaching, learning, and scholarship. In order to address these shifts, faculty members, faculty development practitioners, and institutions now seek to work collaboratively and strengthen linkages among themselves, a characteristic of the final 'Age of the Network' in Sorcinelli et al's periodization (Sorcinelli et al. 2006). They see the 'Age of the Network' as the framework to think about the future direction of faculty development.

So far, an overview of the evolution of faculty development, especially in the USA and the UK, has been provided. The impact of massification, HE policies, the introduction of new cultures such as manegerialism and assessment had major implications for HE institutions. The evolution of faculty development shows how faculty development units and practitioners have responded to such internal and external pressures. The purposes, contents, and methods of faculty development, the organizational position of faculty development units and practitioners' positions shifted over years. Understanding of such evolution offers a comparative framework to analyse the background of faculty development in Japan. As we see, faculty development practitioners have witnessed major changes in the university, teaching and learning in HE, and

the academic profession over the last 50 years. Knapper (2010) says faculty development today is becoming more homogeneous because of greatly increased communication among practitioners internationally and the sharing of good practice. For Knapper, it is still not clear if faculty development is now established on a firm footing worldwide and "whether faculty development will prove to have a lasting role in HE or whether it will turn out to be a temporary phenomenon" (Gosling 2009). Those involved with faculty development practices ask questions about the future direction of faculty development, the preparation of faculty development practitioners, and the scholarship of faculty development. In other words, even after years of practice, there are still questions about the role of practitioners and the field of faculty development. In the following section, I focus on the writing and commentaries of faculty development practitioners as they seek to understand their experiences.

1.2 Voices of Faculty Development Practitioners

In order to illustrate the concerns of faculty development practitioners themselves, I draw mainly on their contributions to the IJAD, which started in 1996 to help define, develop and extend the practice of academic development in HE worldwide (Baume 1996). The majority of contributors are faculty development practitioners, with many from Australia and the UK but with people from other countries as well. In its first editorial, Baume (1996) asks:

> What are you doing? Why? Is it working? How do you know? What theories and principles and values underpin, or spring from, your practice?
> We look forward to such conversations with you through these pages.

I reviewed the titles and abstracts of all articles in 30 volumes published between 1996 and 2009 and I picked those articles that focus on the concept of faculty development and the role, identity, and profession of faculty development practitioners. I then reviewed those articles with two questions in mind: what was the author trying to share based on his/her practice of faculty development, and how did the author conceptualize or theorize faculty development? By doing this review, I pay attention to the experiences and voices of faculty development practitioners that were not picked up in the previous section and investigate what faculty development practitioners thought about and how they came to discuss their professional identity and the field of faculty development.

1.2.1 Emerging Confidence and Underlying Concerns

There are expressions in several of the studies that indicate faculty development practitioner's desire for their work to be recognized as scholarly work and an emerging confidence within the field of faculty development. In the preface to 'The Scholarship of Academic Development' (Eggins and Macdonald, eds. 2003), Eggins (2003, xii) states:

> We hope that the volume will enable this group of scholars to be recognized for their value to the whole of the academic community and for their ongoing contribution to the

complex society of the twenty-first century.

The practitioners and researchers of faculty development in Australia, Canada, the UK and the USA have already started discussions about whether faculty development has become a field in its own right and where it might be heading (McAlpine 2006, Lee and McWilliam 2008). Baume comments, "academic development is a more securely established field" (Baume 2002, 109, my emphasis). Faculty development has progressed from "an informal set of instructional improvement activities" to a "scholarly field of study and practice" (McDonald and Stockley 2008, my emphasis).

The emergence of various terms seems to suggest that the field has been fragmented. Brew asks, "How are we to make sense of the different questions, ideas, agendas, initiatives, and directions in different countries and varying contexts?" (Brew 2006, 73) Brew continues (2006, 77): "there is a sense that we will never reach the state of being able to draw general conclusions about academic development practice." Riegle discusses how the matrix of different terms "accomplishes nothing more than highlighting the extreme complexity of the term faculty development" (1987, 55). However, there are attempts to include different terms in the same field, which can be seen from expressions in studies such as "to unify our sector…" (Harland and Staniforth 2003, 29). Similarly, Macdonald (2003, 3) suggests there is "too much to find

agreement on a commonly understood term to describe the area of practice" but states:

> …with some minor areas of disagreement, we are probably closer to a definition of academic development, which encompasses those activities concerned with developing learning and teaching at individual, departmental, faculty, institutional and even at national/international level.

This would seem to indicate that faculty development practitioners recognize the overlapping areas and different approaches, and accept the diversity of the concept.

On the contrary, there are underlying anxieties and concerns about faculty development which can be identified in the literature. The discussion about how and where to situate the field of faculty development in the landscape of HE (Becher and Trowler 2002) or among other disciplines is a topic explored repeatedly in the journal (Trowler and Bamber 2005, Harland and Staniforth 2003, McAlpine 2006, and Lee and McWilliam 2008), tending to reveal unsettling feelings about the field. Lee and McWilliam (2008, 67) state that the field has been involved in "a major struggle for self-definition in an environment of tension, growing complexity and competing demands". The critical question they are asking is whether faculty development is an academic field or a function of the university, or, in other words, "whether academic development is what people 'know' or what they 'do'" (Macdonald 2002, 2). This question naturally leads into a question about the role and identity of faculty development practitioners, which I discuss in the following section. In short, if faculty development is an academic field

then the people involved are academics, but if it is a function of the university then they are professional or non-academic staff. The hierarchy of academic fields is another cause of anxieties as Harland and Staniforth (2003, 33, my emphasis) state: "if development work becomes genuinely academic then we will still be seen by many as second-class citizens because of the low status of educational research." The anxieties and concerns are also caused by the tension around faculty development. The tension is caused not only by the relative newness of the concept and practice, but the disturbance it causes in relation to "older understandings of the academic role in which scholarship and teaching were seen as united practice based on discipline" (Clegg, 2003, 40). Structural insecurity among the faculty development unit in the university is another underlying anxiety. Sword (2008, 88, my emphasis) says that, "even the most highly regarded academic development initiatives will remain permanently vulnerable to funding cuts".

Difficulties in ensuring the credibility of the practice also prevent faculty development practitioners becoming more confident. Evaluation of faculty development practices has emerged as an important topic, with contributions from Stes et al. (2007), Sword (2008), and Wilcox (2009). Both Sword and Wilcox suggest ways to keep records of activities to evaluate without using quantitative measures. Sword argues that current mode of evaluation assumes a

direct cause-and-effect relationship, which is not necessarily the best approach by which to evaluate faculty development. At the same time, Macdonald (2003, 4) argues that faculty development practitioners often have "little direct contact with students to be able to evaluate the effectiveness of what we are doing to improve the quality of teaching and learning." Those studies indicate that evaluation is a challenging topic. It is difficult to justify the practice of faculty development if people are unable to measure its effectiveness.

The accumulation of experience and research and the establishment of various networks and professional communities for practitioners have given confidence to the field of faculty development but underlying anxieties and concerns show it is not yet secure or established. How about the people working in the field? What do they discuss in regard to their role? As seen in the overview of the evolution of faculty development, the practices of faculty development have shifted and expanded rapidly in just 40 to 50 years. This means that the first generation of practitioners would have experienced several different ages in Sorcinelli et al's periodization. Considering the significant and fundamental changes in the role of faculty development and institutional setting of faculty development unit, it is understandable for practitioners to ask about the field and identity.

1.2.2 Role and Identity of Faculty Development Practitioners

Much attention has been paid to creating faculty development as a field and the scholarship of faculty development practitioners. But turning the role of a faculty development practitioner into a profession raises questions. Is the practitioner an 'expert' or a partner or colleague working towards the understanding of a situation of resolution of a problem (Macdonald 2002, 4)? Is a practitioner an agent of transformative change and if so who should be the practitioner? Do faculty developers belong to the academic staff or the administration? Do faculty development practitioners offer teaching techniques or do they help their colleagues review and develop their conceptions of learning and, hence, teaching (Baume 2002)? If the faculty development practitioners were once academics are they no longer academics once they become professional faculty developers? Those questions interrogate the position of faculty development practitioners in the university and the relationship with other faculty members. Why does it matter to define its position in the university and what makes it difficult to define?

Understanding the fact that the field of faculty development is in "an environment of tension, growing complexity and competing demands" (Lee and McWilliam 2008), faculty development practitioners are cautious about how they come across in the institution, something which is obvious from the studies. For example, for Harland and Staniforth (2003, 28), faculty

developers are aware that "being on the 'wrong side' of the academic–administrative divide creates barriers to establishing good working relationships with academic in certain development situations" (my emphasis). Carew et al. (2008) explain how academic developers might face conflicts by taking one position and argue that an "academic developer is constantly walking a fine line within the context of their own institution" (my emphasis). Manathunga (2007, 25), quoting Rowlands (2002), notes that, "for academic developers, working on the 'fault lines' between teaching and research, between teachers and students, between managers and academics can be an uncomfortable space."

Some argue that the professionalization of faculty development practitioners further fragments the field (Harland and Staniforth 2003, 29). Instead, they propose the concept of an 'inclusive profession' to emphasize the tradition of "openness and collaborations, not exclusivity" of the field. Similarly, Carew et al. (2008) created a new term 'elastic practice' to express how important it is for faculty development work to be diverse and responsible for supporting a range of agendas and objectives. According to them, elastic practice means the "tailoring of an approach for a specific context, drawing on the toolkit of techniques, experiences, ideas, and theoretical stances that a particular academic developer has collected" (Carew et al. 2008, 53). These two concepts seem to suggest that faculty developer is a profession that cannot be defined

simply, like the field of faculty development itself.

Harland and Staniforth (2003) argue that, because of their desire to be part of the academic community, and to be able to convince academics about faculty development practices, practitioners use a theoretical context and often refer to research and teaching experiences. The importance of research is emphasized to meet a rapidly changing and super-complex society which affects academic practice (Brew 2002); to give academic underpinning to the practice rather than just offering teaching techniques (Baume 2002); and to give credibility to what they do.

The position of practitioners in institutionalized faculty development has created greater questions. For example, based on a survey that aimed at finding out how heads of faculty development perceive faculty development in the UK, Gosling (2009, 17) points out:

> the tensions between meeting institutional requirements and the personal values of individual developers has, if anything become more acute as EDC (educational development centre) are drawn into a more 'strategic' role.

Manathunga (2007, 29) writes of how "academic developers can feel trapped in that painful space between managerial quality-assurance agendas and critical, personal understandings of the roles and purposes of educational development" (my emphasis). As we saw in the previous

section, institutionalized faculty development was connected to the introduction of the industrialization of the language of education. Therefore, it is understandable that some academics took it as a threat to academic culture. Macdonald (2003, 9) describes the position of practitioners in institutionalized faculty development as "the filling in a sandwich or as a cushion between conflicting interests".

Many studies give the impression that the position of faculty development practitioner is filled with stress. Practitioners are required to balance various factors. In addition, they are constantly being challenged to justify that what they are doing is valuable in a way that other academics can agree on. However, they have not given up, which can be seen from the fact that practitioners are now talking about how to prepare the future generation of practitioners.

A new generation is entering the field. The first generation came from other disciplinary or relevant occupational backgrounds such as staff with experience in school teaching and brought with them a set of institutional or professional values (Fraser 2001, Carew et al. 2008). Therefore they were pioneers with knowledge and values from different fields. The new generation entering the field does not necessarily have such a background and therefore the need for appropriate training and qualification to be professionally sound is expressed (Baume 2002).

However, as McDonald and Stockley (2008) identified, there are no prescribed pathways into the field of faculty development. As a result, some believe almost anyone can be a faculty development practitioner (Harland and Staniforth 2008). McDonald and Stockley (2008) argue that research should be carried out to facilitate people's entry and advancement in the profession. More recently attempts have been made to develop competency models for faculty development practitioners (Dawson et al. 2010).

1.3 Emerging Key Terms

There are different ways to understand faculty development and these are revealed by focusing on different aspects of it. What has emerged from the previous two sections is the story of a group of people in various countries who were given the role or position of a faculty development practitioner to support faculty members and the university in adjusting to changes. Although the focus of faculty development varies from institution to institution, and from country to country, people are increasingly finding common issues, concerns, and perspectives and talking to each other across borders more. I argue seeing the second generation of practitioners coming in, the first generation of faculty development practitioners are asking themselves how to make sense of what they've been involved with, how to describe what they do, and what kind of specialized knowledge they share. In other words, they are asking about

the role of the faculty development practitioner – particularly whether it is a profession or not – and the field of faculty development.

Thinking about the role means thinking about identity. In a structured society, an individual forms an identity through "categorization of the self as an occupant of a role" (Stets and Burke 2000, 225). An individual acts to fulfil the expectations and meanings associated with the role, which form a set of standards that guide behaviour (Stets and Burke 2000). Wenger (1998, 149) argues that "we define who we are by the ways we experience our selves through participation as well as by the ways we and others reify our selves". In the case of faculty development practitioners, their understanding of what their role is and what they are expected to do contributes to the formation of identity. As a new role added to the institution, expectations and meanings are not self-evident and they change over time. The question of the position of the practitioner in relation to other discipline-based faculty members and the individual's professional identity is unresolved as well. Taylor (1989) talks about the link between identity and the framework, such as sexuality, religion, ethnicity, and nationality. To be someone who qualifies as a potential object of a 'Who are you?' question means to be "someone with one's own standpoint or one's own role, who can speak for him/herself" (Taylor 1989, 29). The individual can determine what is good or what they value by having the frame and if they lose

this frame they become ‘at sea’ and experience disorientation (Taylor 1989). What forms the frame for faculty development practitioners? The evolution of faculty development as examined in the first section of this chapter indicates the process of faculty development practitioners’ efforts to define the role and frame. How can we understand and analyse their struggle? How is their struggle translated into the evolution of faculty development? By paying attention to what faculty development practitioners do, we can begin to understand what they think their expected role is.

The previous sections also identified characteristics relating to the in-between position of faculty development practitioners in academia and in the institution. Becher and Trowler’s concept of academic tribes and territories is one useful lens through which to view the in-between status of both the field of faculty development and faculty development practitioners themselves. This second edition took off from the initial work of Becher (1989), which mapped the territory of academic knowledge and traced the links between the academic disciplines and the cultures of the academics engaged in them. The second edition, in principle, maintains the original argument but asks “how far the relative importance of epistemological factors affecting cultures had changed overtime” (Becher and Trowler 2001, xiv) because of the great changes within the HE field. Their framework helps me to visualize the efforts of faculty development

practitioners in identifying the tribe, as well as to understand its culture and language so that they can communicate well with other tribes. It also helps me to visualize the source of anxiety for faculty development practitioners.

Faculty development practitioners live in the land of HE, where most residents have a disciplinary community (or an academic tribe) to belong to. Here, the discipline gives a primary source of identity and academic culture (Becher and Trowler 2001). Individuals become academics through induction into disciplines that provide a language, methodologies, culture, and many academic values shared by members of the discipline (Henkel 2000, Becher and Trowler 2001). Becher and Trowler argue that the discipline provides a cultural frame such as "traditions, customs and practices, transmitted knowledge, beliefs, morals and rules of conduct as well as their linguistic and symbolic forms of communication and the meanings they share" (Becher and Trowler 2001, 25). Thus, as Henkel argues, "academic working lives [continue] to be centred in their discipline, whether [people see] themselves primarily as researchers, teachers, managers or a combination of more than one of those" (Henkel 2000, 256). As such, the disciplinary identity is critical for academics and it is firmly rooted.

Often, faculty development practitioners have been trained to be academics and worked as a

discipline-based academic but, at some point in their life, have then moved into the position of faculty development practitioner (Rowland 2003). Therefore, as touched on earlier, they bring with them "prior disciplinary identities and knowledge, a range of work and life experiences, and implicit assumptions about the nature of academic work" (Manathunga 2007, 27). Manathunga (2007) applies Bhabha's notion of 'unhomeliness' that describes the experiences of migrant workers displaced from their families, communities, and cultural roots. She argues:

> In some sense, when we (practitioners) migrate from other disciplines, academic developers may experience this dislocating need to re-invent ourselves, especially if the casualisation of academic work and chronic restructuring have forced our 'travel' in search of work.

Therefore, it is natural for faculty development practitioners to try to create a boundary in order to delineate who they are and what they do.

Discussing the disciplinarization of faculty development is one such effort. By seeing oneself in an academic tribe (although it may be different from one's original tribe), an individual can still feel a sense of belonging to the original tribe because he/she is still on the same land. As Becher and Trowler state, "the tribes, after all, share the same ethnicity; the territories they occupy are part of the same land mass" (2001, 205). The critical point is that the field of faculty development is not yet an established discipline. Therefore, those who migrate to the field not only experience 'unhomeliness' but also face the issue of entering an as-yet-undefined home.

By having a tribe, one can lay claim to a knowledge territory, which enables one to draw a boundary to further develop knowledge and professional identity.

Another feature of faculty development practitioners is their location in an institution. The activities of faculty development practitioners take place in new forms of institutional space. An increasing number of texts in the relevant literature recognize the movement within and across academic and management domains, which has resulted in the emergence of mixed identities (Whitchurch 2008a). Whitchurch calls the space between the professional and academic domains a 'third space' (Whitchurch 2008a). Studying the identity disposition of such professional staff and those with mixed identities in HE, Whitchurch (2008b) identified four typologies of professional identities: bounded professionals, cross-boundary professionals, unbounded professionals, and blended professionals (Table 2).

Identity dispositions	**Characteristics**
Bounded professionals	Work within clear structural boundaries (e.g. function, job description)
Cross-boundary professionals	Actively use boundaries for strategic advantage and institutional capacity building
Unbounded professionals	Disregard boundaries to focus on broadly based projects and institutional development
Blended professionals	Dedicated appointments spanning professional and academic domains

Table 2: Typology of professional identities (Whitchurch 2008b)

Those who are recruited to dedicated appointments that span both professional and academic domains are categorized as 'blended professionals' (*Ibid.* 2008b). They demonstrate "an ability to capitalise on a sense of 'belonging' and 'not belonging' entirely to either professional or academic domains, often working in ambiguous conditions" (Whitchurch 2009). As a result, they are redefining the nature of their work (Whitchurch 2008a). Although Whitchurch (2008a) excluded those staff working in the areas of teaching and learning when she carried out her empirical study based on which her typology of professional identity came out, the characteristics of third space and blended professionals give a framework to think about the experiences and position of faculty development practitioners.

So far, I have introduced and explored questions about the field of faculty development and the role of faculty development practitioners. The literature draws on concepts of space such as 'field', 'academic territory', 'framework', 'boundary', and 'third space'. The literature also tries to describe positions through terms such as 'academic tribe' and 'bounded', 'cross-boundary', 'unbounded', and 'blended' professionals. These terms suggest that those writing about faculty development are implicitly looking to understand the field and the position of faculty development practitioners by identifying their space and position in HE.

The review of the literature also indicates that the field of faculty development is slowly emerging and that faculty development practitioners share a basic consensus on their professional identity and role. I argue that the existence of this growing body of knowledge and various forms of communities give faculty development practitioners the confidence to see the shape of their field. They have already formed physical communities in each country, such as the POD and SEDA. Journals such as IJAD spread the ideas and language of faculty development, helping faculty development practitioners to have a shared consciousness, identity, and imagined community[5]. While 'academic tribes and territories' gives a picture of assimilation whereby faculty development practitioners try to mimic and assimilate with fellow academic tribes in the land of HE, trying to understand the community being imagined among faculty development practitioners helps me to recognize the ongoing process of imagining the community of faculty development.

[5] Here, I am referring to the concept of the 'imagined community' articulated by Anderson (1998). Anderson examines the origins of the rise of national consciousness or nationalism. In exploring this topic, he takes an anthropological view to define the nation as an imagined political community that is both inherently limited and sovereign (1998). He argues that people do not know or meet most of their fellow members even in the smallest nations, yet they have an image of their community in the minds (Anderson 1998, 24). He thus defines the nation as an imagined political community. He emphasizes the role of print such as newspapers and popular literature in disseminating national languages, consciousness, and ideologies across people previously unconnected by any conception of shared experience or identity (Anderson 1998).

Conclusion

I started this chapter with a question in mind: 'Why do faculty development practitioners need to discuss their professional identity?' The first section of this chapter reviewed the evolution of faculty development in English-speaking countries, especially the USA and the UK. It showed how the overall paradigm of university education shifted with the massification of HE. Furthermore, the introduction of new cultures such as managerialism and the industrialization of language in HE threatened academic autonomy and freedom. The advancement of research on teaching and learning and the introduction of various educational technologies also contributed to changes in the discourse about HE. Along with these changes to HE, the systematization of faculty development took place and its focus shifted towards a concern with improving practice and gaining influence. The body of knowledge related to HE supported the evolution of faculty development. As possessors of a new role, faculty development practitioners have to make sense of what they do as they practice faculty development.

The voices that I picked out in section 1.2 show how difficult people are finding it to act as faculty development practitioners. The field of faculty development itself is fast changing as the environment surrounding the university changes. It is particularly exposed to policy changes. In such an environment, it is understandable that faculty development practitioners feel rather at a

loss. Faculty development practitioners' delicate relationship with other faculty members also ensures that uncertainties surround their position. Faculty members see the managerialism culture in HE as something that threatens academic freedom and the autonomy of the academic profession. Faculty members tend to resist the idea of faculty development because the systematization of faculty development was seen as part of the new culture of manegerialism. Therefore, although the growing body of knowledge gives confidence to faculty development practitioners in regard to their field, the difficulties they face in everyday life nevertheless mean they question their position and identity.

I suggest that Becher and Trowler's notion of academic tribes and territories helps us understand how the field is evolving. The idea of 'academic tribes and territories' helps us capture the cognitive reality of how faculty development practitioners experience faculty development. Recognizing how the community is being imagined, on the other hand, also provides a perspective through which to investigate the process of a community being formed. One direction practitioners discuss is seeing the field as a new discipline so that they can be one of the tribes in the land of HE. However, what I observe is the field being imagined through sharing of information and exchange of ideas via journal articles and face-to-face dialogue at various associations and organizations for faculty development practitioners. It is not yet clear

how the field is going to shape itself.

This chapter has shown that questions about space and positions are critical for faculty development practitioners and researchers of higher education in those countries where faculty development has been explored and practiced over decades, such as Australia, the USA and the UK. Why is it so important to identify the space and the position? Is it the same for faculty development practitioners in Japan? The literature indicates that the key to answering these questions can be found in the everyday experiences of practitioners. What kind of experiences do they have and why do they think they need to identify themselves while acting as a faculty development practitioner? What is it about faculty development that results in such questions about space and position?

Chapter Two: From 'Faculty Development' to '*FD*' in Japan

Introduction

Chapter One provided an overview of the evolution of faculty development in English-speaking western countries, in particular the USA and the UK. In response to internal and external changes and demands, the shape and contents of faculty development changed. As a result, there is both a sense of confidence in the field and anxieties. With this in mind, we now look at faculty development in Japan.

Three decades have passed since a group of academics introduced the concept of faculty development for the first time in 1980s. Today, the foreign term 'faculty development' has become widely accepted in its abbreviated form '*FD*' among university members in Japan. What kind of discussions and events have taken place during these three decades? Who are the people who have contributed to these discussions? Does the evolution of faculty development in Japan show similar trend as the five ages Sorcinelli et al. (2006) identified? This chapter provides an overview and historical background of faculty development in Japan.

A review of the literature and documents shows that there are three interrelated aspects to the evolution of faculty development in Japan. The first is the discussion led by the faculty members in charge of general education. The Liberal and General Education Society of Japan (LGES) is a representative body of such faculty members. LGES was established to discuss the purpose and methods of general education but it somehow picked faculty development as a particular thematic research topic and promoted it as an idea to support self-directed university education reform. LGES became heavily involved with practices of faculty development after the major HE reform in 1991. The second aspect is work led by researchers in the HE field. In order to understand the concept of faculty development, researchers examined the discussions in the USA and the UK. After the Japan Association of Higher Education Research (JAHER) was established in 1997 as an academic society specifically focused on HE studies, members of JAHER began to play a greater role in promoting scholarly discussion about the concept of and approach to faculty development, and in analysing the situation of faculty development practices. Finally, HE policies created a third dimension. The government's decision to introduce faculty development in the Standards for Establishment of Universities (the Standards) in the 1999 served to put faculty development at the centre of attention among

university members and the term '*FD*' became widespread. Many university members suddenly became posted to the position of faculty development practitioner and various discussions with a view to promote the practices of faculty development began. Interestingly the discussions and practices to improve education at disciplinary level was not integrated into the discussion of formalized *FD*. *FD* was treated as a new concept. Instead of having a progressive evolution as discussed in Chapter One, faculty development practitioners in Japan inevitably took initiative and investigated good practices of faculty development in the USA and the UK to apply to own context. During the post 1991 period, I identified three Ages, which I name the Age of Transmission, the Age of Charismatic Developer, and the Age of Network. What is interesting is that there is lack of discussion about the field of faculty development and identity of faculty development practitioners. More broadly there is lack of voice of practitioners in Japanese literature. Why is this the case?

This chapter describes the transition of the concept of faculty development from a means to solve issues with general education to the political tool '*FD*', designed to enhance the quality of education. It also reveals the implication of borrowing foreign concept. I start by examining two

major changes in HE after WWII that had a great impact on universities and created an identity issue among faculty members in general education, who later became strongly involved with faculty development. I then look at the responses of faculty members and policy makers to understand what faculty development meant for each party.

2.1 Two Major Post-WWII Changes in Universities

Why was the concept of faculty development introduced and why did members of LGES treat the concept as being so significant? In order to understand the background of the introduction of faculty development, it is necessary to understand overall changes in Japanese universities especially after World War II. The two main changes that affected the structure of university education were the introduction of new form of university, *shinsei daigaku*, and the rapid expansion (or massification) of HE.

2.1.1 Introduction of *Shinsei Daigaku* and its Impacts

In terms of Japanese history, universities are rather a new addition to the society. The first university, Tokyo Imperial University, which later became Tokyo University, was established

only in 1886 and modelled on a German university. There were various forms of HE institutions before 1886 but the university form was transplanted to Japan as a western educational institution (Amano 1991). One of the main purposes of Tokyo Imperial University was to bring up bureaucrats or technocrats (Ushiogi 2008). The second university, Kyoto Imperial University, which later became Kyoto University, was established in 1897. It was expected that Tokyo and Kyoto Imperial University would be rivals to offer better education and research outcomes. During this time, many academics had experiences of studying at German universities and introduced systems of university education and the concepts behind it. Since then, Japanese national universities have modelled themselves on European universities, especially German ones, until the end of WWII. Meanwhile, many private HE institutions followed an American model (Amano 1991).

The changes that took place under the American occupation after WWII created long-lasting confusion and conflicts between general education or *ippan kyōiku* and specialized education or *senmon kyōiku*. After WWII, the United States Education Mission to Japan, led by George D. Stoddard, arrived in Japan at the request of the occupation authorities (Tsuchimochi 2006).

Stoddard requested upon arrival that the Japanese government appoint a committee comprised of Japanese experts to work with the American mission to create a new education system[6] (Ministry of Education). The mission held daily meetings with the Japanese committee and presented the Report of the United States Education Mission to Japan on 7 April 1946 (Tsuchimochi 2006). The two major recommendations that affected Japanese universities were the introduction of *ippan kyōiku* or the general education and credit system (Seki 1995, 74). The American idea of 'general education' was introduced in order to change the purpose of university education from educating the elites to providing education for the citizens (Tsuchimochi 2006). In other words, introduction of general education meant a fundamental reform of the meaning and role of university education in Japan. Following the guidelines, the new form of university or *shinsei daigaku* began. What was so significant about the introduction of *ippan kyōiku*?

Before WWII, the senior high school provided a liberal arts education to students, which followed a European model. Completion of senior high school education was the requirement to

[6] www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/hakusho/html/hpbz198103/hpbz198103_2_169.html

enter universities. Hence, the university focused on specialized education. The reforms after WWII extended the years of university from three to four years and combined former senior high school education and university education (Shimizu 1998, 302). Under the new system, the university had to offer two years of general education and two years of specialized education. This change created various issues. Universities had less time for specialized education, which forced them to discuss their curriculum and the objectives of undergraduate education. Academics discussed these issues within their universities and at discipline-based academic societies, such as the Japan Society for Engineering Education and the Physics Education Society of Japan. Both began their activities in the 1950s. Their discussions ranged from teaching practices at an individual level and curriculum reform at an institutional level to the purpose of an undergraduate degree at a disciplinary level.

General education faced even more serious issues. 'General education' was translated as '*ippan kyōiku*' but the concept behind general education was not well understood (Tsuchimochi 2006). In many cases, former senior high school teachers or former foundation programme professors at universities who had been integrated into the new university system taught *ippan kyōiku*

(general education) courses (Yoshida 2006). The Standards set three divisions of subjects to be taught as *ippan kyōiku*. Without having a good understanding of the concept of *ippan kyōiku*, many universities treated *ippan kyōiku* subjects as elementary or as a foundation to specialized education or *senmon kyōiku*. This is the problem with importing structures and concepts from overseas. The concept of general education in the USA emerged from its own context and needs, which is different from Japanese context. Thus the concept did not make sense to Japanese HE (Tsuchimochi 2006). The Standards also created a clear structural division in the academic staff between *ippan kyōiku* and *senmon kyōiku* at national and public universities (Yoshida 2006). At large national and public universities, the department for *ippan kyōiku* was created and put in charge while at smaller institutions a committee for *ippan kyōiku* education played the role (Yoshida 2006). In the latter case, faculty members taught both *ippan kyōiku* and *senmon kyōiku*, or sometimes an *ippan kyōiku* faculty staff member would be placed in discipline-based faculties. For example, at one of my interviewees' universities, which is an average size private university, the lecturers to teach university English as part of *ippan kyōiku* were placed in the Faculty of Law, Engineering, and Economics. This division of academic staff created inconsistency in the undergraduate curriculum. It also created a hierarchy among academics.

For example, *ippan kyōiku* teachers at Tokyo University were not expected to carry out research activities and the budget for *ippan kyōiku* was different from those in faculties (Inter University Seminar House 1989, 94). As a result, those who taught general education were considered to be not a proper academics (Seki 1986, 5). Inevitably those faculty members in *ippan kyōiku* were faced with the question about professional identity. This hierarchy of faculty members later creates part of the context in which faculty development practitioners sought to work. Over years, both the *ippan kyōiku* and credit systems became largely symbolic (Tsuchimochi 2006).

2.1.2 Impact of the Expansion of HE

Before the new structure of universities settled down, Japanese universities experienced a rapid expansion of HE in the 1960s and 70s, as with universities in the US and UK. Between 1950 and 1971, the number of HE institutions increased from 350 to 875 and student numbers grew from about 240,000 to about 1,470,000 (Statistics Bureau, Ministry of Education 1971, cited in Amano 2006). The Ministry of Education dealt with the rapid growth in student numbers by basically increasing the number of private universities, without making the necessary adjustments in administration or educational structure (Ministry of Education 1980, Chapter 6

(1)). National and public universities were under the strong control of the Ministry of Education. They needed permission from the Ministry to increase numbers of academic staff and to create new faculties and departments. Private universities, on the other hand, enjoyed freedom in return for not getting much financial support from the government. This meant private universities had to rely on students' fees therefore it was natural for private universities to accept larger amounts of students (Amano 2006). A sense of dissatisfaction among students gradually grew during this expansion of HE.

Being aware of the issues with the new university structure and the impact of massification, major universities in Tokyo such as the University of Tokyo, Waseda University, and Hitotsubashi University set up the Inter University Seminar House in 1965. Soichiro Iida, an administrator at International Christian University (ICU), suggested the idea of creating a place for university members both public and private to carry out educational activities for students from different institutions, and to interact and discuss issues related to the role of the university and university education (Inter University Seminar House 1989). They built a seminar house with accommodation and started to offer a series of seminars in 1965. For example, the theme

of the first seminar was 'Japan in the world'. Three professors in humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences were invited to give a lecture and 103 students from 17 different universities stayed two nights and three days to discuss the theme (Inter University Seminar House 1989). This was an innovative initiative and attracted hundreds of students every year in the 1970s. The Inter University Seminar House later became one of the places for university members to discuss issues related to university education and faculty development.

With the massification of HE, universities and policy makers were gradually but slowly making adjustments. The most powerful force was the student protests. Mirroring international concerns, student protests took place in 1968 and 1969. They questioned the role of university education, especially *ippan kyōiku* (general education), criticized the poor condition of the university, protested against the fee rise at some private universities, and raised other political matters (Ogose 1968). Students took over university buildings and many universities were forced to cancel lectures.

In response to the protests, the Ministry of Education and universities announced various plans

to solve issues. In 1971, the Central Educational Council submitted a report known as *46 tōshin* that discussed the issues and vision of an overall educational structure. In the section on HE, it highlighted the importance of structural reform for the future development of HE (Kuroha 2001). This report introduced critical concepts that are being discussed seriously even today, such as the diversification and independence of HE institutions, improvement of pedagogical methods, rationalization of management structure, professional development of academics, and widening participation (Kuroha 2001). It also emphasized that *ippan kyōiku* was different from foundation program for *senmon kyōiku*. At that time, it was expected that the Ministry of Education would plan and support the expansion of HE, but the economic downturn after the oil shock in 1973 shifted the government's policy (Kuroha 2001). By the end of the 1970s, the government allowed for more flexibility in the structure of HE so that individual universities would be able to deal with massification independently.

Meanwhile, universities published reports that investigated the shortcomings of university education and suggested ways to resolve those issues. They were insightful and showed foresight (Ogasawara 2004, 75). For example, a report by Nagoya University identified three

causes of fossilization of general education: 1) separation of *ippan kyōiku* and *senmon kyōiku* (specialized education); 2) the recruitment structure that hired lecturers exclusively for teaching *ippan kyōiku*; and 3) lack of appropriate infrastructure and sufficient numbers of academics in *ippan kyōiku* (Ogasawara 2004, 75). However, these reforms were not carried out. One of the reasons for this was the split in the student body. During the student protests, divisions appeared and in the 1970s the conflicts became heated. They fought against each other's political views, which weakened students' voice against universities (Inter University Seminar House 1989, Taguchi 1987). Another explanation is the impact of the rapid growth of the economy and certain structural characteristics of Japanese companies. The Japanese economy experienced rapid growth in the 1970s and 1980s and therefore students had no difficulties finding a job. The system of lifetime employment among Japanese companies came with promotion through seniority, the seniority wage system, and in-service training (Suehiro 2000). Due to this system, graduates were not expected to have specific knowledge or skills, because companies were prepared to give training. Universities were ranked depending on the entrants' academic achievements in high schools and based on the results of entrance examinations (Iwami 2004, 111). Also, the strong credentialism in Japanese society prevented society from paying attention

to the quality of education. Instead, greater emphasis was placed on the name value of the university itself (Arimoto 2005, 104). As a result, the external pressure on university education lessened and the movement to reform university education weakened. Those faculty members who were active in reforming university education at various universities worked voluntarily and universities did not lessen their teaching load (Seki 1995). Naturally, the energy among academics to reform university education gradually disappeared at an institutional level (Seki 1995). The forces of the student protests and the massification of HE did not bring the kind of changes universities in English-speaking countries experienced, such as what we saw in Chapter One. Amano (2008) describes the 1970s and 1980s as the lost decades of university reform. How did the academics in *ippan kyōiku* respond to these movements?

2.2 Responses

There were two types of responses. One was continuous discussion about university education reform among academics responsible for *ippan kyōiku* and the other was an expansion of research interests in issues with HE. The former led to the formation of LGES in 1979 and later the *Nihon Kōtō Kyōiku Gakkai* (JAHER) in 1997. Roughly speaking, those reactions can be

characterized as practitioners' reactions and researchers' reactions respectively.

LGES was established to offer a platform to discuss the role and methods of university education, with a particular focus on *ippan kyōiku*. The members' interests often arose from practical issues they faced at the university. Even after the disappearance of student protests and the energy to reform university education at individual institutions in 1980s, *ippan kyōiku* continued to face issues. The introduction of the common first-stage examination, a standardized university admissions examination in 1979, and altered learning behaviour among students as a result of this exam pushed academics in *ippan kyōiku* to discuss the ways to improve university education (Hata 2009). This was because *ippan kyōiku* was carried out during the first two years of undergraduate program therefore academics in *ippan kyōiku* had to deal with those changing students first. I argue that it was a natural reaction for those academics from *ippan kyōiku* to find the concept of faculty development fascinating because in the USA and the UK the idea of faculty development (or staff development) came out as a way to support faculty members to adjust to the changing demands of the academic profession caused by the massification of HE.

Changing learning behaviour also became an issue for *senmon kyōiku* therefore academics discussed about it in their own discipline. According to the survey by Research Institute for Higher Education (RIHE) in 1982, discipline-based societies and faculties carried out their own discussions about educational issues. They sent surveys to deans of faculties at 1,165 universities and junior colleges and 697 (59.7%) of them responded. In the survey, professors in various faculties described the methods they used to improve their teaching. For example, one professor was quoted as saying, "In order to create an interactive lecture, I use workshops and discussions". A professor in engineering said, "Our faculty translated the handbook used at MIT [Massachusetts Institute of Technology], 'You and your students', and hand it out to all the faculty members" (RIHE, 1982). These quotes show how discipline-based faculty members were searching for ways to improve their education. They just did not encounter or use the term 'faculty development'.

Meanwhile, JAHER was established as an academic society to promote research in the HE field. Prior to its establishment, there were growing interests in various academic societies to see issues with HE as a subject for research. For example, the Japan Association of Educational

Sociology (JAES) created a section on HE studies and Historical Studies on Higher Education started in 1966 (Tanaka 2009). The Research Institute for Higher Education at Hiroshima University (RIHE), the first national research institute specializing in HE studies, was established in 1972. Gradually, demands for advancement of theories and research methods to carry out research in HE studies grew, and thus JAHER was established in 1997. Those research outcomes contributed to the formation of HE policies.

In this section, I focus on pre-1991 movements; 1991 is an epochal year in the history of Japanese HE because the Standards were deregulated and more autonomy was given to HE institutions. This resulted in the dissolving of departments and faculties for *ippan kyōiku.*

2.2.1 LGES and Faculty Development

As mentioned previously, the idea of *ippan kyōiku* was not well adopted in Japanese universities and the student protests created further criticisms about the purpose, curriculum and quality of general education. As mentioned above, one of the places university members actively exchanged opinions over university education was at the Inter University Seminar House. In

1970, the House invited academic staff at various institutions to discuss the future of university reform. This was the beginning of a seminar series for academic staff (Inter University Seminar House 1989). The topic covered *ippan kyōiku*, university reform, foreign language education in undergraduate programmes, graduate education, international students, and the role of universities in a society.

To solve the structural issues, the Central Educational Council suggested relaxation of the division between *ippan kyōiku* and *senmon kyōiku*, and the subject categories within *ippan kyōiku* in 1975. Those faculty members in *ippan kyōiku* strongly opposed this suggestion. In response to the report, some national universities established a nation-wide network of *ippan kyōiku* to discuss and carry out research on the new structure to provide *ippan kyōiku* (LGES 2004, 33). This became LGES in 1979. Three major challenges were: 1) to identify the purpose of *ippan kyōiku*; 2) to design the curriculum to create consistency between *ippan kyōiku* and *senmon kyōiku*; and 3) to improve the status of *ippan kyōiku* teachers (LGES 2004). At around the same time, the government began supporting national universities by creating a special budget for improving *ippan kyōiku*. A group of academics were sent overseas to inspect the

curriculum and structure of *ippan kyōiku* in other countries (LGES 2004, 36). At the Society, members discussed the concept, curriculum, pedagogy and assessment of *ippan kyōiku*, undergraduate students, the institutional structure for *ippan kyōiku*, and international trends in general and liberal education (LGES 2004). The members exchanged, shared, and promoted further investigation by holding an annual conference, publishing its own academic journal, and forming a thematic research project. I will explain the thematic research project later. As I discussed above, those who taught *ippan kyōiku* were treated separately from other discipline-based faculty members and were not expected to produce research outcomes. Naturally, their focus became on teaching of *ippan kyōiku* and LGES became the place to share teaching methods and educational issues.

In 1985, Kinukawa, the president of International Christian University (ICU) at that time, and ICU Professor Hara presented a paper at the seventh LGES annual meeting called '*Daigakukyōin hyōka no shiten*' (Views on Assessment of Faculty Members). Reflecting on their practices at ICU, their paper stressed the importance of faculty assessment and continuous faculty development to sustain the quality of education (Kinukawa 2006, 228). In their view,

faculty development meant a chance to reflect on their educational practices and to improve its quality through discussion with others. This sounds like normal practice in today's context. However, back then no one discussed the assessment of faculty members' educational practices let alone students' evaluation and therefore their discussion was considered innovative (Kinukawa 1995). Why did ICU introduce such a practice? To answer this question, it is necessary to understand the uniqueness of ICU as a university.

ICU is a private university, established in 1953 with the same structures as America's liberal arts colleges (ICU, website). ICU holds as its mission:

> The establishment of an academic tradition of freedom and reverence based on Christian ideals, and the education of individuals of conscience, internationally cultured and with a strong sense of citizenship in a democratic society.

Their mission is expressed through its undergraduate curriculum and the emphasis placed on students' outcomes. They only have the College of Liberal Arts for undergraduate and various specialized programmes for graduate students. Currently, there are 32 majors within the college. Being a Christian university means that, in order to be a faculty member, staff have to be Christian, although students are ensured freedom of religion. The medium of instruction at ICU

is both Japanese and English. It is a relatively small university with about 2,800 undergraduate students, 150 full-time faculty members and 170 part-time faculty members as of 2011 (ICU, website). Due to the characteristics of the undergraduate programme, university staff members share the mission of the university and work together to achieve it (Kinukawa 1995). Faculty members share graduate distributions of all courses offered and the dean of the college comments on the outcome (Kinukawa 1995). To promote dialogue among university staff members, ICU organizes retreats once a year, where not only faculty members but also administrative staff spend two days together to discuss ICU's mission and the purpose of a liberal arts education. This is all part of faculty development for them (Kinukawa 1995, 165–169). As early as the 1970s there was a discussion about introducing students' evaluation of faculty members, which was unthinkable at other Japanese universities. As I mentioned earlier, one of the complaints the student protests were intended to represent concerned the quality of *ippan kyōiku*. It was natural for the members of LGES to consider ICU a successful example of *ippan kyōiku* because at their own universities they saw the necessity of curriculum reform to improve *ippan kyōiku* but were confronted by the divisions between discipline-based faculties and *ippan kyōiku*. Both Kinukawa and Hara became influential figures in promoting

the concept of faculty development.

Since then, Kinukawa has published a number of books and journal articles on faculty development (e.g. Kinukawa 1995, 2004, and 2006). His main argument is that faculty development is a way to change the nature of university education and academic identity to meet demands in mass HE. He argues that faculty development is a concept that includes all the institutional support needed to promote meaningful practices among faculty members (Kinukawa 1995, 181). Therefore, faculty development should be carried out institutionally and should not be treated as professional development for an individual faculty member (*Ibid.*). This means full institutional support to promote faculty development is critical. In other words, all academic and non-academic staff members should be included in the discussion about the improvement of university education. He claims that it is crucial to see a university as a community and that both academic and non-academic staff members have a critical role to play in making the community a better place (Kinukawa 1995, 184). It is clear that the characteristics of ICU and his experiences have had an impact on Kinukawa's argument about faculty development and the purpose of university education. This is one of the characteristics of

practitioner's value. Their value is constructed through experiences.

The successful example of ICU and Kinukawa and Hara's report led LGES to set up a fourth thematic research project focused on faculty development in 1985, which was ongoing until 1997, and was then integrated into the eighth thematic research project. The thematic research is one of the central research activities of LGES. The board of directors picks a critical theme and appoints one of the members of LGES to lead an intensive investigation with self-selected project members. By 2010, 19 research projects were set up. Each research project shared the outcome at LGES meetings and conferences, and in journal publications. The overview of themes shows the changing interests of LGES. Another mission of LGES was to encourage discussion about university education among universities and policy makers. They used two methods: by carrying out the large survey, and by submitting the public opinion letter to the policy makers (LGES 2004).

Recognizing the importance of the concept of faculty development, LGES conducted a nation-wide survey to understand the readiness of Japanese universities to accept the concept of

faculty development in January 1987. The design of the survey was very unique. Instead of asking what each university was doing to support faculty members, they listed 35 opinions related to faculty development and asked respondents to choose from 'strongly agreed, agreed, not sure, disagreed, strongly disagreed' (Hamano 1987). By using this unique method, LGES was intending to capture what a Japanese version of faculty development might look like. To give an idea of what 'faculty development' meant, they included examples of faculty development practices in the USA as an attachment (LGES 1987). They used alphabetically written phrase 'Faculty Development' instead of giving Japanese translation. For example, opinion one stated:

> The faculty's autonomous evaluation of university and faculty development in order to adjust to historical and social changes surrounding the university is acceptable, even against the idea of an autonomous university. It is characteristic of Japanese universities to have assessment of university and faculty development not directed by the board members of the university but through professors' meeting. …

Opinion 35 said:

> The idea of faculty development may have a negative impact on the faculty's autonomy. It may lead faculty members to be passive about his/her own development. The faculty should continuously reflect on this potential negative impact of faculty development.

The team responsible for this survey was not planning to analyze the result statistically. The team was hoping to stimulate discussions among university members about the idea of faculty

development (LGES 2004). In retrospect, the LGES argued that this was a bottom-up approach to stimulate discussions among university members and would protect the autonomy of universities from the top-down approach of policy makers to introduce assessment of faculty members (LGES 2004). The survey was sent to three different groups: the first group included those who were in positions of power, such as the president, deans, and directors (the number of surveys sent: 2,338 people); the second group included regular faculty members (1,014 universities); and the third group consisted of members of LGES (627 people). The return rates were 20.5%, 14.3% and 24.9 % respectively (LGES 1987, 73). The respondents of this survey criticized the design and its attempt to ask about 'faculty development' that did not exist. But as the team intended, some respondents expressed the sense of being motivated to consider and discuss more about 'faculty development' (LGES 2004).

In autumn 1987, LGES conducted another national survey on faculty development. This time the purpose was to investigate the actual situation of faculty development practices (LGES 2004). The survey with 26 questions was sent to about 1,000 people, including those in charge of general education at a university level and presidents and directors of junior colleges. The

return rate was 42.2 % and 26.4% respectively. It listed a wide range of activities, including self-assessment, training for faculty members, and standards for employment and promotion of faculty members. Those were listed as basic forms of faculty development. There was another section in the survey that focused on the improvement of general education as part of faculty development. It asked if the university offered interdisciplinary subjects, academic writing, foreign languages, and support for students (LGES 2004). At a glance, it was hard to see what exactly the survey was about (LGES 2004) but the survey was designed with an understanding that faculty development could mean training for faculty members but it could also refer to any endeavours to promote continuous improvement of university education (LGES 2004).

From these 1987 surveys, I argue that LGES understood there were ideas, methods, and structures in Japanese universities that were not referred to using the term 'faculty development' but which played the role of faculty development implicitly. Its effort to disseminate the term 'faculty development' indicates members' desire to have a term so that they would be able to start the conversation with other faculty members about university education. I argue that the successful example of ICU helped members visualize such a conversation and the role of

faculty development (see Seki 1995). Eventually, 'faculty development' was translated into Japanese as '*kyōjudan shishitsu kaikaku*' (improvement of quality of the faculty as a whole) and not limited to teaching but also included research and the other activities involving the academic profession.

2.2.2 Negotiations between the University Council and LGES

In 1987, the Ministry of Education established a national University Council. It was a response to the report by the National Council on Educational Reform set up by Yasuhiro Nakasone, the then Prime Minister, to promote the reform of HE. The National Council on Educational Reform was an advisory body to the Prime Minister. The purpose of the University Council was to "discuss the role and purpose of HE, to give advice or support to universities, and to hold the right to advise the Minister of Education" (*Kōtō kyōiku kenkyū kai* 2002). It was intended to be a place to hold discussions to design HE policies among policy makers, university members, and other parties concerned with HE. It is hard to judge how well the University Council was able to play this idealized role but having an independent organization for HE for the first time in the history meant a lot (Amano 2006). During the 14 years of its existence, the University

Council published 26 policy papers and two reports.

The University Council began to draft a paper in 1988 to formulate a policy to advance HE and research, to support originality in HE, and to activate institutional management of HE institutions (Kōtō kyōiku kenkyūkai, 2002). 'Advanced (*kōdo*)', 'original (*kosei*)' and 'active (*kassei*)' were the three key terms the University Council used to frame their analysis (*Kōtō kyōiku kenkyū kai* 2002). In order to achieve the mission, the University Council looked into the possibility of the relaxation of the Standards and the introduction of a self-assessment structure (LGES 2004). It argued that it should be up to a university how it wants to design its curriculum, which basically meant getting rid of the division between *ippan kyōiku* and *senmon kyōiku*. This was a point of concern for LGES as they feared the category of *ippan kyōiku* might disappear.

In the process of drafting the policy paper, the University Council canvassed public opinion several times. LGES sent five opinion letters between 1988 and 1991 (LGES 2004). In 1988, LGES sent the first opinion letter. The letter expressed agreement with the idea of giving more autonomy to universities but opposed to the abolishment of the division between *ippan kyōiku*

and *senmon kyōiku*. Instead, LGES referred to the way universities in the USA and the UK responded to the changes led by the massification of HE. According to the letter, universities in the USA and the UK conducted research about university education, examined ways of introducing university assessment, and carried out faculty development workshops to improve the standard of education (LGES 2004). The 1980s was the time universities in the USA saw upsurge of faculty development programs (Sorcinelli et al. 2006). The letter's authors recommended the establishment of a self-study centre to support university reform (LGES 2004). The letter also discussed the result of the 1987 survey and recommended the introduction of faculty development at Japanese universities (LGES 2004).

Reflecting on opinions from various parties, the Council published the second draft of the policy paper. The basic approach did not change but the report carefully described the importance of *ippan kyōiku*, with LGES again emphasizing the importance of keeping the structure of *ippan kyōiku*. The negotiation continued over a few years but finally the Council published its first policy paper titled 'Improvement of University Education' in 1991. It argued that the relaxation of the Standards and introduction of the quality assessment system would

support each university to create an original curriculum that meets own mission or philosophy of education, to improve students' learning experiences, to improve both *ippan* and *senmon kyōiku*, and to offer varieties of learning opportunities (Amano 2006). This report led to major reform of Japanese universities with the relaxation of the Standards in 1991. Terasaki writes: "The scale of changes taking place during the period after 1991 is as extensive and comprehensive as the changes that took place after WWII" (2006, 1). Based on the amendment of the Standards, more autonomy was given for the university to design their own curriculum and the division between *ippan kyōiku* and *senmon kyōiku* was abolished. The members of LGES expressed strong concerns about this change. Kinukawa uses a metaphor of medical treatment to explain the University Council's decision to relax the Standards as follows (1995, 30):

> The Standards is like the life-support equipment to sustain the life of *ippan kyōiku* in *shinsei daigaku* (new form of university after WWII). Currently *ippan kyōiku* is like the patient with brain death therefore they (the University Council) are getting rid of the life-support equipment. The University Council is giving a camphor injection in the form of the introduction of a self assessment and hopes *ippan kyōiku* to recover on its own strength.

As a result, *ippan kyōiku* departments at various universities vanished and many attempts were made to integrate *ippan kyōiku* into the four-year curriculum. In order to create posts for those

in *ippan kyōiku*, many national universities established centres for university education (*daigaku kyōiku*). Those centres became responsible for general education[7] and quality assurance, and when the government began to promote faculty development it became part of their responsibilities.

2.2.3 From *Ippan Kyōiku Gakkai* to *Daigaku Kyōiku Gakkai*

In 1997, the name of LGES in Japanese changed from *Ippan kyōiku gakkai* to *Daigaku kyōiku gakkai*, although its English name remained the same. *Daigaku kyōiku* means university education. The reason to change its name was partly because the name *ippan kyōiku* disappeared after 1991 reform, meaning it did not make sense to keep the term. Another reason was that LGES wanted to emphasize its interest in dealing with university education as their main topic of concern. As I described in the previous sections, the discussion about general education inevitably led LGES to think about university education as a whole because general education was the core concept of the *shinsei daigaku* (new university after WWII). It was implicit before

[7] After the relaxation of the Standards, each university began to call *ippan kyōiku* differently such as *kyōyō kyōiku* (liberal arts education), *zengaku kyōiku* (university-wide education), and *ippan kyōiku.* Therefore here I use 'general education'.

but by changing the name of the society it wanted to formally express its commitment to offer a platform to discuss university education (LGES 2004).

After the change of its Japanese name, LGES began to focus more on practical issues with undergraduate education instead of discussing the philosophy and concept of university education. For example, topics in 1997 included admission processes, linkage with senior high school education, course assessment methods, methods of teaching, students' counselling, students' careers, organizational management, recruitment of faculty members, and faculty development (LGES 2004). This reflected universities' responses to the University Council's first policy report. The Council recommended the introduction of syllabi, institutional faculty development, teaching assistantships, recognition of extra-curricular activities as credit, and a quota for transfer students. The Council outlined those structures in order to improve and diversify the learning experiences of students (Amano 2006). In addition to publishing self-assessment reports, universities actively introduced the above-mentioned structures and tools, which created new demands within the university to deal with new duties.

LGES carried out an investigation of the impact of the relaxation of the Standards between 1991 and 1994. This identified that most universities and junior colleges had dissolved the faculty and department of general education, introduced a new structure for general education, carried out curriculum reform, and undertaken self-assessment (LGES 2004). The speed of reform was so rapid that it was questionable if the changes were substantial (Amano 2006) because those new ideas were imported, in just the way general education had first been introduced. A cross-divisional organization such as a university-wide committee and a centre for university education became responsible for dealing with reform and those faculty members in general education took up those new posts. Hence, the topics covered at LGES annual conferences and journal articles shifted.

This is how faculty members responsible for *ippan kyōiku* became involved with the practices of faculty development. There are differences in the way LGES discussed faculty development before and after 1991. Before 1991, LGES treated faculty development as an alternative concept that would promote self-directed university education reform, as opposed to the government-led structural reform. Instead of defining faculty development based on discussions and practices in

the USA and UK, LGES hoped to capture already existing concepts and methods to improve university education by using the idea of faculty development as a lens. In short, it sought to define a Japanese version of faculty development. LGES kept the same idea even after the 1991 reform but the government's introduction of various methods and structures created an understanding among other faculty members that faculty development is a mere method to improve the educational activities of faculty members and therefore linked with the new culture of assessment that threatens the autonomy of the academic profession. Those faculty members who were responsible for *ippan kyōiku* were already facing a question about professional identity when they became involved with various assessments and institutionalized faculty development in the 1990s.

2.2.4 HE Research

I will now briefly discuss the development of the field of HE studies, with a particular emphasis on the characteristics of research approaches and topics, which offer background information about certain ways HE researchers discuss faculty development.

In 1997, the JAHER was established, which marked the beginning of HE studies as an independent field of research. 1997 was the year LGES changed its Japanese name and the Japan Association of University Administrative Management was established. The emergence of numbers of academic societies related to higher education could imply growing scholarly interests in HE. But it is also argued that the increasing pressure on academics to produce research outcomes triggered the establishment of those academic societies so that they would be able to publish in the academic journal each academic society created (Takakura cited in Hashimoto 2007).

The fact there was no academic society dedicated to HE studies until 1997 did not mean there were no research on HE. Researchers in the sociology of education, comparative educational studies, and history of education chose HE as a subject of research and published. Among others, the Japan Society of Educational Sociology became a place for researchers to discuss HE topics. One of the first journal articles on HE in the Journal for Sociology of Education was written by Shimbori and published in 1956. It was on issues with access to university (Shimbori 1956). He later published 'Academic Marketplace in Japan' in 1965, which became one of the

most influential publications in the field of HE. Shimbori identified the structure of '*gakubatsu*' or 'unconditional patronage for the graduates of a particular university' (Shimbori 1981) as a Japanese version of nepotism and argued the importance of considering the impact of '*gakubatsu*' on the academic market place. He also argued that one of the reasons for stagnation of research outcome in Japan was to do with the promotion of academics (Shimbori 1965). He compared the composition of professors, associate professors, lecturers, and assistant professors between across countries and identified that the number of academics in each career stage were the same, which meant those who entered an academic career path eventually became a professor (*Ibid.*). Meanwhile, in the USA and the UK the number of professors was the smallest compared with academics in other positions, which indicated that there was a competition to become a professor (*Ibid.*). His study not only had impact on higher education research but also on the public (Ushiogi 2009). Shimbori's study later led to three major research themes: the academic profession, gender in the academic profession, and inbreeding (Yamanoi 2007). These became important research themes for the Research Institute for Higher Education (RIHE) that I introduce in the next paragraph. In 1971, Amano and Arai reviewed the literature on issues related to HE (Amano and Arai 1971). At that point, they identified thousands of books and

journal articles published on various HE topics. Although it should be noted that not all of those publications were written by academics, this trend showed how critical HE as a subject of research had become (*Ibid.*).

The first national research centre for HE was established at Hiroshima University in 1972, which is now called the Research Institute for Higher Education (RIHE). The forerunner of RIHE was the section for investigation of university issues established in 1970 after the student protests. Thus their original interest before becoming the national research institute was to investigate into issues with Hiroshima University. As a national research institute the role of RIHE also included to contribute to Japanese university education. This was a challenge. Looking back on a decade of RIHE activities, Kitamura stated (1989, 14–15):

> The centre has two major roles. One can be called 'self-study'. The focus of the study is Hiroshima University. The centre checks and evaluates the functions and activities of Hiroshima University and offers necessary services to the university. The other can be called 'study on HE'. The centre researches and analyses various aspects of HE. […] Looking back into its history, the centre had always been pulled and pushed between those two roles.

He concluded that the RIHE did not make much contribution internally during those ten years, which triggered criticism among university members at Hiroshima University (Kitamura 1989).

The question about contributing to the practice of university education within the institution or to the development of the scholarly field is one of the questions HE studies face even today. The major contribution of RIHE became the advancement of HE research rather than to the educational management of Hiroshima University. Their four objectives included:

1. To research the fundamental issues of universities and HE;
2. To collect and classify documents on universities and HE in general;
3. To provide intellectual information about universities and HE; and
4. To teach students and train university staff about universities and HE.

A popular research topic was HE in other countries, especially in the USA. This was partly because of the history of Japanese HE and the fact that massification of HE took place in the USA first (Amano 2008). Researchers visited HE institutions and other relevant bodies in various countries to collect information. They actively translated handbooks, documents, and books as part of their research activities. As discussed in Chapter One, the body of literature on HE grew rapidly in English-speaking countries as HE institutions experienced major transformations. Japanese academics were aware of this trend and devoted their time to studying and disseminating this knowledge (Shimbori 1981). Shimbori (1981, 84) states that, “many university teachers consider it the prime duty of scholars to read foreign books and introduce them to Japanese audiences”.

Another important research activity of RIHE was to carry out various national surveys to offer foundational data for policy makers, other universities, and the international community, such as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). For example, in 1982 RIHE conducted a national survey about university education as part of an international project led by OECD/Center for Educational Research and Innovation. The aim was to find out what deans of faculties and departments think about curriculum and teaching at universities (RIHE 1985). As part of the international project, Kitamura and Umakoshi translated and introduced 'Improving Teaching in Higher Education' produced by the University of London Teaching Methods Units at the Institute of Education (University of London Teaching Methods Unit, et al 1985). This was the first time the term 'staff development' appeared in Japanese HE. Both Kitamura and Umakoshi were researchers at RIHE at that time. Their intention was to introduce new methods to improve university teaching. Along with another translator, Higashi, they only translated those chapters they considered relevant to Japanese universities. In addition, they tried to relate the contents of the book to the Japanese context (University of London Teaching Methods Unit, et al 1985, v).

In 1986, RIHE started a postgraduate degree programme on 'comparative studies of university systems'. This marked a new turn in the field of HE studies. It was a claim that the field of HE studies could be seen as an independent discipline. RIHE remained the only research centre dedicated to the field of HE studies until the second research centre was established at Tsukuba University in 1986 and it contributed to the advancement of the field (Teichler 2007). I argue that research approaches, topics, and outcomes at RIHE influenced the characteristics of HE studies in Japan. As the name of the postgraduate degree programme indicates, studying universities in other countries is one of the main research approaches at RIHE and the field of HE studies in Japan. Teichler (2007) points out that this kind of research approach is very popular in HE studies in Japan.

The discussion on research approaches and topics also took place at the Japan Society of Educational Sociology. Like other disciplines, as a new field of studies it was inevitable that researchers would import, transplant, and reinvigorate the knowledge framework, theories and research methodologies (Arimoto 1992). Ushiogi (1989) criticized the tendency for research on HE to focus on big themes such as the philosophy and values of the university and not pay

enough attention to the status quo of Japanese HE. As has been mentioned, Japanese universities experienced massification of HE in the 1970s and 80s and universities faced various issues such as changing characteristics of students, increasing levels of tuition fees, internationalization, and the changing role of universities. Much research focused on the function of university in a society, such as its role in selecting, screening and credentializing students. However, less attention was paid to the educational and research functions of the university (Arimoto 1992). Ushiogi (1989) shares one episode about a faculty member failing to manage a class and asked if there has ever been a single faculty member who never had difficulties in giving a lecture and communicating with students. He asks (1989 7): "Why don't we start our research on higher education by looking at the reality?" These criticisms and comments indicate a lack of studies that capture and critically analyse the status quo of Japanese HE at that time. It also indicates that there was a lack of resources for decision makers in the university and the government to refer to which were based on scholarly investigation and analysis.

JAHER was established to offer an academic society for junior researchers specialized in HE

studies, such as graduates of RIHE, to network with senior researchers from various disciplinary backgrounds who worked on HE issues (Hashimoto 2007). The aim was to accumulate knowledge, develop theoretical frameworks, and contribute to wider society (JAHER, website). Hashimoto (2007) examined the percentage of members of JAHER also belonging to other academic societies related to education, finding that about 35% belong to the Japan Association of Educational Sociology, 20% to LGES, and 18% to the Japan Comparative Education Society. From these numbers, it is possible to estimate what kind of topics and approaches members tended to choose in carrying out research in the field of HE. It was educational sociology that had the greatest impact on HE research as an approach. Only a handful of studies were carried out on teaching and learning in HE, and about students. Nevertheless, thanks to their research activities, academics and policy makers gradually developed a better understanding of HE policies and university education reform in other countries and structural issues with HE in Japan.

2.3 New Policy and Universities' Response

2.3.1 Introduction of New Concepts

As mentioned above, the Japanese government carried out the relaxation of the Standards in 1991 to give more managerial autonomy to universities. It was expected that each university would design its institutional strategies such as a curriculum to achieve own mission. At the same time, following the discussions in the UK and the USA, the government introduced the idea of self-assessment, accountability, and third-party quality assurance. New concepts such as enrolment management, syllabi, office hours, student evaluations, and GPA began to be introduced. Researchers in HE studies, especially those at RIHE and JAHER, were heavily involved with defining these concepts and giving advice to policy makers.

In 1997, the then Minister of Education, Nobutaka Machimura, called for an advisory meeting of the University Council to discuss the future role and direction of university reform. Based on the discussions held, the University Council submitted a report called 'A Vision for the University of the 21st Century and Future Reform Measures: Distinctive Universities in a Competitive Environment' in 1998. The report presented the basic policies for university reform

and stated that institutionalized *fakarutī diberoppumento* (faculty development) should be included in the Standard for Establishment of Universities in order to improve the contents of education and faculty member's teaching methods (University Council 1998, Chapter 2 (2) iv). It also explained that in order "to keep the faculty from becoming obsolete," a sustained long-term faculty development strategy is considered necessary (University Council 1998). This report had as great impact on higher education as 1991 report (Arimoto 2009). It emphasized the role and responsibility of the faculty member as an educator and discussed ways to assess them not as a researcher but as an educator (*Ibid.*).

In 2000, the University Council published '*Gurōbaruka jidai ni motomerareru kōtō kyōiku no arikata ni tsuite*' ('Higher Education in the Age of Globalization'). The report argued that HE institutions are in a critical position to educate and train people so that they can meet the demands of a globalized and knowledge-focused society and economy. It recommended universities to examine not only research outcome but also the educational abilities of applicants in the recruitment process. It also emphasized the need to promote institutionalized *fakarutī diberoppumento* (faculty development). The report points out that it is necessary for a

university to analyse the current situation of lectures and, based on the analysis, the university should plan institutionalized *fakarutī diberoppumento* activities.

Similar to the funding and quality-assurance structure in the UK that offers separate funding for research activities and educational activities, MEXT began providing block funding for educational activities in 2003. The aim of the funding was to promote good practice in terms of educational activities and therefore the funding was named *GP*. There were two different types of *GP*: *Tokushoku GP* and *Gendai GP*. *Tokushoku GP* supported outstanding practices of a university to improve its education while *Gendai GP* preset a theme and supported successful application of a project (MEXT, website, accessed 30 April, 2012). *Tokushoku GP* and *Gendai GP* are now combined and called *Kyōiku GP* or 'Programme for Promoting High-Quality University Education'. MEXT used *GP* funding as incentives for universities to promote institutionalized *fakarutī diberoppumento*. As a result, universities began developing projects to promote institutionalized faculty development and successful universities hired academics as project members. In July 2007, the Standards were further amended to make institutionalized *fakarutī diberoppumento* mandatory for universities from the 2008 academic year. Clause 25-3

of the Standards for Establishment of Universities gives the government's definition of faculty development: "A university should make efforts to organize institutional workshops and research to improve contents of lectures and educational methods". As a result of this clause, universities in Japan suddenly began offering *fakarutī diberoppumento*. It is around this time the term '*FD*' became widely used. Hereafter, I use '*FD*' to indicate the Japanese *fakarutī diberoppumento*.

2.3.2 The Academic Profession in Japan

Why did the government repeatedly emphasize the role of the academic as educator? A number of factors can be identified, such as the impact of the expansion and massification of HE and the changing role of the university in society, but it is also critical to pay attention to how academics perceive the academic profession in Japan and how it was constructed through the structure of the university.

Generally speaking, Japanese academics are considered to be research-oriented and treat education as insignificant (Arimoto 2009). Indeed, according to the international comparative

study in 1992 and 2007, Japanese academics tend to identify their role as that of a researcher rather than an educator (*Ibid.*)[8]. To the question "Regarding your own preferences, do your interests lie in teaching or in research?" the percentage of people who consider teaching to be their primary interest is low compared with other countries, although it should also be noted that the attitude of Japanese academics towards education has changed slightly over the years (*Ibid.*).

That said, it is important to pay attention to the term '*kenkyū*', which is usually translated as 'research'. In large surveys such as the one led by the Carnegie Foundation and Arimoto, 'research' is rendered as '*kenkyū*'. However, based on an ethnographic study at a Japanese private university, Poole (2010) argues that Japanese academics interpret '*kenkyū*' in various ways. Indeed, the scope is so broad "as to include study, teaching preparation, and even teaching itself ("action research"), an interpretation that would be considered a conflation of academic activities at a Euro-American HEI" (*Ibid.* 141). Poole uses an example of how the office of a faculty member is called '*kenkyū shitsu*' (research room) or 'laboratory' in the hard

[8] This is based on the international comparative research project 'The Changing Academic Profession' led by the US Carnegie Foundation, which started in 1992 involving 14 countries throughout the world including Japan. Later, RIHE conducted a corresponding project 'An International Comparative Study on the Vision of Academic Profession in the Twenty-first Century' between 2006 and 2009. Arimoto took part in the Carnegie project and led RIHE's project.

scientific disciplines. Usually students would meet in the '*kenkyū shitsu*' (research room) to have a tutorial-like discussion with the faculty member or to prepare and perform experiments (*Ibid.* 141). If Japanese academics intuitively define '*kenkyū*' as broadly as Poole believes, the result of the survey led by Arimoto should be scrutinized[9].

The chair system or *kōza* structure might have contributed to form the broad concept of *kenkyū*. The *kōza* structure was introduced to imperial universities in the 19th century as the basic academic and administrative unit (Cummings and Amano 1977). Each *kōza* had a specific field of research and was composed of one professor, one associate professor, and one assistant professor who shared the same research field (Cumming and Amano 1977, Ushiogi 2009). According to the School Education Law of 1948, the role of the professor was to contribute to the advancement of the field and to educate the next generation. Meanwhile, both the associate professor and assistant professor's role was to 'support[10]' the professor (and associate professor)

[9] Poole argues that, "To better support and interpret comparative data on the professoriate and universities, the cultural interpretation of these categories must be further deconstructed through ethnographic studies" (2010, 144).

[10] Under this structure, the associate professor was called '*jo kyōju*' and the assistant professor '*jyo shu*'. This is different from the current '*jun kyōju*' and '*jo kyōju*'. The term '*jo*' means 'to help' or 'to support'.

within the *kōza* (*Ibid.* 2006)[11]. In other words, the *kōza* offered an apprenticeship system to train junior academics for an academic profession (*Ibid.* 2006). Therefore, *kōza* offered an intellectual community where research and education were integrated, a characteristic of the university in elite higher education (*Ibid.* 2006). Until the late 1990s, the *kōza* structure remained the basic academic structure, which means that most contemporary professors experienced the *kōza* system as a student and junior academic and managed it as a professor. Due to this background, it is possible to assume that Japanese academics consider *kenkyū* to have the broad definition Poole (2010) identifies.

However, the government amended the Standards to allow more flexibility within the academic structure and the government report *Waga kuni no kōtō kyōiku no shōrai zō ni* ('The future of higher education in Japan') published in 2005 suggested diminishing the regulations on *kōza* from the Standards. This was because, while the *kōza* structure contributed greatly to the advancement of research in Japan, it also promoted academic inbreeding, widely considered to be one of the causes of the declining quality of research in recent years (Hugo et. al. 2010).

[11] Being able to have one's own *kōza* meant the discipline or the academic society approved the research field as an established one (Amano 2006).

What this means is that universities have to reconstruct academic management structure in which research, education, and the training of the next generation of academics takes place (Amano 2006). The great shift and structural changes were taking place in the background of the government's emphasis on the educational activities of academics and the introduction of institutional *FD*.

2.3.3 Response of Universities and *FD* Practitioners

As I showed in Chapter One, Sorcinelli et al. (2006) identified five ages in the evolution of faculty development in the USA. In Japan, I suggest that there are three ages, which I name: the Age of Transmission; the Age of the Charismatic Developer; and the Age of the Network.

The 1990s were the Age of Transmission, a period when the government introduced and recommended the foreign concept of *FD* and HE researchers and those who became involved with *FD* to discuss what it meant to practice *FD*. In 1999, the Standards were amended and Clause 25-3 recommended universities to carry out institutional *FD*. In response to this recommendation, universities held seminars and symposiums to learn what *FD* was all about.

Certain HE researchers such as Arimoto, Kinukawa and Terasaki were invited to talk from the perspective of HE studies. Because of its abbreviation, people used to joke, "Do you know what *FD* is? *FD* is not a floppy disk. It is *fakarutī diberoppumento*." How to define *FD* remains a topic for discussion today, partly because it is an English term that does not make any sense in Japanese and partly because of the definition given by the government. Clause 25-3 of the Standards sets the definition of *FD*, which only focuses on the development of faculty members' ability as teachers. Some practitioners contested this definition and discuss the importance of understanding the concept of faculty development more broadly. They use the term '*kōgi no FD*' (*FD* with a broader definition) while they call the definition given by the Standards '*kyōgi no FD*' (*FD* with a narrow definition). Arimoto (2005), Terasaki (2006), Natsume (2009) and Tanaka (2003) use these expressions to criticize the narrow focus of Clause 25-3. Terasaki (2006) refers to discussions about the definition of faculty development in English-language literature and warns of the negative impact of limiting the definition of *FD* to teaching improvement. Arimoto (2005) discusses the importance of understanding the academic profession in order to understand what *FD* is about.

By 2006, there were a number of individuals or universities widely recognized for their *FD* practices, such as Masaru Hashimoto at Okayama University and Hiroaki Sato at Ehime University. The fact it was possible to identify the names of individuals or institutions for their style of *FD* practice is characteristic of the Age of the Charismatic Developer. Hashimoto became famous for motivating students to be an active learner so that it would eventually stimulate faculty members to give better lectures. Hiroaki Sato became famous for designing comprehensive *FD* programmes including individual consultation and the idea of professional *FD* staff or faculty developers. Tsunemi Tanaka at Kyoto University became known for promoting the idea of *FD* based on peer learning. Takaharu Oda at Yamagata University started a *FD* network in the region to share information about *FD* and mutual support. A series of reportage on various practices of *FD* by the Daily Yomiuri, the biggest newspaper in Japan, also contributed to creating the public image of those charismatic *FD* practitioners. Hashimoto, Oda, and Sato appeared in the reportage. The implication of Daily Yomiuri, I argue, was that it showed actual activities of what *FD* practitioners were doing on everyday basis. It must have had an impact on those practitioners who were struggling to find a way to practice *FD*. It is similar to how ICU gave an idea of what faculty development meant to the members of LGES

in the 1980s. Mina Matsumoto, the main writer of this series in the Daily Yomiuri, later became strongly involved with the discussion about *FD* and other initiatives to improve university education. She appeared as a speaker at a *FD* seminar (including the LGES Thematic Research Meeting in 2008 at Okayama University and the Second *FD* Forum in 2011 at Teikyo University). Daily Yomiuri's series are published in a book titled '*Kyōiku runessansu Daigaku no jitsuryoku* (Education Renaissance Ability of the University)' in 2009. Following the example of charismatic developers' activities, many *FD* practitioners began to carry out more substantial *FD* activities that were designed to meet demands from academic members (Tanaka 2003, 98).

Each *FD* practitioner used their expertise to do what they could do. For example, some practitioners put the emphasis on the use of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) as a way to promote *FD*. Some practitioners put the emphasis on introducing teaching techniques and some consider creating a learning community of academics as being suited for Japanese academic culture, allowing people to share concerns and experiences in education and learn from each other. The emphasis of *FD* was placed strongly on individual faculty's teaching

skills. Methods for teaching a lecture, students' instruction, curriculum design, and evaluation were the four major topics of *FD* (Arimoto 2008, 37). To support various *FD* activities, an increasing number of 'how-to' guides were published, including those by Akahori (1997), Ito and Otsuka (1999), Sugie et al. (2004) and Mio and Yoshida (2002). What's interesting is that many of these authors are from the field of educational technology. Historically the field of educational technology mainly focused on elementary and primary education. Thus this was another impact of introduction of *FD*. Meanwhile, research-based studies that examine the concept of faculty development remain scarce, such as those by Arimoto (2005), Seki (1988), Kinukawa (2006), Tanaka (2011) and Terasaki (2006). This tendency is led by the fact that the field of HE studies is new and there is a lack of research-based studies that would enhance scholarly discussions about *FD*. For example, if one intends to discuss the importance of integrating an academic career path with the design of faculty development practices, there are only a few studies available on the Japanese academic career path, such as those by Shimbori (1981) and Yamanoi (2007). Unlike the maturing conversation between research-based literature and 'how-to' literature in English, literature on HE in Japanese remains in its

infancy[12].

As institutional *FD* became widely practiced, *FD* practitioners began to form various networks. One of the oldest networks is the Consortium of Universities in Kyoto, which was established in 1994 to promote credit transfer between universities in the Kyoto area. They began offering *FD* seminars in 1995. Today, they offer not only seminars but also training sessions for faculty members and administrators (the Consortium of Universities in Kyoto, website accessed 30 April 2012). The *FD* network '*Juhyō*' led by Takahiro Oda at Yamagata University is another example. It was established in 2004 to promote *FD* in the Yamagata area in northern Japan. As these regional *FD* consortiums and networks were established, we see the Age of the Network. *FD* practitioners share ideas and practices in relation to *FD*, discuss the issues they face, and deepen understanding of *FD*. Reflecting on the discussion in Chapter One, it is suggested that these networks offer a place for a *FD* practitioner to meet other *FD* practitioners from various universities, which contributes to a sense of community. However, their voice has not yet been

[12] Recently Hata and others carried out a large survey on acquisition process of abilities as a faculty member and Otsuka and others carried out another survey on senior faculty members in management positions but the results have not been published yet.

expressed in the literature.

Conclusion

This chapter has looked at the development of faculty development and the people involved with practices of faculty development by paying attention to LGES, JAHER, and HE policies. Historically, 'faculty development' was discussed among faculty members in *ippan kyōiku*, in an effort to create a space to discuss the linkage between *ippan kyōiku* and *senmon kyōiku*, the purpose of undergraduate education, the role of faculty members in undergraduate education, and ways to sustain the culture of continuous professional development of faculty members. It was a bottom-up approach to promote university reform. However, it failed to promote the conversation between faculty members in *ippan kyōiku* and *senmon kyōiku*.

Then, the government led major structural changes of higher education, which ensured more autonomy to universities along with the idea of self and external evaluation. The introduction of institutional *FD* in the Standards suddenly put *FD* at the centre of attention. The National Institute for Educational Policy Research (NIER) (2006) carried out a nation-wide survey on

institutional structures to carry out university education reform in 2005. The return rate was 67.4% in total (NIER 2006). Nearly 70% of universities set up a university-wide committee to deal with the new concepts introduced by the government. About 25% of them set up a centre for university education and 23% of universities said that educational matters were dealt with at a department or faculty level (NIER 2006). Roughly half of the staff are from *ippan kyōiku* and another half have a research background in the field of HE (Tanaka 2009). As such, by placing responsibilities on a centre of university education, that is a peripheral organization within the university, discussions and practices related with *FD* remained external to disciplinary-based faculties.

Today, the statistics show the institutional *FD* is widely practiced. According to MEXT, 40% of HE institutions set up centres, committees, and other sections to be in charge of *FD* and 90% of universities organized some kind of *FD* activities (Central Council 2008). The four main roles of these centres included enhancement and promotion of *ippan kyōiku*, planning and practicing *FD*, planning and carrying out assessment of education, and development and reform of

curricula (Tanaka 2009). According to RIHE's national survey[13] that investigated status quo of institutional *FD* in 2006, 89% of universities said their *FD* focused on methods of lecturing (Arimoto 2008). This indicates the focus of *FD* is mostly on individual faculty member's teaching methods. In fact those centres and units for *FD* often organize workshop on teaching technique (e.g. 'How to write syllabus' and 'How to design problem based learning'). Whether those *FD* practices do make a contribution to the improvement of university education is a question.

It took almost 50 years in the USA and over 20 years in the UK for faculty development to mature and yet faculty development practitioners still express both confidence and anxieties with the field and profession or role. In the case of Japan, most of these changes have happened in the last 10 to 15 years. As is often the case with Japanese HE reform, the government supported researchers investigating practices in other countries (especially in the USA and the UK) so that universities in Japan learn from best practice, which is the characteristics of the age of transmission. What this means is that *FD* practitioners and HE researchers found the latest

[13] Return rate in total was 43.6% (break down: national university 71.3%, public university 60.3%, private university 45.5%).

scholarly discussions about faculty development and practices that had evolved over years in the USA and the UK and introduced these to Japanese HE without giving much consideration to the process involved in the evolution. There are some *FD* practitioners who became known for his/her successful practices of *FD* contributed to actualization of what institutional *FD* looks like. I named this phenomenon the Age of Charismatic Developer. Others formed various network to share their experiences and exchange information, which I called the Age of Network.

At the same time, although there are discussions about ways to redefine *FD*, there is no movement to change the term itself so far like how it changed to educational development, organizational development, instructional development, and academic development in English-speaking countries. What does this mean? In addition, unlike in English-speaking countries there is lack of discussion about identity and the field of *FD* in Japanese literature. Without paying attention to what exactly is taking place under the name of *FD* at an institutional level, it is hard to investigate about the concept of *FD* in Japan any further.

This is therefore a critical moment to investigate how the concept of *FD* is shaped through *FD* practitioners' lived experiences.

Chapter Three: Research Design

Introduction

This chapter explains my choice of ethnography as the research strategy and the research process I undertook to explore my research question, 'How do Japanese faculty development practitioners make sense of the concept of faculty development as a professional identity and a lived experience?' The first section briefly explains how my research question emerged from the literature review in chapters One and Two. I also show how analysis of the nature of my research question informed my choice of research strategy. In the second section, I introduce what ethnography is and what it enables a researcher to do. I then explain how ethnography helps me explore my research question. I go on to discuss the strength and weakness of ethnography as a research strategy and how I dealt with them. In the third section, I describe how I conceptualized the research process and introduce the actual research path I took.

3.1 Research Question

An ultimate purpose of my research is to understand faculty development in Japan. To make this broad inquiry into a research project, I carried out a review of literature, through which I

came to understand that the evolution of faculty development in English-speaking countries (especially the USA) took place through the interaction between researchers writing on various topics in HE, practices and experiences of faculty development practitioners, and socio-political changes that affect universities. Faculty development practitioners play a critical role in such interaction.

Chapter One showed that the evolution of faculty development and how the identity and the field of faculty development are established have become an issue for faculty development practitioners in English-speaking countries. The issue of identity is related to the role of the faculty development practitioner and the field of faculty development. In short, an individual plays a role so as to fulfil what he/she is expected to do, which contributes to the formation of an identity. However, because the role of faculty development practitioner is new and continues to change in response to internal and external pressure, although they are building confidence about their role, practitioners continue to wonder about their professional identity. Therefore, by paying attention to how faculty development practitioners act, it is possible to identify what they see their role as. There are interview-based studies about faculty development practitioners

(e.g. Land 2004) but practitioner's day-to-day experiences have not been looked at. In Chapter One, I also suggested to pay attention to the role of 'community' in order to recognize the formation of the field through the establishment of various associations and networks, as well as their own journals. It is one of the purposes of this research to illuminate what is being constructed.

Chapter Two focused on the evolution of faculty development in Japan. When I applied the framework I identified in Chapter One to faculty development in Japan, it illuminated the complexities of the Japanese situation. Unlike the five ages in the evolution of faculty development identified in the USA, I suggested that there was a lack of consistency in the evolution of Japanese faculty development. The government's policy to promote faculty development along with other initiatives has had a great impact on the wide dissemination of faculty development. The use of the English term 'faculty development' and the government's statement of what faculty development involved created confusion among those who became responsible for promoting faculty development activities. There is also a lack of studies that examine how faculty development practitioners interpret and practice faculty development,

especially when I started to design this research project in 2007. In recent years, a number of books and articles have been published related to faculty development in Japan but they are mostly theoretical discussions about the approach without critical analysis of actual practices (e.g. Tanaka 2003, Sato 2008, Taguchi 2011, and Matsushita ed. 2011). Researchers also discuss the concept of faculty development by making reference to discussions in English-speaking countries (e.g. Arimoto 2005, Kinukawa 1999, and Hata 2009). Those discussions are important but do not capture what is emerging as faculty development in Japan. A group of researchers conducted a survey about faculty development practitioners in 2009 but the result has not been published. Therefore, some kind of grounded approach is necessary to capture who faculty development practitioners are, what they do, and how they work.

In my Master's thesis, 'Faculty Development in Higher Education – An investigation of rationales and challenges in the Japanese context', I used interview methods to find out how faculty development practitioners understood faculty development, what kind of activities they were involved with, and their views on challenges and possibilities of faculty development in Japan (unpublished, 2007). I interviewed 11 academics acting as a faculty development

practitioner at seven universities considered to be advanced with regard to institutionalized faculty development in 2007. From the investigation, I identified that each faculty development practitioner struggled to create a boundary for their work because the university tended to associate anything related with university education with faculty development. They defined faculty development on their own and were trying to negotiate what came under their responsibilities. Those interviews helped me gain some understanding of the situation faculty development practitioners were in, their motivations, and the challenges they faced. However, I also recognized that it was just a part of the picture that I came to see. Without observing what faculty development practitioners experience on daily basis, I found it difficult to understand why and how they came to make decisions about various things. Hence, I developed my research question to focus more on the process of the implementation of faculty development and searched for a research strategy that would allow me to use various methods to get the whole picture.

Understanding what motivates and informs faculty development practitioners' decision-making is the key to understand the emerging or imagined concept of faculty development. Hence, it is

particularly important to focus on the day-to-day experiences of faculty development practitioners in order to understand what exactly is happening at the ground level and how such activities inform the concept of faculty development in Japan. My research question, 'How do faculty development practitioners make sense of the concept of faculty development as a professional identity and a lived experience?', guides the investigation. There are some key terms that emerged from the literature review that serve as signposts for me to progress the research activity and to answer my research question. These include role, identity, lived experiences, the community, and the field.

So, what is the best way to explore this research question? In social science research there are various research strategies a researcher can choose such as survey research, experimental research, feminist research, grounded theory, and so on. The choice of research strategy is informed by the framework and research question. What kind of data do I need to collect to answer my research question? My research question is exploratory in nature and aims at understanding the process of the conceptualization of faculty development. The research strategy should allow me to take a grounded approach, to observe the process, and to include

methods to generate data and knowledge through the research. In order to answer my main research question, I developed the following sub-questions:

- Who are faculty development practitioners?
- What do they do?
- What is their understanding of faculty development and their role?
- How do they make sense of what they are engaged with?

In this section, I explain my reasons for choosing ethnography, and how I design the research process.

3.2 Research Strategy

3.2.1 The Ethnographic Approach to Research

What is ethnography? Ethnography is exploratory in nature and ethnographic data can be used to generate knowledge and to generate theory or they can be applied to issues of policy and policy making instead of proving the research hypothesis (Brewer 2000, 143). Historically, ethnography was mainly associated with social anthropology in Britain as a research methodology to understand the cultures of particular people, especially in those preindustrial

places under the British Empire (Walford 2008, Brewer 2000). Typically, ethnographers would spend a long period of time in the field, become acquaintances of the people, and try to understand the culture as the members experienced it. They observed and kept records in the field and analysed and described the culture. Thick description and participant observation are the two characteristics of ethnography. These are the methods ethnographers invented to collect data and generate knowledge in the field. In the 1920s and 30s, researchers in sociology – especially the Chicago School of sociology – found ethnography, in particular participant observation, crucial to gain full understanding of the urban environment and thus promoted the use of ethnography (Walford 2008, Brewer 2000). The uniqueness of this approach was the distance between an ethnographer and participants of the study.

More recently, educational studies also began to introduce the use of ethnography because of many educationists' wish to look inside the 'black box' of schools and the culture inside (Walford 2008). For example, in the case of Japan, the emergence of new types of issues in education such as bullying, burn-out among teachers, and *hikikomori* (a student who stays at home all the time and refuses to communicate with others for a number of years), as well as the

introduction of various educational reform policies, made educational researchers realize it was no longer appropriate to study education by focusing on a child and the relation between a child and a teacher. They understood those new types of educational issues were strongly related to social, political, and cultural contexts (Shimizu 1999, 4). Those researchers began to pay attention to ethnography because the strength of ethnography was that ethnographers took account of the cultural context and balanced "everyday detail of individual lives" with "wider social structures" (Walford 2008, 7). Ethnography is also well suited to gathering data about the consequences and 'lived realities' of those involved in the implementation and reception of policy decisions at the local level. Walford (2001, 2) states that, "Ethnography can provide insights into the effects of policies as they are interpreted by those involved and as they become the subject of varying degrees of resistance, accommodation or acceptance". Researchers who study organizations see the effectiveness of ethnography in collecting data and understanding more about organizational behaviour and strategy (Neyland 2008. 6). Ethnography is considered to be a valuable method because "it problematizes the ways that individuals and groups constitute and interpret organizations and societies on a daily interactional basis" (Schwartzman 1993, 3) and organizational ethnographers "have the opportunity to scrutinize even the most

apparently banal features of organizational activity" (Neyland 2008, 7). It is utilized to explain counter-intuitive results of studies carried out using more straightforward management research (Neyland 2008, 7).

It is also suited to revisiting taken-for-granted concepts. Sakai (1998) uses ethnography to study the issue of pressurized teachers at junior high schools in Japan. There are many studies and reports that say teachers at junior high schools are over-loaded and too busy. According to Sakai, however, there is lack of research into why. Nor has how teachers themselves think about their current situation been sufficiently investigated, with Sakai asking, "Do they think they are unfortunate or do they feel satisfied with their work although they are busy?" In order to explore his research questions, he decided to use ethnography. He argues that observing and analysing the daily activities of teachers is critical to understanding what creates the status quo and how it is sustained. As a result of one year of fieldwork at a public junior high school, Sakai discovered the factors that keep teachers busy, such as constant communication with parents and students even outside of the school. Based on data analysis, he makes the argument that the use of the word *shidō* (guidance) changes every act of a teacher from non-educational to

educational behaviour, which creates the sense of busyness among teachers. He argues that without observing the daily activities of teachers, he would not have been able to make these findings and arguments. Sakai comments that by employing ethnography he was able to construct and check his hypothesis throughout the fieldwork. This study is a good example of studies describing insiders' (teachers) point of view. It also presents what ethnography can bring out from a field (a junior high school) which is not totally exotic to the researcher in the classic sense of anthropology. In a way, ethnography enables researchers to examine the taken-for-granted ideas and practices that influence the way people are.

Thus, all in all, the purpose of ethnography is to understand what people do and how they make sense of a particular phenomenon by providing a detailed description or 'thick description' of everyday life and practice (Geertz 1973, Hammersley and Atkinson 2007). In other words, ethnography is the study of people "in naturally occurring settings by methods of data collection" (Brew 2000, 6). It is written representation of a culture (Maanen 1988). It recognizes the complexities of people's experience and the importance of understanding cultural context in order to understand the behaviour, values and meanings of any given individual or group

(Walford 2008). Therefore, the ethnographic research strategy encourages a researcher to use various research methods both quantitative and qualitative, such as surveys, interviews, observation, and document analysis. It is suited to those times the research focus is on understanding a phenomenon or issue from the insider's viewpoint. As the focus of my study is faculty development in Japanese universities, it makes sense to choose a research strategy that pushes me to constantly review my analysis and what I might be taking for granted as a Japanese national. I will discuss the issues of being an insider and an outsider in a later section.

Moreover, universities exist in a super-complex society (Barnett 2000) and internal and external factors such as institutional contexts, personal background, the government's policy, and funding influence the role and practices of practitioners of faculty development (McDonald and Stockley 2008, Gosling 2009). Therefore, understanding faculty development not only within the university but also from a wider perspective is critical and understanding how practitioners identify and go about those factors can be done through ethnographic research. The exploratory and reflective nature of ethnography as a research strategy therefore allows me to engage with my research question.

Another aspect that helped me choose the research strategy is my attention to the term 'faculty development'. As I explained in Chapter Two, the English term 'faculty development' is used in Japan as '*fakarutī diberoppumento*' (or '*FD*'), which does not mean anything in the Japanese language. There is an ongoing discussion about how to define faculty development. Therefore, particular attention should be paid to understanding what people really mean or have in mind when faculty development practitioners in Japan use the term. What is crucial is the translation of the term with reference to the cultural context. Poole states (2010, 11) that, "Such translation becomes especially critical in cases where terms appear to have a linear gloss across two languages, but the cultural reality describes quite different meanings". Poole's *The Japanese Professor: An Ethnography of a University Faculty* (2010) gives a good example of how ethnography helps the researcher to unpack certain linguistic usages that are embedded in a particular cultural context. In this study, Poole (2010) carried out an ethnographic study of a low-level private university. He emphasizes the significance of readjusting the model of the Japanese professoriate with the one based on the cultural reality of the Japanese *daigaku* (university) and *kyōju* (professor) worldview, rather than assuming a global yardstick of the western research university and professor. Based on his ethnographic fieldwork, Poole (2010)

redefines terms such as *kyōiku* (education), *kenkyū* (research), *kyōju* (professor), *daigaku* (university), *soshiki* (organization), and *kaikaku* (reform). He successfully describes the similarities and differences with the meaning of those terms and equivalent English terms by analysing the data he collected from his ethnographic investigation. As such, ethnography is a revealing research strategy when looking at the contextual meanings a language carries. However, it also has its drawbacks. In the next section, I examine the limitations of ethnography as a research strategy.

3.2.2 Limitations of Ethnography

Although the ethnographic approach allows me to study the case in depth, it restricts the claims one can make about the universality of the results of the study. Ethnography is often criticized for not being generalizable, with critics asserting that a theory developed as a result of ethnographic investigation cannot be tested because of the way the data is collected and analysed. However, for Geertz, ethnography aims to construct meaning through close engagement with the culture, which would contribute, cumulatively, to our general understanding of human cultures (1973). It can be said that research validity is perhaps less of a

priority for ethnographers than insights and reflections. Mills (email conversation, 9 September 2009) argues:

> Ethnographic researchers draw on a range of different approaches, but do not necessarily consider them as separate and pre-defined approaches and methods to be 'triangulated' or combined. Instead one's methodological tool-kit tends to be used in a more flexible and exploratory way, responding to the issues and situations at hand.

In terms of this study, the question that needs to be asked is "How do the experiences of one faculty development project contribute to the overall discussions about faculty development in Japan?" I argue that my discussion is not only based on the outcome of the ethnography but also the literature review. As mentioned in my literature review, years of rather informal sets of practices and activities have shaped the field of faculty development and further steps are taken to discuss the formation of the scholarship of faculty development in English-speaking countries (McDonald and Stockley 2008). My assumption is that it is the case with Japanese faculty development as well. Faculty development is still a recent addition to many Japanese universities and practitioners are exchanging information through publications, presentations, seminars, and workshops. By studying the experiences of one project, it is possible to understand how ideas for practices and the understanding of faculty development are exchanged and discussed, as well as how the conceptualization of faculty development takes place. In

addition, as Walford (2008, 17) discusses, if I give detailed descriptions of the field studied, readers can make "informed decisions about the applicability of the findings to their own or another situation." Therefore, although the findings of the study are not generalizable they nevertheless serve to generate knowledge.

The trustworthiness of findings is also the subject of much debate (Robson 2002, 168). Maxwell (1992 cited in Robson 2002) presents various threats to validity in flexible design. The main threat to providing a valid description lies in the inaccuracy or incompleteness of the data. I decided not to use any digital devices such as an IC recorder or digital video camera and my field notes depend on my memos and memories; therefore, I was concerned about the possibility of writing inaccurate field notes. However, as my fieldwork went on, I began to feel convinced that the length of my fieldwork would help me deal with this concern. I realized similar types of episodes kept occurring over a year, which made me think that although the factual detail of each event was important, I could also rely on the accumulation of information to ensure the trustworthiness of my field notes and my analysis.

3.3 Ethnographic Research Design

It is a characteristic of ethnography that a researcher makes decisions about the research process as the research unfolds. Flexibility in the research process makes it possible for a researcher to be reflexive and makes the research process inclusive. Ethnographers are expected to:

> …manage a set of relationships, a research project, observations, being a participant member, trying to figure out what they want to find out as an ethnographer, while also not limiting the exploratory scope of ethnography, sticking to a budget, a deadline and producing something at the end of the ethnography (Neyland 2008, 26).

However, because of this feature, researchers find it difficult to capture what ethnographic research looks like and how to prepare for it (Lee et al. 2008, Neyland 2008). In many cases, researchers are encouraged to go into the field and start ethnographic research, which then eventually reveals what ethnography is (Lee et al. 2008). Neyland (2008) argues that thinking carefully about the research question and the fieldwork and developing an ethnographic research design or strategy helps researchers to conduct ethnography successfully. Having the design does not mean flexibility and impromptu decision-making are ruled out (Brewer 2000, 58).

I decided to use a main research question along with research sub-questions or data collection

questions to design the research strategy. The research question guides the research project while data collection questions are asked to provide data relevant to a research question (Punch 2005). By considering how to answer sub-questions and data collection questions, I began to have some kind of research framework or guideline to think about actual research activities in the field. My main research question is "How do faculty development practitioners make sense of the concept of faculty development as a professional identity and a lived experience?" I developed several sub-questions and data collection questions to think about the research design before going into the field. The questions include: "Who are faculty development practitioners?" "How did they get involved with faculty development?" "How has the understanding of the concept of faculty development changed over time?" "What are the institutional factors that affect how practitioners practice the concept?" Below, I explain how I attempted to answer those questions, which together informed the research process.

- "Who are faculty development practitioners?" "What is their role?" "How did they get involved with faculty development?"

According to the literature review, there is no statistical information about the background of

faculty development practitioners in Japan. In order to get a general understanding of who faculty development practitioners are, I drew on the websites of faculty development units in different universities. At the same time, there are many occasions for faculty development practitioners to present their work which tend to show who they are and how they go about carrying out practices in a given situation. Therefore, I attended such seminars and conferences to gather information such as handouts and presentation materials. I also used interviews as a method to find out about faculty development practitioners. In the interview, I could ask about the given job description, contractual obligations, academic and professional background, and their entry to the field. However, job descriptions on employment advertisements often do not tell one much about the actual job in the case of Japan. Therefore, observation is also a useful method to apply.

- "How has the understanding of the concept of faculty development changed over time?"

This question asks about the transformation of the concept of faculty development. This question can be followed at different levels, including the policy level, academic societies' level, and practitioners' level. The first two seem to influence the overall understanding of faculty

development and are discussed as external factors by Trowler and Bamber (2005) and McDonald and Stockley (2008). The roles of academic societies are discussed in my MSc dissertation. As a result, I collected documents including policy papers, academic papers, and reports to analyse their arguments and also attended seminars and talks while conducting my analysis of my fieldwork in Japan. Interviews were conducted as necessary. Finding out how the understanding of the concept of faculty development changed over time for a faculty development practitioner can best be done by observations and interviews.

- "What are the institutional factors that affect how practitioners practice the concept?"

Understanding the institutional context makes it easier to answer this question. The necessary data include the type and historical background of the university, location, students' and faculty numbers, number of departments, treatment of teaching activities, and profile of students. In addition, it is important to find out how the university describes the purpose of faculty development and what kind of structure it has to practice faculty development. These matters can be found out by collecting documents from the university website, reports, and policy papers. Identifying institutional factors that affect faculty development practitioners on a daily

basis can be observed and interviews conducted as necessary. These questions helped me think about actual data collecting methods while in the field.

3.3.1 The Researcher as a Research Instrument

In ethnographic studies, the researcher is the key research instrument. Walford encourages the ethnographer to "constantly review the evolution of his or her ideas" and try to "articulate the assumptions and values implicit in the research, and what it means to acknowledge the researcher as part of, rather than outside, the research act" (2008, 10–11). Therefore, the personal qualities of the investigator are critical for the study to be successful. Robson states (2002, 167) that an open and enquiring mind, being a 'good listener', general sensitivity, and responsiveness to contradictory evidence are needed for the investigator to be a good research instrument. I am confident that my social skills are relatively good and my experience of living in seven different countries, from two months up to two years, have taught me to be sensitive to differences in communication styles and culture. My previous training was in Southeast Asian Studies, which also helped me to have an open mind about understanding the culture from an insider's view. Being Japanese and going 'into the field' in a Japanese university raised the

question of whether I was an ‘insider’ or an ‘outsider’. It was possible that I took some of the cultural background for granted and so was less critical in asking questions. However, I believe the process of translating my field notes into English and describing various episodes in English helped me identify what I took for granted. This is because translating the description of a particular event from one language to the other requires an explanation of the cultural context. Regular conversations with my supervisors and others about the research progress also helped me to be reflective and responsive to the research.

In the field, I decided to take a participant-as-observer role. I became a member of the university as a faculty development practitioner while I carried out the ethnographic fieldwork. It could be that this was a limitation of my research method, i.e. that I became very strongly involved with my ‘field’. My position in the field was a contract researcher for the project related with faculty development. The purpose of the project was to design and practice *FD* programs to promote the use of ICT (information and communication technology) in educational activities and administrative work. Therefore, the main work for me was to develop resources (mostly online material) for *FD* and to run workshops. The contract was for one year

and I worked four times a week. I was expected to work in a team for the project[14]. I was the only member who specialize in the field of HE studies therefore I was expected to contribute to the project as an expert in HE. At first the leader of the project told me what to do, however, as I spent more time in the office, more and more responsibilities were given to me. Eventually the leader of the project appointed me as the internal leader of the project. This happened at the end of October 2008, which was seven months after I started my ethnographic fieldwork. I became responsible for managing the overall schedule of the project and annual report, arranging the annual symposium, and designing and conducting faculty development practices. It became difficult to observe what kind of changes I was bringing to the centre and how much influence my personal thoughts about faculty development might have on my colleagues.

On the other hand, the benefit of taking a participant-as-observer role was that I was able to experience the same situation as people that I observed. As a result, I was able to develop more in-depth questions to understand what goes in the mind and emotion of the people in the field. This was particularly important in this research. As I introduced as voices of faculty

[14] The number and members of the project team changed, which I discuss in Chapter Four.

development practitioners in Chapter One, their everyday experiences both create confidence and concerns about their work, professional identity, and the field in English speaking Western countries. Another benefit is to use researcher's own experience as a tool for the people in the field to reflect on and identify their interpretation of the same experience. Sometimes I expressed how I felt and what kind of impact a particular event had on me personally with a hope to trigger my colleagues to analyze his/her own experience of the same event.

Similar dilemmas are seen in ethnographic studies by others. For example, Kuzukami, who conducted an ethnographic study at a public primary school in Japan, reflects on his position in the field as follows. He entered the field as an ethnographer but soon the president of the school began to ask him to provide information about education at other schools and support other teachers with technical matters:

> I became more involved with the work itself and some teachers began to treat me as their colleague. This was a good way to establish very close relations with teachers. However, this meant I began to take many things for granted and became less objective and critical. At the same time, though, teachers began to tell me more stories that they wish the outside world to know. […] I think what the ethnographer does is to accept sometimes contradicting and sometimes overlapping layers of voices, thoughts and feelings and tell the story. (Kuzukami 1998, 220–221)

Poole (2010) carried out ethnographic fieldwork at the university where he was a full-time

faculty member. He addresses his challenges as follows:

> I was struck by the uncommon challenge of exoticizing the familiar – my everyday experiences at my field site – of having to think of my Japanese university field site, EUC, as the analogue of an aboriginal community in the outback of Australia. The difficulty of viewing a familiar social environment in an 'unfamiliar' way is not to be underestimated (Poole 2010, 9).

As such, it is inevitable and unavoidable that an ethnographer faces dilemmas regarding their position and subjectivity. I need to keep in mind how my strong involvement might affect the project and my data collection. At the same time, I should not overestimate the impact of my involvement. After all, I was just a part-time staff member who had no decision-making power in the university. What is good about ethnography is that I can address this sort of concern. Whatever research methods I used, there will always be some degree of subjectivity reflected in the choice of methods, analysis and interpretation of data, and writing up of the findings. What I believe is important is to address potential bias or the existence of my voice rather than pretending the research is objective. I therefore continued to do my best to be critical of the research process.

Ethnographers have identities that might affect research, such as gender, age, social class, race, and ethnicity (Brewer 2000, 99). Being female usually made me less threatening to research

participants. Generally speaking, it was easy for me to get others to talk to me. I also had two identities through which to present myself: a postgraduate student and a faculty development practitioner. Sometimes it was easier to present myself as a postgraduate student to have access to people because of the strong negative feelings some academics had against faculty development. Also, by presenting myself as a faculty development practitioner, some immediately made the assumption that I was promoting the concept and practice of faculty development, which did not necessarily help in asking questions. On my name card, I presented myself as a faculty development practitioner on one side and a postgraduate student on the other side. I was not misleading people about my identity and I do not believe I was conducting a covert study. However, I am aware of the different impressions and influences I may have caused by presenting myself as a faculty development practitioner at some instances and a postgraduate student at others. In fact, people's reaction to my different identities itself became part of my findings. In the next section, I give an overview of my ethnographic fieldwork.

3.4 Fieldwork

3.4.1 Selecting the Site

Choosing the field or site is not easy for ethnographers as there are no clear guidelines. Walford (2010) emphasizes the importance of making distinction between 'selecting a site' and 'access' because often those two are discussed at the same time and treated as a difficult part of the research process. According to Walford (2008), selecting sites should be based on the theoretical and conceptual framework or practical issues that the researcher seeks to investigate, while access may require some compromise with the ideal. In other words, selecting a site should not be just based on convenience but needs careful consideration and justification.

In my case, the purpose of the fieldwork was to observe what faculty development practitioners do on a daily basis. My Master's dissertation identified different types of faculty development units and institutional settings affect the practices of faculty development practitioners. Therefore, in choosing the location for my fieldwork, at first I wondered if I should choose a 'typical faculty development unit' at a 'typical university' so that what I might find would sustain a certain level of generalizability. I also considered choosing one of the leading

universities in conducting faculty development and, from my Master's dissertation, I did have a clear idea which universities are considered leading universities. However, I soon realized that there are no studies that show what a typical faculty development unit might be and, in addition, observing the influence of the institutional setting on the conceptualization and practices of faculty development would be part of the aims of my research. I also decided not to choose one of the leading universities as their activities are considered to provide models for conducting faculty development, which means they have already finished the process of interpretation and localization of faculty development. The focus of my research was to examine the process of understanding, interpreting, and practicing faculty development. Therefore, I decided to choose a university that employed practitioners of faculty development.

3.4.2 Access

I began to look at faculty development units on various universities' websites and at the same time started to look at the recruitment database Japan Research Career Information Network (JREC-IN) in order to see the recruitment trends in the field of faculty development. JREC-IN provides information about research-related job announcements and information about

researchers who are looking for research-related jobs. The database is set up and maintained by the Japan Science and Technology Agency and Table 3-1 shows how the information is provided.

In December 2007, a research centre at a private university placed a recruitment notice on JREC-IN. The job description said that the successful candidate would work in a project related to 'faculty development' and the use of ICT in teaching. This project received a three-year funding grant in 2007 from MEXT, which is a typical grant for 'faculty development' related projects. The university is upper middle in terms of the Japanese university rankings and is, generally speaking, popular among high school students. There are about 20,000 undergraduate students and over 1,000 full-time and part-time faculty members. To make it easy to talk about this university, I will call it Sakura University. The research centre has a project to promote the use of ICT in university education: I will call this project the ICT-FD Project.

The position's tasks included: (1) To promote and to conduct faculty development for teaching with ICT; (2) To undertake research related to the project; and (3) To organize seminars and

forums. The centre required the candidate to have either a PhD degree or its equivalent, to have experience in faculty development or have studied faculty development, and to be familiar with ICT. The documents required to apply for the position included a CV, three research papers, the abstract of three papers, a research proposal related to the project, and a personal statement.

The deadline for the application was 15 January 2008. On 16 January, I received an email from the centre to arrange an interview. On 29 January, the Skype interview took place at 09:30 in the morning in Oxford, 18:30 in Japan. Two male staff interviewed me. One was a full-time academic at the centre and the other was a visiting associate professor. The interview took about 30 minutes. I was asked to introduce myself and state my reasons for applying for this position. I said:

> The focus of my research is about faculty development in Japan so I am familiar with the discussions and practices of faculty development not only in Japan but also in the UK and the USA. Therefore, I believe I would be able to make a contribution to your faculty development projects. I am also interested in your approach to faculty development by using e-learning materials. One of the criticisms of faculty development practices in Japan is that it is time consuming. Your project may potentially provide a new model for faculty development.

Then one of them asked me about the research proposal I had submitted (Appendix 2). He also asked me about my Master's dissertation. The other one asked me if the university would allow

me to work while I read for a DPhil and also how many times a week I would be working. I got the impression that they had already decided my application had been successful and that they just wanted to check my situation. I also explained that I intended to carry out an ethnographic study of the faculty development practitioners at the centre. They said that would be fine. When they asked me if I had any other questions, I asked, "Can I ask how you set the objective for your faculty development project?" The visiting associate professor smiled and looked at the other staff member. The other one started to explain: "Well, that's actually a difficult question. We think the effective use of ICT in teaching would improve the quality of education. We know that *FD* is difficult and sensitive but we only look at the use of ICT in teaching so it might be useful." He said some other things but he did not exactly answer my question in the end. On 6 February, the centre told me that my application was successful and they would forward it to the professor's meeting where the final decision was to be made. On 17 March, the professor's meeting was held and my application was accepted.

Table 3: JREC-IN Website[15]

3.4.3 Recording Data

Note-taking is the main form of recording data in my fieldwork. There are two different types of field notes: the substantive field note which is for recording data and the analytic field note which is for keeping initial analytical ideas (Brew 2000, 107). I followed Spradley's (1980 cited

[15] This university is recruiting one academic for an associate professor's position on a tenure track. The candidate needs to specialize in university education research and faculty development. The content of the work includes: (1) Conducting research on university education, getting involved with education, promoting faculty development, and assisting in the improvement of university education at the university; and (2) Conducting public seminars.

in Robson 2002, 320) nine dimensions to collect and describe data collected from observation: space, actors, activities, objects, acts, events, time, goals, and feelings. An example of my substantive field note (translated into English) is attached in Appendix 3. I used Japanese to keep the field note unless I felt comfortable writing in English. This was not due to any lack of English fluency but to keep the native language and to better describe the vagueness inherent in certain Japanese expressions. The substantive field notes were usually written on the same night but occasionally I had no choice but to do it the following day or a day after, such as those days when I came home past midnight after spending over 14 hours at work. I was aware that recalling events in detail in the evening is difficult and therefore I used post-it notes to write down key words and key events while it was taking place. Sometimes it was inevitable that I just wrote down my general impressions rather than 'thick description'.

In ethnography, reflections and insights are critical. Ethnographers need to move between insider and outsider roles, in order "to maintain ethnographic strangeness and avoid taking what the tribe says for granted" (Neyland 2008, 16). This indicates that preliminary analysis starts as soon as the fieldwork starts and reflectivity plays an important role in challenging one's own

hypothesis. In order to do this, I created another notebook for reflection and development of the hypothesis: the analytical field notes. For this notebook, I allowed myself to write the way I wanted and in any language that worked. I sent some of my initial analysis to my supervisor during the fieldwork to check my analytical ability. An example is attached in Appendix 4.

3.4.4 Collecting Data

I collected reports, handouts and minutes of meetings during the fieldwork. Reports include the annual report of the centre, the annual report of the ICT-FD Project, the report of Sakura University, and reports from other universities' faculty development units. Handouts are collected from the workshops the ICT-FD Project team organized, any meetings attended, faculty development seminars, workshops and meetings held at other universities and associations, and annual conferences of different academic societies such as the LGES. A regular meeting was held every Monday at the Centre so I took minutes of the meetings. The ICT-FD Project team also held meetings, occasionally at the beginning and more regularly later in the year, and I took minutes of those meetings as well. Instead of having face-to-face meetings, the project team often used email to communicate and discuss issues related to the

project. These email communications are kept as data.

Apart from the data collection at the Centre, I conducted two types of interviews as part of my study. One was set up as an interview study and the other was an ethnographic interview with faculty development practitioners in other universities and HE researchers. The former study was carried out as part of a research project on academic inbreeding in Japanese universities led by Hugo Horta and Akiyoshi Yonezawa. The result has been published in the Asia Pacific Education Review as 'Academic inbreeding: exploring its characteristics and rationale in Japanese universities using a qualitative perspective' (Horta et al. 2011). The purpose of the study was to analyse why and how academic inbreeding as a recruitment practice continued to prevail in Japan, a country with a mature HE system, where high rates of academic inbreeding endured in most of the research-oriented universities in spite of several HE reforms (Horta et al. 2011).

Horta and Yonezawa picked several research-intensive universities and invited faculty members to take part in the study. They invited me to join the research and to carry out interviews in the

area I was located. Out of 36 interviews, I conducted nine interviews. In the letter of invitation, we explained that the interview would be for two separate studies. One was Horta's research on academic career paths and the other was my research on university education and faculty development. We prepared semi-structured interviews and shared the interview scripts for analysis but I decided to use only the nine interviews I carried out for this study because I did not feel confident dealing with qualitative data produced by someone else. In the interview I focused on the interviewee's experience with teaching. I asked about their first experience of teaching at the university, issues they faced in relation to teaching, and their methods in regard to such issues. I also asked if they knew about faculty development, their understanding and experiences with faculty development, and their opinion on the government's decision to mandate institutionalized faculty development. The purpose of the interview was to deepen my understanding of faculty members' relationship with education and faculty development in terms of people who are members of a traditionally established discipline-based faculty. I am aware that nine is a very small number but it helped me get a glimpse of the life of faculty members in a discipline-based faculty.

I carried out 18 interviews to supplement the ethnographic fieldwork. Interviewees included researchers of HE and faculty development practitioners at other institutions. As faculty development practitioners, the ICT-FD team members were involved with networking with other practitioners of faculty development. I soon realized that, for practitioners, interaction with other practitioners plays an important role in confirming their understanding, interpreting, and practicing of the concept of faculty development. Therefore, I decided to interview practitioners at other institutions. I also visited some of the interviewees I interviewed for my Master's thesis to ask about changes over time. In addition, I conducted interviews with researchers of HE. I used analytical field notes to develop questions and checked how they might react to my analysis. All interviews were semi-structured, in-depth interviews or, at times, almost like 'conversation with purpose' (Burgess 1984, 102). The interviews lasted between one hour and one and a half hours and they were recorded in all except two cases, who refused permission. The list of interviewees is in Appendix 5.

3.4.5 Research Ethics

All social research involves ethical issues because the research involves collecting data

from people and about people (Punch 1998, 281). Ethical issues are even more critical for ethnographers as they "pry into people's innermost secrets, witness their failures and participate in their lives" (Brewer 2000, 89). To conduct ethically responsible research, the researcher should be familiar with the ethics of research and conduct the research within an ethically responsible framework. In designing my research, I used the 'Revised Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research' by the British Educational Research Association (BERA) as the guidelines and checklist of points to consider. I also referred to other literature discussing ethical issues in social science research, including Brewer (2000), Burgess (1989), and Punch (1998), so as to better understand the issues and how to deal with them.

One of the aspects of ethnography that made it difficult to carry out my ethically sensitive fieldwork was its exploratory nature. I picked the field and negotiated access but as the research unfolded some people disappeared from the field and new people came into the picture. It was hard to draw a line in terms of who was in the study and who was not. It was even more difficult when I started to visit various seminars and workshops for faculty development practitioners. I

informed the project members that I was conducting ethnographic research. I explained the purpose of my research project and how I was going to deal with private information. At the public seminars and talks that were held by other institutions and associations, if there was an opportunity, I informed the participants about my research and my participatory observer role. But often I did not have such an opportunity. In that case, I used the data collected to build my analytical framework but did not use them directly in the description of findings. When I conducted interviews, I informed the interviewee of his/her right to withdraw from the interview whenever he/she wanted. I also explained that any private information would be anonymized. With my interviews, I used the consent letter that is attached in Appendix 1.

Although I did everything possible to maintain the anonymity of the people I worked with and other faculty development practitioners and interviewees, it is still very possible for anyone to investigate and find out which institutions I have been involved with. Therefore, dealing with the data ethically needed more attention than collecting data. Ethnographic data contains private information as they are collected through daily observations, interactions on the part of the researcher and participants, and in-depth interviews. Mistreating and misinterpreting the data to

create the story that I want to tell would be highly unethical. Also, because it is collected from the daily lives of faculty development practitioners, I am aware of the power of data that possibly can be used against the interests of the participants of the study by others.

The amount and complexity of ethnographic data make analysis, interpretation, and presentation of data challenging. In ethnography, the analysis of data begins whilst a researcher is in the field. My analytic field notes played that role. Key terms and themes emerge from this process. However, the major analysis and interpretation of data took place after finishing the data collection. Because of the nature of ethnographic fieldwork, I felt a strong emotional attachment to the people and the field; therefore, it was helpful for me to have a physical distance from the field to deal with the data. Going into the field meant trying to gain an insider's view but coming out of the field – and returning to Oxford – felt as if I was again going into an unknown place. It was partly a natural reaction because I am not from Britain and English is not my mother tongue, making me an outsider. This sense of being an outsider was good for me. A regular ethnographer would go back to the place of origin to start thinking about how to tell the story from the field. He/she would know what the readers would understand and what they

would find exotic and needs more explanation. In my case, on top of thinking about how to tell the story, I needed to consider what readers in English-speaking countries would automatically understand. Having both British and Japanese supervisors helped this process of cultural translation.

Conclusion

My exploratory research question emerged from the literature review presented in Chapters One and Two. The nature of my research question helped me to decide which research strategy to choose. Careful consideration of the research process using the main, sub, and data collecting questions convinced me to use a research strategy that allows a researcher to include various research methods and to have a grounded approach to the investigation. Thus, I made the decision to choose ethnography as my research strategy. As I explained in this chapter, ethnography is not a straightforward research strategy and, although it is possible to prepare for the fieldwork in advance, much of the refining process in regard to one's research strategy happens while one is carrying out the fieldwork. Therefore, it is important to have various tools such as field notes, analytical notes, email communication with one's supervisor, and talking to

the research group to keep the researcher open and reflexive.

Chapter Four: The Case of Sakura University

Introduction

This chapter introduces Sakura University, the Research Centre for Human Resource Training (the '*Sentā*'), and the ICT-FD Project (Project), where I worked and carried out participant observations. I use the Japanese term '*Sentā*' in order to emphasize university member's judgement in seeing *Sentā kyōin* (faculty members who belong to a centre and not the faculty) as inferior to *gakubu kyōin* (those who belong to faculties), which I discussed in Chapter Two. From the literature review, it is apparent that faculty development practitioners are cautious about how they come across in their institutions because the field of faculty development is in "an environment of tension, growing complexity and competing demands" (Lee and McWilliam, 2008). Practitioners in institutional faculty development programmes face particularly acute tensions between meeting institutional requirements and maintaining the personal values that individual developers have (Gosling 2009, 17). Therefore, it is critical to understand how Project members observed and understood the contexts in which they had to carry out their work.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the position of the Project members caught amidst

contradictory policy discourses and institutional attitudes towards *FD*. Firstly, I use my observation of the University and the *Sentā* combined with the official data to give a broad picture of the field, followed by an introduction of the Project and its members. I then explore the university's attitudes to *FD* through the eyes of Project members as well as document analysis. It is mandatory to practice institutionalized *FD* but the case of Sakura University shows how the university controls its impact by choosing approaches and rationalizing those choices. It also shows that the absence of *FD* does not seem to cause significant problems for Sakura University. Lastly, I describe one case that took place in the field in order to show the impact of the peripheral position of the *Sentā* and the Project at the University. In particular, I demonstrate the role of '*tetsuzuki*' in controlling the attitudes of key administrative staff to the *Sentā* and the use of '*gakunai jijyō*' in demanding a person to accept illogical phenomenon. I unpack those notions in the following sections. As I show, access to informal university networks and access to information not in the public domain were critical in negotiating the Project.

4.1 The Field in Context

4.1.1 The University

For Japanese universities, the first week of April is the start of an academic year. On my first

day at work, I took the train to Momo station, one of the busiest stations in the city. Sakura University is about a 15-minute walk from the station. I joined the wave of people getting off the train and walked with the flow to one of the exits. It was a fresh spring day. I looked around as I walked to the university. There were very few men wearing the standard issue grey or dark blue suits with white shirts. Instead, men were adorned in suits of various patterns and contemporary cuts. Women were wearing a range of fashions, casual to formal, classic to funky, and colourful to simple. The university is in an area known for its fashion industries and there were many independent model agencies, designers' offices, and galleries. The streets were filled with cafes, restaurants, bars, clothing and shoe shops, beauty salons, and small offices. As I walked up to the main street and turned left, I saw a big tall, reddish-brown building in the distance. It was one of the buildings of Sakura University. The main gate faced the busy street. However, once I walked into the tree-lined courtyard, the sound of the city suddenly faded away.

Sakura University is a private university in one of the major cities in Japan. Merging three Christian schools that were established in the 19th century, Sakura University was established in 1949 as a Christian university. It retains its Christian educational mission, but it is not a formal requirement for students, faculty members or administrators to be Christian

in order to become members of the university. The only requirement for students in relation to Christianity is to take one course on Christianity during the first two years and attend the morning service a required number of times. Beside the main gate there was a statue of a cleric. I walked through a row of ginkgo trees and found the university chapel at the centre of the campus. The *Sentā* was located on the top floor of the building where the chapel was. I walked into the building. The entrance hall had a vaulted ceiling to the second floor and one of the walls was made up entirely of windows. When I walked in, I felt that I was in a big space although the building itself was narrow. I was 20 minutes early for the appointment, so I decided to walk around the campus.

Outside the building, children in school uniforms were walking with their mothers. Sakura University is part of the Sakura School Corporation, comprising a kindergarten, the primary school, the junior and senior high school, the women's college, and the university. This form of school corporation is popular among private educational institutions in Japan. The history of the Sakura School Corporation goes back to 1870s. As the Japanese school system started only in 1872, the Sakura School Corporation is considered to be an educational institution with a long historical tradition. Fees for kindergarten and primary school are known to be expensive; about ¥650,000 (approximately £4,000) and ¥1,000,000 (approximately £7,000)

per year respectively, which is nearly ten times the fees for public school. Nevertheless, their high educational standards maintain their popularity among rich families. More than 95% of Sakura Primary School students go on to study at Sakura Junior High School and about 80% of Sakura High School students end up entering Sakura University. As the entrance examinations for a high school and a university are competitive, these 'escalator type of educational institutions' are popular because once they enter the primary school students do not have to worry about entrance examinations until university. Students still have to sit a university entrance exam but the university usually has a quota for the affiliated high school graduates, meaning they are not in competition with other high school students.

As a result, it seems there is a strong sense of belonging among students and alumni. One of the university staff who has studied at Sakura since junior high school said, "There are so many fans of Sakura School Corporation, including me. They are loyal to Sakura culture. I just do not want to leave this environment." It is also typical of Japanese private universities to hire graduates as administrators in order to build nurturing relationships between the administrators and students. They thus have a '*senpai* (senior)' and '*kōhai* (junior)' relationship, as well as that of an administrator and a student. As '*senpai*', an administrator would be able to associate with students better by sharing their experiences at Sakura

University. The students, as '*kōhai*', look at the administrators as one of their career role models and treat them with respect. Naturally, the sense of community among university members becomes enhanced. All the schools of the Sakura School Corporation are located at the city campus with vague boundaries. Therefore, on the campus I was able to see a mixture of schoolchildren and university students. On a sunny day, primary schoolchildren would be practicing painting outside beside university students who would be studying or relaxing. On any given morning, high school students can be seen rushing into the building as mothers walk across the campus with their children to the kindergarten.

The campus is compact. All six buildings for lecture rooms and offices stood next to each other along the main path, lined with a row of gingko trees. This campus is one of the two campuses to accommodate all 12 faculties consisting of 16,800 students. There is another campus in a distant area of the city. Undergraduate students spend their first two years at this satellite campus and the last two years at the city campus. It makes sense to have third and fourth year students in the city centre because it made the process of job hunting easier, a search that typically starts as early as November of their third year. To my surprise, the insides of the buildings were plain and ramshackle. As a result of extension work, buildings were connected with winding corridors. There was nothing special about the lecture rooms

and the toilets were clean but simple. My expectations had been shaped by the impressive public image of Sakura University. According to the University Ranking by Asahi Newspaper and the Internet survey about the image and name value of universities conducted by Nikkei BP Consulting, Sakura University was ranked high for providing educational programmes with strong international perspectives and as an '*oshare*' university. The word '*oshare*' means 'fashionable' 'cool' and 'trendy.' Originally it was used to describe someone who takes pride in his/her look. Today, the term is used for places, shops, and universities to indicate their popularity among fashionable people based on such things as their locations, architecture, interior, and quality of service. Although it is not clear what exactly it means and how significant it is to be an '*oshare*' university for students or the university, it has become one of the concepts to judge universities. In the case of Sakura University, in addition to the location of the city campus, the fact that 45% of students are female and many alumni appear on television as musicians, models, entertainers and presenters strengthens the '*oshare*' image of the university. Therefore, I was expecting the campus to be '*oshare*', and had imagined new buildings with sunlight coming through big windows, a cafeteria overlooking the city, and toilets with the latest design with a powder room attached, facilities which many private universities in the city provide to attract students. The fact the university has not spent much money improving the campus indicated

that Sakura University remains confident about its ability to attract students. In fact, on average only one out of ten applicants is able to pass Sakura University's entrance examination. Among the second cohort of universities in Japan, it is one of the most popular universities.

4.1.2 The *Sentā* and its Staff

First Impression

It was ten minutes before my appointment so I decided to head for the *Sentā*. The name of the *Sentā* was not on the information board placed next to the elevators. There were classrooms on the lower floors and offices on upper floors for academics in English studies, law, religious studies, and international politics. Previously, I had been instructed to go to the 13th floor, the top floor, so I got in the lift. My first impression of the top floor was of a long corridor with offices on both sides. There were windows on both ends and the view from the floor was magnificent as there were not many tall buildings around the campus. The floor was cream coloured and the doors were painted grey-blue, which gave a clean but slightly cold and uninviting impression. There was a communal sink and a machine for hot and cold water and green tea but there was no common area for academics to gather on the floor. Therefore, I rarely saw anyone talking in the corridor during the time I was at the *Sentā*.

The floor was very quiet. There were nameplates and door signs that indicated if the person was in or out of the office so I looked carefully on both sides of the corridor. Although the corridor only had seven offices before the *Sentā*, it was long enough to make me wonder if I was at the right place. Later on, I heard visitors making similar comments. Finally, I was standing in front of the *Sentā*. I knocked and opened the door.

The room was surprisingly small. There were six desks facing each other, three bookshelves on one side, and a small locker on the other side. The desks were separated with tall partitions so I could not see what everyone was doing. I thought this was only the *Sentā*'s administration office but it turned out to be the whole *Sentā*. The lady sitting at the corner desk turned around and said, "You must be Sato-san. Welcome. I am Ando. Please follow me to the meeting room. Kuroki-san just called me to say he will be late because of a delay with the train." Ando was the administrator of the *Sentā* and Kuroki was the person who had interviewed me. Ando took me to the room at the end of the corridor and asked me to wait inside. The room was different from other offices. It had a heavy wooden door. Inside, there was a huge wooden round table with about ten big black leather chairs. There was a big screen at the front. It was the kind of room where a CEO of a company might have an

executive meeting. There was already someone in the room. He was wearing a suit and typing on his computer. His name was Yoshida. Yoshida was new at the *Sentā* so he was also waiting for Kuroki to arrive. Yoshida was in his second year of a PhD programme in the field of educational technology. He was hired as a part-time researcher to work on several projects that the *Sentā* was running. He came to the *Sentā* only three times a week. Just after we introduced ourselves, Kuroki walked into the room saying:

> I am very sorry for being late. The train stopped because someone got sick or something so I was stuck there for about 20 minutes. I actually have to attend an orientation in 30 minutes so I will briefly explain about the *Sentā* and will give you more details in the afternoon.

Kuroki was in his mid-thirties and had been recently appointed as an assistant professor. In Japan, *kyōju* (professor) stand at the top of the hierarchy and are followed by *junkyōju* (associate professor), *kōshi* (lecturer), and *jokyō* (assistant professor). There are other posts such as *jyoshu* (assistant professor/researcher usually in the science field) and *kenkyūin* (researcher). It is up to the university to name those posts below *jokyō* (assistant professor) because they are usually hired for a research project and do not have any responsibilities with university affairs or teaching. This was why he had to attend an orientation for new faculty members even though he had been working for the university for over four years as a contract researcher by then. Later, I realized this showed how contract researchers were not considered to be members of faculty. Kuroki gave us a sheet with information regarding

administrative matters at the *Sentā*. By the time he finished going through it, it was time for him to go. He brought us new computers and asked us to familiarize ourselves with them until lunch.

Ando came to the meeting room at 12:00 to ask us to join her for lunch. She came with two other male members of the *Sentā*. One was an assistant professor who worked for one of the professors of the *Sentā* and the other was Ishida, a contract researcher, who had interviewed me with Kuroki. Ishida and Yoshida knew each other because of Yoshida's former supervisor. During lunch, I found out that they usually go out for lunch together at noon. Later, I learnt that lunch was the place for *nemawashi*, negotiations behind the scenes through informal conversations and gossip. At this point, I began to wonder where all those professors and associate professors listed as members of the *Sentā* might be.

The *Sentā* was established in 2007 as one of the research centres in the Institute for the Social Partnership (ISP) to promote linkages between the university and society through research activities. The head of ISP was the vice-president. The focus of the *Sentā* was to develop various training methods that would enable people to be life-long learners. Members of the *Sentā* specialized in cognitive science, educational psychology, educational

technology, management, information technology, communication, educational sociology, and English pedagogy. There were 16 full-time members but 14 of them also belonged to faculties, which meant their main affiliations were with the faculties (Table 4). As a result, their offices were located within their own faculty buildings. This was also the situation of the head of the *Sentā*, which was why the office for the *Sentā* was small and I had not met the other members.

Position in the *Sentā*	**University Position**	**Affiliation**	**Number**
Head	Professor	Faculty of Social Informatics	1
Vice-head	Professor	Faculty of Education and Psychology	1
Vice-head	Professor	Faculty of Management	1
Member (with a position at the faculty)	Professor	Faculty of Literature	1
	Professor	Faculty of Education and Psychology	1
	Associate Professor	Faculty of Education and Psychology	1
	Professor	Faculty of Management	2
	Associate Professor	Faculty of Management	1
	Professor	Faculty of Social Informatics	2
	Assistant Professor	Faculty of Social Informatics	1
	Associate Professor	Faculty of English Literature	1
Full-time Member	Assistant Professor	*Sentā*	1
	Research Assistant	*Sentā*	1

Table 4: A list of members as of April 2009

The *Sentā* ran seven independent projects as well as two government-funded projects. Each project had a project team comprised of members of the *Sentā* and contract researchers.

Sometimes, academics at other universities and people from industries and other types of organizations were registered as affiliated project members, which fulfilled one of the *Sentā*'s missions to strengthen the linkage between academia and industries. In total, there were 47 contract and affiliated researchers listed on its website in 2008. Each project ran separately with a separate group of people. As a result, there was no opportunity for contract researchers to interact with those in different projects. My conversations with researchers confirmed this sense of fragmentation:

> I bet the head of the *Sentā* does not know that we (contract researchers) exist, and if I meet him in the university accidentally, he would neither recognize me nor remember my name.
>
> Contract researcher, personal conversation, May 2008

> I was talking to a person from a different university during the seminar the other day and found out that he was actually one of the affiliated researchers at the *Sentā*. I felt so embarrassed.
>
> Contract researcher, personal conversation, July 2008

The *Sentā* in a way was a loosely connected community. The identities of most members were rooted in their faculties and contract researchers were only concerned with the project of their affiliation. My focus of observations, therefore, became those members who stayed in the *Sentā* and worked for the ICT-FD Project, funded by MEXT.

We shall go back to the story of my first day. After lunch, Yoshida and I had nothing to do

so we chatted and waited for Kuroki to come back from his orientation. Finally, at 16:00, Kuroki came back and asked everyone in the office to come to the meeting room for a briefing. Kuroki chaired the meeting. Ishida, Sano, one assistant professor, Ando, two female part-timers, Yoshida and I attended the meeting. Kuroki introduced us to the group and each one of them gave a short self-introduction. Kuroki started:

> We have already talked but my name is Kuroki. I specialize in information technology and I am in charge of various projects and day-to-day activities of the *Sentā*.

Ishida followed:

> My name is Ishida. I am a contract associate professor, well, not sure what it means… My field is communication studies. At this *Sentā*, I am working on supporting learning in e-learning courses. I am the oldest in the office.

Ishida was in his early 40s. He initially worked for the Project but after his new project successfully received MEXT funding he withdrew from it. He worked at the *Sentā* three times a week. One of his favorite phrases was, "I love research. I do not mind being busy as long as the job benefits my research." Therefore, he often did overtime in the office.

Both Kuroki and Ishida used to work for the e-learning research centre at Sakura University before moving to the *Sentā* while they were in the PhD programme. Kuroki was doing his PhD at another university and Ishida at Sakura University. Noda, one of the vice-heads of the *Sentā*, led the e-learning research centre. The three of them had known each other for a few

years by then. Ishida completed his PhD but Kuroki did not. Both Kuroki and Ishida worked in the private sector before joining their postgraduate degree programmes; therefore, they often used managerial language to discuss the Project, using terms such as 'task force' and 'WBS (work breakdown structure)'. It also meant they had not followed a standard academic trajectory.

Sano was in his early 30s. He worked in a company before joining the *Sentā* in November 2007. He was also a PhD student in Educational Management studies. He joined the *Sentā* when it recruited contract researchers for the Project for the first time. There was another person who was hired at that time but she left before I joined the *Sentā* in April 2008. Sano used to claim that he would not carry out any research at this *Sentā* because his research topic was irrelevant to the *Sentā*'s activities. His responsibility in the Project was to manage the part-timers, to film lectures and seminars, and to edit these videos in order to create e-learning programmes with those part-timers. He worked in a computer room next to the office all the time. The size of the computer room was one quarter of the office with five computers to edit e-learning programmes, as well as servers. It was just big enough for four people to work at the same time. He stuck to his Monday to Friday 9:00 to 17:00 working hours and, unlike other staff, rarely worked overtime.

Ando was a contract administrator. She was the only full-time administrator at the *Sentā*; therefore, she had to manage all administrative matters. Her working hours were strictly from 9:30 to 17:00, Monday to Friday, because of her contract. The two other female staff members were part-timers. One helped Ando and the other helped Kuroki and Ishida with another project. Both worked only twice or three times a week. As Ando was not a full-time member of the university, she often complained:

> I can't take any responsibility if something goes wrong with the administrative matters because of my position. I do not know why the university does not appoint a university administrator to this *Sentā*.

As a result, Ando often asked a senior administrator in a different office, Yamamoto, for advice. Yamamoto was the one who trained her when Ando started to work for Sakura University in 2007. She had been working in different sections of the administration for over 10 years, so she knew the people and the regulations very well. Yamamoto would usually be in the office between 7:30 and 22:00, Monday to Saturday. She was always working overtime and even on Sunday she would reply to e-mails from her mobile phone. She used to say, "In an organization, the more you work, the more work you get. I have been in this university long enough to know who might get my work if I don't do it. So I work."

Yamamoto became an important person for all members of the Project later on. The reason for having only a contract administrator at the *Sentā* was because of organizational issues

within the university. When the *Sentā* was established, the university executives did not make a decision about which administration office should be in charge of the administrative matters of the *Sentā*. In the university, there were academic divisions, such as faculties, professional schools and research centres, and administrative divisions, such as the student affair's office and financial office. Each academic division was linked with an administration office that functioned as a channel between the central administration and the academic division. The administration office was responsible for all the administrative matters and made sure everything followed the university's administrative regulations. However, because the *Sentā* did not have an administration office allocated by the university, the *Sentā* needed to hire a contract administrator to deal with day-to-day administrative matters:

> I don't know why it is taking such a long time to decide which administration office is to be responsible for the *Sentā*. I have heard the rumour that the university is thinking about major restructuring of the research centres in the near future so they want to wait until the plan becomes clear.
>
> Kuroki, June 2008

After the briefing, Kuroki took Yoshida and I to the office to show us around. There were two desks that did not have anything on top of them. Kuroki explained that those two desks would be for all contract researchers and part-timers. Monday was the only day all members of the office worked, which was a problem because there were not enough desks for everyone. Nevertheless, because of the different arrangements of people's contracts, two

desks were enough on the other days. Usually, the contract researchers were able to choose to work between two and five times a week, seven hours a day. They were paid a fixed salary depending on their working days per month. The salary for a day was ¥15,000 (approximately £100). Kuroki allocated a shelf to each of us. There were not many books on the bookshelves. Academic journals occupied three shelves. There were about 20 *FD* reports from different universities, dictionaries, various software manuals, and folders of documents related to the *Sentā*'s projects. Two shelves were completely empty. Yoshida realized the *Sentā* did not have the essential books for carrying out research in educational technology so later he ordered a couple of them through the *Sentā*. I realized there was no information about Sakura University so I asked for a descriptive pamphlet from every faculty to learn about the educational structures and standards. To my surprise, Kuroki said, "I am not sure if we can get all of the pamphlets. I will try but can't promise." Later, Ando told me:

> We were not able to get information from all the faculties but here are most of them. The central administration office said that they could not see why we have to have the details about every faculty. So they decided to exclude some of them.

This small episode indicated the position of the *Sentā* and the power relations within the university. Somehow, administrators were not willing to share information about the university even though it was already in the public domain, demonstrating their control over the *Sentā*'s activities. At the very least it conveyed the message that the *Sentā* was in no position to need to know the curriculum of the university.

The lack of a label for the *Sentā* on the building's information board, the junior rank of members working in the office, the remote location of the *Sentā*, and the minimal resources in the office all made me wonder about the position of the *Sentā* in the university.

Additional members and a new office room

The *Sentā* hired four more contract researchers for the Project later on. The *Sentā* put out a third recruitment advertisement in April to start from June, an irregular arrangement as the academic year in Japan starts in April. This meant the people who would apply for the position would be those without a position, without a full-time position, or looking to change to a new job. The recruitment process was confidential but there were several applications and Kuroki and Ishida interviewed some of them in late April. As a result, Makino and Hoshino joined the *Sentā* in June 2008. Both had part-time teaching positions at different universities. Makino was a part-time lecturer in IT literacy courses for undergraduate students at a private university. She also worked as an IT person for a research project at another private university. She had a PhD in Physics; therefore, she was carrying out research in her field with a research group based at Kiku University which she had graduated from. She was in her late 30s and before she joined the *Sentā* she had worked in several different universities and a corporation. From the first day, she actively tried to understand

the status quo of the Project and the *Sentā* by asking questions of its members.

Hoshino, on the other hand, was a very reserved person. His field of study was Psychology, and he worked for a private university as a part-time assistant in a computer services centre once a week and as a contract lecturer at a woman's college once a week. He did not talk much from the beginning. Kuroki assigned him to work with Sano so he spent most of the time in the computer room. However, Hoshino quit the *Sentā* at the end of June. Both Makino and Hoshino worked at the *Sentā* four times a week.

Ueno and Nara joined the *Sentā* in April 2009, the final year of the Project. Ueno had a PhD in Public Health and had been working at a private university as a coordinator of e-learning programmes. While working for the *Sentā*, she also worked at another university as an assistant professor twice a week. Nara worked for the *Sentā* as a part-timer previously and was recruited to work as a contract researcher. He was writing his PhD dissertation in sociology of religion and also worked as a part-time lecturer of English. He had another job as a researcher at a private university once a week. Both of them were in their late 20s and worked at the *Sentā* three times a week.

The *Sentā* negotiated with the administration office and was allocated another office opposite the main office in May 2008. Hereafter, I call the main office 'Office A' and the other office 'Office B'. Office B was half the size of Office A. They bought four desks with attached bookshelves and set two long tables for small meetings. In Office B, all of the desks and tables were shared among the contract researchers. Eventually, Office B became mainly for the Project members. There was no phone in Office B. I asked why this was the case. Ando answered, "I am not sure. Maybe because we already have one line as a *Sentā* but it could be for *gakunai jijyō* (internal reasons)…" By then I realized that Ando and other members of the *Sentā* often used '*gakunai jijyō*' to explain something that did not make logical sense to them. '*Gakunai*' means 'internal to an educational institution'; therefore when Ando used '*gakunai jijyō*', it meant the situation was particular to Sakura University. '*Jijyō*' in Japanese has the implication that something is beyond one's control. Therefore, '*gakunai jijyō*' also indicated that there would be no further discussion about the matter. This episode again showed how the administration office decided the position of the *Sentā* within the university by not sharing information that might help members to make sense of the situation. Not allocating a phone line in Office B indicated that administrators did not expect the *Sentā* to receive many phone calls internally. This came as a surprise to me because the Project aimed at supporting the university members, meaning I naturally imagined having

conversations with the university members about their issues and questions. In the next section, I introduce the details of the Project.

4.2 ICT-FD Project

4.2.1 Overview of the Project

In 2007, the ICT-FD Project was selected to receive three years of funding worth ¥72,000,000 (£480,000) from MEXT as part of their Support Programme for Contemporary Education Needs, *Gendai GP*. As I explained in Chapter Two, *GP* was the government's financial incentive to support the educational activities of universities. The aim of the Project was to improve the quality of ICT-enhanced education by providing a support programme to faculty members (including part-time members, administrators and teaching assistants) as part of the Sakura University's *FD* and staff development (*SD*). The design of the support programme changed as time went by. In this section, I introduce the original plan of the support programme used as part of the application form for *GP*. There were two components in the support programme: online courses and face-to-face courses. There was no definition of ICT-enhanced education, which later caused misunderstandings even among the Project members. According to Kuroki, Ishida and he wrote the draft of the document and it was further developed in discussions with other academics.

In designing the support programme, Kuroki and Ishida analysed the relevant issues by going through *FD* reports from various universities, as well as reports by MEXT. They identified that the format of *FD* practices, such as full-day seminars and workshops, were not suited for busy university members. Also, existing *FD* practices were often organized in a top-down manner rather than investigating the needs of individual members of the university. Therefore, they decided to develop online courses on various aspects of ICT-enhanced education so that university members would be able to learn when they wanted. Each online module was 20 minutes long and covered one topic completely. Therefore, the user of the programme would be able to choose a module according to his/her needs. In order to make it easy for users to identify which online course might best match their needs, they suggested designing four courses: the common course and three specialized courses. The common course provided information about basic knowledge, skills and quality assurance methods and legal knowledge in carrying out ICT-enhanced education. The first specialized course focused on the design, evaluation, and improvement of ICT-enhanced education. The second focused on methods to support students in ICT-enhanced education. The third specialized course introduced various methods and technical information to develop e-learning and video-on-demand educational materials. The face-to-face course was another important component of the support programme, which was carried out in a seminar or workshop style.

The face-to-face course employed a 'blended learning' approach of combining e-learning courses and face-to-face workshops and seminars. Participants in the face-to-face course would be requested to study assigned online modules before attending face-to-face workshops. In this way, it was expected that the time of the seminar or workshop would be shorter and participants would acquire knowledge and skills much quicker. The role of the Project members was to create materials for online and face-to-face courses, to support the research necessary to create materials, to run seminars and workshops, and to promote the programme.

Kuroki said during the first project meeting in April that, by putting emphasis on ICT and not *FD*, the Project would be able to prevent faculty resistance to the use of the support programme: "ICT will veil our true intention of promoting *FD*." In his understanding, *FD* meant improving one's teaching practice, including the design of a lecture, methods of teaching, and evaluation of students' outcomes. He was aware that there was a strong resistance to *FD*. It was interesting to observe how they designed the Project on the assumption that academics would be resistant to *FD*. This assumption seemed to set the tone of the discussions about the Project later on.

4.2.2 The Project Member

The members of the ICT-FD Project changed over three years because of the changes in contract researcher staffing (Table 5). There were clear divisions between those with full academic positions and those without. The former did not get involved with the actual activities of ICT-FD Project at all. Their job was to lend legitimacy to the Project and to take responsibilities at official events such as the annual forums and the external assessment meetings. For example, Tamura was a highly respected and recognized scholar in the field of cognitive science and education; therefore, the standard of research in the Project was expected to be high. His name was better known than the name of the *Sentā*. The typical response when one of the contract researchers introduced themselves to someone from another university would be: "Hmmm, I have never heard of the *Sentā*… Oh, Professor Tamura is the head of the *Sentā*. I see. I read his work on…" He joined Sakura University in 2000 after he retired from a national university, which is a typical arrangement in Japan. Except for a small number of prestigious private universities, it is difficult to carry out research at private universities because of a lack of funding from the government and limited facilities. As a result, private universities hire celebrated professors after they retire from national universities in order to build the research profile of the university in addition to attracting students. The retirement age for academics at a national university is between 60

and 65 but at a private university it is 70 on average. This indicated that Tamura was not necessarily active in research or other activities at the university because he was already approaching his second retirement.

Position in the *Sentā*	**Name**	**Specialization**	**Period as Project Member**	**Working days**
Head	Tamura	Cognitive Science and Education (PhD)	2007–2010 (Mar)	Full time
Vice-head	Noda	Management (PhD)	2007–2010 (Mar)	Full time
Vice-head	Okada	Cognitive Science and Education (PhD)	2007–2010 (Mar)	Full time
Member/Faculty member	Aoki	Sociology of Education (PhD)	2007–2010 (Mar)	Full time
Full-time member	Kuroki	IT and Educational Technology	2007–2010 (Mar)	Full time
Contract researcher	Ishida	Communication (PhD)	2007–2008 (July)	4/wk (~ 2008 Mar) 2/wk (2008 April~)
	---	Communication (PhD)	2007(Nov) –2007(Mar)	4/wk
	Makino	Physics (PhD)	2008 (Jun) –2010 (Mar)	4/wk (~2009 Mar) 3/wk (2009 April~)
	Hoshino	Psychology	2008 (Jun)	4/wk
	Sano	Educational Management	2007 (Nov) –2008 (June)	5/wk
	Ueno	Public Health (PhD)	2009 (April) –2010 (Mar)	3/wk
	Nara	Religious Studies and Sociology	2009 (April) –2010 (Mar)	3/wk
	Sato (Researcher)	Higher Education Studies	2008 (April)–2009 (Sept)	4/wk (~2009 Mar) 3/wk (2009 April~)
Part-time researcher	Yoshida	Educational Technology	2008 (April) –2009(Jan)	2/wk

Table 5: A list of Project members

The contract researchers led by Kuroki did the actual work to develop and carry out the support programme. Therefore, Kuroki became the boss in the eyes of the contract

researchers, which sometimes put him in a difficult position because he, in fact, was not in a position to take any responsibility.

4.2.3 Understanding the Government Funding

GP, one of the government funding schemes, started in the financial year 2004 to support "the outstanding efforts of universities, etc. and to respond to recommendations of the various councils and policy issues with strong social demands" (MEXT website, accessed 17 February 2010).[16] The term *GP* creates certain expectations about *GP*-funded projects because of the competitive screening process and requirements of MEXT. There were 600 applications and only 116 projects were chosen in 2007. The four main criteria for successful selection were: compatibility of the project with the selected theme; possibility for the completion of the project; expected educational contribution to society; and clear evaluation methods. Every year MEXT sets six different thematic categories reflecting the recommendations and demands of councils and the society. One of the themes in 2007 was 'Promotion of ICT-enhanced education for the improvement of educational outcomes', for which Kuroki and Ishida applied. In addition, the project should meet the vision of the university, have a management structure supported by the president of the university, have a

[16] http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/koutou/kaikaku/gp/001.htm

clear and achievable plan, and the potential to contribute to the enhancement of higher education in Japan (MEXT 2007, 1). In other words, the university should commit to the project. Submission of applications was usually in May. The universities who pass the first stage of the selection are invited for an interview in July and MEXT announces the final decision in August. The interview consisted of two parts: eight minutes to give an overview of the project and 17 minutes for questions and answers. As the interview time is strictly kept and short, applicants usually prepare answers for expected questions in advance. In the case of Sakura University, the president, the head of the administration, the head and vice-head of the *Sentā* and the assistant professor attended the interview.

Because of the tough screening process, a successful proposal for *GP* is considered to be promising and innovative. The awarding of a *GP* also leads to other expectations. For example, university members usually anticipate that a *GP*-funded project is supported and promoted by the university. The following interview conversation with Makino reveals such an expectation. In the interview with Makino on 5 February 2010, I asked why she decided to apply for the position in the *Sentā*. She explained that she actually applied for a different position in the *Sentā* because someone who used to work for the *Sentā* recommended it to her. But a week after she sent her application, the *Sentā* posted a contract researcher's

position for the Project, in which she was more interested. So she consulted the person who recommended the position to her and this person told either Kuroki or Ishida about her interest in the ICT-FD Project. Therefore, by the time she had an interview with them, they already knew of her interest. I asked why she wanted to apply for ICT-FD Project. She said:

> Well, to be honest, I was suspicious about the other project because there was very limited information about it and no published research papers […] The ICT-FD project, on the other hand, was a *Gendai GP* project so I was able to see the plan. Also, it meant that the university was willing to commit to the project so I felt more assured with it.

GP status also led to the understanding that the selected project had a feasible plan with aclear time line, allocation of tasks, and necessary resources. This meant contract researchers should be hired to complete certain tasks within the project and they should have the necessary skills and knowledge to do that. From the contract researchers' point of view, they understand their contract ends once their roles end. During the fieldwork, I observed and experienced the gaps between expectations created by *GP* funding and the reality on various occasions, which affected the Project members' attitudes and motivations toward the Project. In other words, the discourse of *GP* brought institutional tensions and complexities to the surface.

Hereafter, I introduce several episodes to capture the complexities that the Project members faced.

4.3 The University and FD

The institutional *FD* was mandated in 2008. Prior to that, graduate schools were obliged to have institutional *FD* in 2007, meaning university members were already aware of the possible change to the Standards at that time. Kuroki and Ishida made the assumption that Sakura University would come up with an institutional policy about *FD* once it was mandated. With this assumption, they put the application for *GP* together. They thought they would be able to run the support programme in line with the university's policy. However, it turned out that the president kept quiet about *FD* for almost a year and eventually it became clear that he was not keen on pushing institutional *FD* aggressively, which was reflected by the university's policy about *FD*. This held up the Project's progress and left the support programme in an awkward place. The following episode illustrates the university's attitude toward *FD* and its impact on the Project.

4.3.1 The Mystery of *FD* Committee

On 9 April, Kuroki gave me the reports about the *FD* project at Sakura University. It was the first time Kuroki had talked about the university's *FD* since I joined the *Sentā*. He told me that the former president formed a *FD* Team to discuss the ways to carry out *FD* at Sakura University but when the president was replaced, the team was also dissolved. The new

president has not made any formal announcement about his plan for *FD*. I said, "But *FD* is mandated from this academic year. Do you know what the university might do?" Kuroki said:

> I know. I know that the board of directors has suggested forming a *FD* committee but I don't think they have decided who to include as committee members or what they will do. […] You see this university has affiliated schools so they don't have to worry too much about the finances of the university or the number of students. So I don't know how serious the university is about *FD*.

Kuroki then asked Ando to forward me whatever documents she had received about *FD* at Sakura University, which she did. I read through the documents and asked Kuroki if it would be possible to talk with someone about the committee because it would be necessary for the ICT-FD project team to understand the university's plan for *FD*. He agreed:

> That's what we said in the proposal. Once the university decides the policy and the committee, then we can develop accordingly and approach them with our support programme.

He told me that it might be possible for me to talk with one of the officers at the president's office who used to work with the *FD* Team:

> This officer knows me and Ishida well so he might agree to talk with you about the *FD* project. But he is a very cautious person so you might not find out anything more than what is written in the report. I tried to find out but he would not tell me anything. Maybe he might tell you because you are new.

Kuroki asked Ando to forward me his email address. Although I set up a meeting with this officer at the president's office, he did not agree for me to use the talk in my study in this thesis; therefore, I am not able to discuss the details. Also, I was denied access to the minutes

of the *FD* Team meetings. What I found out was, as Kuroki expected, not much more than what were in the reports and the fact that no one knew about what might be happening with the forming of the committee.

On 21 April, Kuroki and I talked about the *FD* Team again. Kuroki said, "The new president probably has not decided what to do with *FD;* that is why he has not appointed the committee members." I asked, "What is going to happen to the *FD* Team?" He replied:

> Well, I guess it is logical to take over the team but it is not that simple. The new president might have a different idea about *FD*… Perhaps the new board of directors would not make use of the outcomes at all. In any case, Sakura University was preparing for *Gaibu Hyōka* (external evaluation) when the FD Team was formed so it must have been easier to take initiative. But now that *Gaibu Hyōka* is over, it will be difficult… you know…

He also mentioned that without knowing the president's position on *FD* it would be difficult to predict what kind of position and support the Project might receive in the university. This made me realize how vulnerable the Project was to the institutional priorities of the university. My feeling was confirmed from others as well. For example, in a conversation on 24 August with a contract researcher in a different project at the *Sentā*, he said:

> I think in order to have successful *FD*, we need to think about the design of the organizational structure to have sustainable *FD*. Currently, even if the *FD* unit makes progress with *FD*, once the president changes, the unit is faced with the risk of a reduction in funding, staff, and authority.

Sakura University was a typical example where the president used power to proceed with *FD* activities in a top-down manner. The details of the *FD* Committee did not become available during the academic year 2008. Rumour had it that one of the members of the *FD* Team would be invited to join the committee but it was not confirmed. Everything was concealed behind the scenes. Kuroki showed his frustration for a couple of months but eventually the Project members had to proceed with the Project because of the time line.

4.3.2 The University's Attitude to *FD*

In this section, I introduce the background of the *FD* Team by using documents and quotes from the members of the *Sentā*. It is intended to give a sense of how the members including some university members saw the activities of the *FD* Team instead of an objective description of it.

According to the university's records, the first *FD* activity was the students' evaluation of teaching, which started in 2002. In March 2005, the *FD* Team was established under the direct leadership of the then president of the university. An administrator in the central administration office said:

> By making the team under the president's direct leadership, it became so much easier for the members to organize university-wide activities and carry out investigations about the university.

The *FD* Team was able to carry out their activities without going through regular *tetsuzuki* (formalities) or meetings for approval. *Tetsuzuki* means formal procedures, but in the context of Japanese organizations it often comes with the informal processes of negotiation. Therefore, the *FD* Team saved the time and energy often used for negotiation behind the scenes in order to get something through by being exempt from *tetsuzuki*. It also meant the faculties and administration offices had to cooperate with the team. According to their official statements, the aim of the *FD* Team was to investigate the best-suited *FD* for the university.

The team consisted of 20 members, both academics and non-academics, and the vice-president was appointed team leader. This was a reflection of the idea that academics and non-academics need to work together in order for *FD* to be successful because university education was not only carried out by academics but was also supported by the work of non-academics. This idea was shared during the first *FD* symposium in 2005. The team existed until the end of the 2007 academic year[17]. Therefore, by the time I started my fieldwork, the team had been dissolved.

[17] The academic year 2007 is between 1 April 2007 and 31 March 2008.

During these three years, the team carried out four major activities: 1) Orientations for new faculty members; 2) Open lectures; 3) Interviews with students; and 4) a survey on academics' views on 'good teaching'. The team intended to find the best form of *FD* through these activities. According to their annual reports, it can be estimated that only a small group of university members took part in those activities. For example, open lectures were organized in 2006 and 2007 and the number of lectures increased from 28 to 44. The open lecture meant a lecturer would leave his/her regular lecture open to the university members on a certain day for viewing. However, a careful look at the details reveals that the same lecturers participated in both years and most of the lecturers opened up several courses that they taught in the second year. Also, *FD* Team members were counted as participants. In the 2007 report, it says that out of 71 people who came to observe lectures only 13 were academics and the rest were non-academics. The fact that non-academics made up the majority of the observers indicates that the head of the administration might have given permission and encouraged administrators to observe lectures. My conversation with an administrator on a different occasion revealed that administrators would not be able to take time off to attend events in the university unless the head gave permission. She wanted to join one of the workshops the *Sentā* organized but it was during her working hours so she said, "I can't join the workshop unless the head of the administration considers those

workshops as part of professional development and gives permission for us to join."

In 2007, the team sent a letter to all faculty members including contract lecturers. In the letter the team explained that both quality assurance and *FD* were compulsory and Sakura University had no choice but to carry out those practices. It then explained what the *FD* Team had been doing over two years and emphasized the urgent need to establish a permanent *FD* unit. Judging from the past activities, the team concluded that the aim of *FD* for Sakura University would be to create a mechanism to share individual academics' good practices with others, to deal with issues as a group, and to contribute to the improvement of students' learning experiences. However, it was not clear what kind of picture the team was drawing about *FD*.

As indicated in Kuroki's remark, the period Sakura University was active with *FD* coincides with the period when Sakura University went through an accreditation process by the Japan University Accreditation Association (JUAA). JUAA is a voluntary organization of universities that was established in 1947 with the purpose of improving the quality of universities in Japan. JUAA started accreditation activities in 1951 and it officially received the status of a certified evaluation agency in 2004 from MEXT (JUAA website). In order to

be accredited, the applicant-university should conduct a self-study based on the 'self-study items' specified by JUAA and submit a report. JUAA reviews the report, visits the university and organizes hearing sessions with the university. After the hearing, JUAA announces the result of the accreditation with a detailed report, which the university announces to the public. It takes one year to prepare a self-study report and another year for the accreditation.

With the revision of the School Education Law in 2002, all universities in Japan became obliged to be evaluated by a quality assurance agency certified by MEXT every seven years. Corresponding to this change, Sakura University decided to apply for accreditation by JUAA in 2005. Coincidence or not, it was at this time that the university decided to establish the *FD* Team. JUAA requires universities to have a structure in place to improve university education. According to the university's website, 13 committees and centres became responsible for writing reports about their own activities. The FD Team became responsible for reporting on *FD* activities in the university. The 2006 academic year was spent preparing for the self-study report and JUAA evaluated and accredited the university in 2007.

The result of the accreditation was available on the website. According to JUAA's report, Sakura University gave great autonomy to faculties and departments but because of that there was lack of consensus across different sections. JUAA recommended the university

make more efforts to create cross-sectional linkages. In terms of the university's measurements to improve education, JUAA argued that more institutionalized efforts were necessary, such as *FD*. An administrator commented to me, "JUAA basically says our *FD* is not good enough so the university feels it needs to do something about it before the next accreditation. But what is the best thing to do?" This quote sharply points out one of the issues of *FD*. Although *FD* is compulsory, MEXT does not state how it evaluates whether a university meets its requirements or not. This became a point of discussion at the 15th Kyoto University Conference on Higher Education held on 20 and 21 March 2009. During the discussion time in the symposium titled 'Organizing Faculty Development Activities on the University Campus and Collaborating between Universities', a professor from *Aichi Kyōiku Daigaku* (Aichi University of Education) asked the presenter from MEXT (Kyoto University Research in Higher Education 2009, 169–170) the following:

> In the 2008 evaluation, my university was told that although the university was practicing *FD*, the outcome was not sufficient. Could you tell me what it means to have 'effective' *FD* with concrete examples from your evaluation index?

The presenter from MEXT answered, "If I had been a member of the evaluation team, I might have been able to answer your question but I am not so I don't know why your university was evaluated in that way." The professor pushed, "No, I just want to know what you think it means to see improvement as a result of *FD*." The presenter answered:

> The evaluation is conducted by means of peer review. I personally believe that I, the government official, should not be involved with the evaluation process; therefore, I

can't answer your question. I am sorry.

This conversation shows one of the issues of mandated *FD* and it also shows how *FD* is linked strongly with evaluation rather than with methods to improve university education.

At Sakura University, I heard several times from different university members that the *FD* Team was established as *shōko* (evidence) in order to pass the accreditation. It was possible that university members might have begun to see any *FD* activity as being *shōko* that would help meet the regulation, which was the case at many other universities. I heard *FD tantōsya* and regular university members using '*shōko zukuri no FD*' (*FD* as evidence) to sarcastically describe *FD* activities at various seminars and workshops. The Project members had to promote their support programme in such an atmosphere.

4.4 Impact of the Peripheral Position of the Sentā on the Project

The lack of institutional initiative with *FD* created a wall against the Project. The peripheral position of the *Sentā* in the university created another barrier for the Project. In this section, I introduce one episode that shows the barriers the Project members encountered during their activities.

What Makino called '*toshokan jiken* (the library incident)' had a huge impact on Makino's and my understanding of the position of the contract researchers, the *Sentā*, and the Project.

Makino's use of the word '*jiken*', which means a serious incident, indicates how negatively the experience affected her motivation. What is striking with this episode is the use of the term '*tetsuzuki*', meaning formalities. It allows a person to have both the power to control the situation and to have an excuse for not being able to do something. With this in mind, let us look at 'the library incident.'

4.4.1 The Library Incident

The *Sentā* held the ICT-FD Project meeting on 9 June 2008, the first one for Makino and Hoshino who had joined only a week before. Kuroki led the meeting as usual. After discussing various other things, Kuroki explained to Makino and Hoshino that the *Sentā* had been helping the university's careers centre. The *Sentā* recorded the careers centre's seminars for students and put the edited video online for students.[18] Makino paused a little and asked how that could be called *SD*.[19] She said:

> Umm… but I thought the purpose of the project is to train academics and non-academics to be able to use ICT so… that means the *Sentā* does not create videos for the careers centre but teaches how to make videos and how to put them on the

---

[18] The careers centre at Sakura University is run by administrators. It is the same at most universities in Japan. They run seminars and sessions about how to write a CV (which has a standard format in Japan), how to put make up on for a job interview, how to prepare for the standard examination called the Synthetic Personality Inventory, and how to prepare for an interview. These are very popular among students, which means the careers centre runs the same seminars repeatedly so that students can attend at some point. However, the centre has less than ten staff members, so they were overloaded.

[19] Generally speaking, *SD* in Japan means development of non-faculty members of the university.

website… doesn't it?

Kuroki explained that given the lack of recognition of the *Sentā* in the university it was difficult to start *SD* without making themselves useful for administrators. So there had been a strategic decision to support the careers centre in the way they were doing and hopefully in the future the university would see the benefit of getting the *Sentā* involved. Makino gave it a thought and then wondered if it would be possible to work with the library, given that the library often runs seminars and training sessions for students just like the careers centre. Therefore, the *Sentā* might be able to provide support in a similar way. Kuroki said that was a good idea.

On that night, Makino and I walked together to the train station. As soon as we walked out of the university, we started to talk about the meeting and the project. Makino said:

> I still don't really understand how the support for the careers centre could be called *SD*. In my understanding, isn't the project about supporting university members to be able to use ICT?

I found out in the conversation that she used to work as an administrator at a private university. I told her that I was also an administrator before. Makino excitedly said, "That's great. We both understand the administrators." She then suggested that we should visit the library on the following day to have a chat with the librarians and to find out if they would be interested in our help with online content before proceeding with the idea.

On the next day, before Makino and I went to the library, we agreed that she would do the talking and I would concentrate on observing. A lady in her early 30s at the reference counter received us. She looked at us suspiciously and asked, “How can I help you?” Makino introduced herself,

> Hi, I am from the *Sentā*. We provide services to the university offices to create e-learning programmes and I wanted to ask you about the library sessions and see if youare interested in putting your sessions online.

She carried on, “So, do you actually design the session and run them? It must be time consuming because students are only interested in attending these sessions when they need to!” The lady said, hesitantly, “Well, yes. So we run the same session repeatedly.” Makino tactfully continued the conversation and the lady softened her attitude a little. After a couple of minutes of conversation the lady asked, “By the way, which company are you from?”

Both Makino and I started to giggle. Makino said, “In fact, we are from this university. Well, it is understandable because our *Sentā* is still new and the name is hard to recognize. Here is my name card. My name is Makino.” At this point, another librarian joined us. She also looked to be in her early 30s. After exchanging name cards, Makino, the two librarians and I discussed the possibilities of working together for about one hour. Before ending the discussion Makino asked, “Do you think you would be interested in working with us?” The librarians looked at each other and one replied with a vague smile, “Well, I can’t answer that

question at the moment. I need to discuss this with our team and the boss and see what they say…" Makino pushed, "Of course, should I bring any information about the *Sentā*? Do you have any specific information you need in order to talk with the team?" The librarian paused for a few moments and said, "Umm… yes, something that I can show when I talk with others…" Makino said she would bring a sample of the e-learning content and information about the *Sentā* the following day. As soon as we returned to the office, Makino said excitedly, "Well, the librarians were quite positive about our suggestion, weren't they!" An unexpected incident happened on the following day. I arrived at the office before Makino. Ando, the administrator at the *Sentā*, adopted a serious tone, and said that mine and Makino's visit to the library the day before had attracted criticism. I asked what was wrong with our visit. Ando said that Yamamoto, an administrator in another section, questioned why contract researchers went to see librarians without making an appointment. I said, "Oh, I am sorry. But Makino and I just wanted to have a chat and not a formal conversation." Ando said, "Well, but you need to follow *tetsuzuki* (formalities)…" Kuroki was in the office behind the desk listening to the conversation. He stood up and said, "I also didn't think you would act so quickly. I should have warned you before." Kuroki sat down and I was no longer able to see him from where I was standing. Neither Kuroki nor Ando sounded like he or she was going to explain to me what the proper *tetsuzuki* (formalities) were in this matter.

I suggested that I would call Yamamoto to have a chat.

Ando sat next to me while I talked with Yamamoto on the phone. I said:

> Hello, Yamamoto-san. My name is Sato. I have long wanted to talk with you in person since I joined in April because I have heard a lot about you. I am sorry about yesterday. I guess there was a misunderstanding in this *Sentā* and also with the librarians.

Yamamoto said:

> It's nice to talk with you finally. Well, you don't need to be sorry because you didn't know *tetsuzuki* (formalities). Umm… you know sometimes we are very strict about formalities in this university, especially among administrators. Umm… also there were problems in the past when contract researchers acted independently and… you know. So I just wanted to protect you from getting into any trouble.

I asked what the librarians told her. Yamamoto said casually:

> They were not upset. They were just wondering who you were and about the *Sentā*. I bumped into one of the librarians that you talked to on campus yesterday afternoon and she told me that two contract researchers came to the library in the morning to talk. She was wondering how to deal with it.

Then, Yamamoto told me that next time any contract researchers needed to contact members of the university about the project, it was better for us to make an appointment through the administrator and go with a full-time member or a professor. She explained that the fact the *Sentā* was not widely recognized in the university was part of the problem:

> If the library decides to ask the *Sentā* to make online content, it is not clear for them, for example, who is going to pay the cost or where the copyright might belong. That's why it is important to follow the formalities.

I apologized again for causing the trouble and told her that I would discuss the matter with Kuroki. I hung up the phone and told Kuroki about what I discussed with Yamamoto. He

said, “The problem is that we don’t have an administration office that is in charge of our *Sentā*! Anyway, I understand.” He did not blame me.

I went back to Office B. Makino was there so I explained what had happened. The first thing Makino said was:

> I can’t believe this! So we are not even allowed to have a chat with university members because we are not full-time members? I know that we have to go through formalities but before that it was necessary to see if the library was interested in it at all! If they were not, there would be no point for the *Sentā* to contact them formally. Oh, I can’t believe this. And who is this Yamamoto to tell us off? She belongs to another office so she is interfering in our activities. On top of that, it was Kuroki who said we could go ahead with the library project. Isn’t he responsible for not telling us about the formalities?

I explained to her about the relationship between Ando and Yamamoto, i.e. that Yamamoto was the one who trained Ando when she first joined the *Sentā*. Therefore, she was familiar with Noda, Kuroki and Ishida. Makino claimed that it still did not mean Yamamoto was in a position to interfere with the *Sentā*’s activities. She was angry.

Kuroki asked Makino and I to consult with Noda about the matter. It was only then that both Makino and I realized we did not even know Noda’s email address. It struck me how unconnected contract researchers were. Noda suggested organizing a meeting with the head of the library’s administration to discuss the possibility of working together. On 24 June

2008, the meeting was held between the head of the library's administration, the two librarians Makino and I talked with, Noda, Kuroki, Makino and I to explain about the *Sentā* and the ICT-FD Project and how the *Sentā* might be able to contribute to the library's activities. During the meeting, Noda and Kuroki talked mostly and the head of the library's administration did not make any particular comments. Makino tried to get the two librarians to speak out about their needs by asking questions but they did not say much. Makino later said:

> I tried to make them [the two librarians] speak about their desire to better organize the website but they were so quiet. I don't know why they didn't say much. They could have changed the direction of the meeting…

The decision was deferred as the head had to consult with the head of the library, which is an academic position. Nothing happened for a month after the meeting. Kuroki eventually told Makino and I that we should forget about the project. Two years later, Makino happened to talk with a professor who worked with the library at Sakura University. Makino explained what the *Sentā* had proposed to the library and the professor was shocked to hear about the reaction:

> It would have been a great opportunity for the library to improve their service! The library didn't have to pay to put their seminars online, right? I don't understand why they didn't take your proposal…

Kuroki and Makino were not able to find a logical reason why the *Sentā*'s proposal did not get through. The only reason they could think of was '*gakunai jijyō* (internal politics)',

which meant it was beyond their control.

4.4.2 Discussion

The library incident highlighted the peripheral position of the *Sentā* and the contract researchers in the university. It was clearly revealed in the episode that the *Sentā* had little acknowledgement among the librarians. Here is another example that reveals the lack of recognition of the *Sentā* in the university more generally. One day, I was in the elevator with one of the professors whose office was next to our office. He said, "Do you work for the whatever *Sentā*? What do you actually do?" Lack of recognition meant the Project members had to work hard to promote its support programme for university members. The episode shows that lack of recognition led to hesitation to work with the *Sentā* among the librarians. During the formal meeting, one of the librarians kept asking about the work the *Sentā* did for the careers centre, as if she was checking to see if the *Sentā* was reliable. The librarians did not share their information with us as well. Noda, Kuroki and Makino asked different questions but the librarians did not answer any of the questions with clear answers. After the meeting Kuroki said they were quite cautious. The fact the librarians were reluctant to give their information and thoughts during the meeting meant that they were not considering working with the *Sentā* in a positive light. Otherwise, they would have shared the

information that would have helped the *Sentā* to come up with a better proposal to further advance the Project.

The episode also revealed the weak position of contract researchers in the university. After hearing Yamamoto's warning, Kuroki said, "I don't really understand why it is wrong for the contract researchers to have a casual conversation with university members." However, he asked the contract researchers not to contact the members of the university directly for a while. I discuss the position of contract researchers in the next chapter in more depth. For now, it is critical to point out that the majority of the Project members were contract researchers and they were denied free access to full-time university faculty and staff. It was contradictory to the purpose of the Project, which was to deliver the support programme for university members. Working closely with the university members was inevitable for the Project members. In contrast to the FD Team, the Project members did not have any privileges with the *tetsuzuki*. Rather, their range of activities was restricted because of the position. This indicates the university did not give its full support to the promotion of the Project.

Another finding was that *tetsuzuki* took precedence over the legitimacy created by having

GP funding in terms of carrying out the project. As mentioned before, MEXT expects *GP*-funded projects to have the full support of the university, which means the university in some cases needs to omit a formal process of decision making by showing the president of the university's permission. Otherwise, the project might not proceed within the given time constraints. In the case of Sakura University, the episode showed that key administrative staff used *tetsuzuki* to control the Project's activities. At the time of the library incident, it was not clear if it was particular to this case but later similar cases happened where the Project members were not able to carry out their activities because of the *tetsuzuki*. For instance, the Project members planned to give out an information sheet with the details of the support programme but it took five months to get approval from the university because of the complex *tetsuzuki*. As the members never learnt the formal *tetsuzuki*, they had to take different routes to get approval. In other words, the Project members were able to justify their activities as long as *tetsuzuki* was completed properly. In this sense, finding out the right way to do *tetsuzuki* meant identifying the person with the decision-making power and *tetsuzuki* represented a way of negotiation with the university.

Yamamoto's intervention indicates that Yamamoto seems to hold a certain authority that even Kuroki could not fight with by knowing *tetsuzuki*. Having worked as an administrator

at a different university, Makino was aware of the importance of *tetsuzuki* and frustrated by not knowing the standard *tetsuzuki*. At the beginning, she tried to protect herself from getting into trouble by remembering how *tetsuzuki* was conducted at her previous workplace, but she often ended up even more frustrated because it did not proceed as she expected. The interesting fact is that there was no standard *tetsuzuki*, which is reflected in Kuroki's expression about his unawareness of the *tetsuzuki* needed for contract researchers to meet other members of the university. This was partly because of not being allocated the administration office responsible for the *Sentā*'s administration. It meant *tetsuzuki* was amended and adopted to the *Sentā* depending on what the *Sentā* requested. Members of the project, especially the contract researchers, continued to suffer from not knowing the *tetsuzuki* throughout the year. They had to spend a great amount of time figuring out what they were supposed to do. Eventually, they started to rely on Yamamoto in relation to *tetsuzuki*. Often, they just told Yamamoto what they were intending to do and let her play the role of negotiator behind the scenes. Yamamoto continued to play a critical role informing the *Sentā* of the necessary *tetsuzuki* to follow.

Conclusion

This chapter introduced the field and described the institutional complexities in which the

Project members were located. There are two elements to this: the complexities related to *FD* and those related to the *Sentā* itself.

The complexities related to *FD* were defined by the status of the university, the policy and structure of the assessment, and the *GP*. Sakura University was one of the fortunate universities because they did not need to worry too much about securing a certain number of students, which was usually the strongest drive for a university to reform. The university enjoyed a good reputation and high levels of popularity among students. Therefore, it was not anxious to change anything in particular. Meanwhile, MEXT made it mandatory for universities to practice *FD* and *FD* became part of the ministry's assessment criteria. However, there were no specific guidelines for assessing a university's efforts with *FD*. As a result, Sakura University was able to avoid putting emphasis on *FD* once it had passed the assessment. The expression '*shōko zukuri no FD* (*FD* as evidence)' captures well the university's reaction to the policy-led reform. The *Sentā* intended to run the ICT-FD Project in line with the university-wide *FD* so that it would contribute to the activities of the university. However, the university postponed its decision about the university-wide *FD* after it passed the external assessment. The *Sentā* was left with the Project that needed institutional support in order to be completed in the funding period. The *GP* was introduced

to promote good practices to improve university education. It required the university to support the Project once it received the *GP*. However, there was no structure to evaluate the university's support; therefore, it was still up to the university to decide how much support it would give. Sakura University was not opposed to the project but nor did it actively support it. In addition, the university had its own unique institutional culture, which slowed down changes, such as *tetsuzuki* and *gakunai jijyō*. These structures would not have been an issue if the Project had institutional support. The Project members were rendered impotent.

Another layer of complexity was created by the institutional setting of the *Sentā*. It was a new addition to the university therefore the members often encountered problems with *tetsuzuki* and found it difficult to gain trust from other university members. Within the *Sentā*, there was a clear divide between the senior members, the junior members, and the contract researchers. Having posts in a faculty, senior members did not put any priority on the management of the *Sentā*. The senior members were absent physically as they did not have offices in the *Sentā*. As a result, the junior members who did not have much power in the university and the contract researchers who were considered outsiders by administrators had to deal with the *Sentā*'s day-to-day activities and the Project. Thus, the members of the Project had to cope with complexities that were beyond their control before they could even

think about the design and delivery of the Project. With this in mind, in the next chapter I focus on individual member's activities.

Chapter Five: Personal Trajectory, Professional Values, and Career Prospects

Introduction

In Chapter Four, I described the institutional complexities surrounding the Project members from their viewpoints. I explained how the ICT-FD Project was designed to offer support programmes for the university members without interfering with their work schedule. By offering the programmes online and by reflecting the needs of university members, the Project members tried not to threaten the autonomy of university members and emphasize its bottom-up approach. The successful *GP* award made the Project members confident about their idea and they expected the university to support the Project. They were also planning to work in tandem with the university's policy on *FD*. However, they understood that Sakura University was not keen on practicing institutional *FD* actively because the university did not make any progress with institutional *FD* after dissolving the *FD* Team in 2007. Therefore, the Project members did not have an institutional framework of *FD* to position the support programmes. It was like trying to design the wheel without seeing the car. This created a difficult situation for the Project.

Within the *Sentā*, there was a clear divide between those members who held an academic position in a faculty and the full-time members. Those with full appointments with faculties had very little to do with the running of the Project and it was full-time members of the *Sentā* who were in junior positions in the university that ran the Project on a day-to-day basis. Hereafter, when I use the term 'Project member' I only refer to those junior members of the *Sentā* who did actual work for the Project. This resulted in them having little negotiating power to further the Project, which became apparent when they had to identify the right *tetsuzuki* or formalities. The Project members were caught between the expected outcome for *GP*-funded activities, their low position in the university, and the vague institutional policy on *FD*. In other words, expectations were high but members did not have the institutional support needed to meet these expectations. In addition, lack of contact with university members created doubts about whether university members needed the support programme or not. One member said, "What is the point of creating the e-learning course materials if no one is going to use them?" Yet it was their responsibility to complete the Project within three years. How did the Project members react to such circumstances? What affected their reactions? This chapter focuses on individual members' process of sense making of the situation and decision-making regarding their actions.

In an organization in general, individual members continually negotiate their sense of role and identity to find an appropriate fit. While contract researchers were adjusting to the organizational culture as new employees, existing full-time members were also continuing to negotiate their place. This process of adjustment happened at two levels. One is within the *Sentā* and the other is in the university. In this chapter I first describe how the new Project members investigated how they were expected to behave and what they were expected to achieve with the Project. In other words, they paid attention to understanding the Project and their role in the Project team. In the *Sentā*, there was a hierarchical structure with the full-time professors at the top followed by full-time staff and then contract researchers at the bottom. As I explained in Chapter Four, the full-time professors were not involved in the development of the Project. Therefore, one of the full-time staff, Kuroki, acted as the virtual leader of the Project. However, at the same time, each member's expertise was recognized and equal positions were created among the Project members. The fact that everyone was of a similar age also enhanced the equality of the positions. This could have been a good team management structure if there was a clear target for the Project shared among the Project members. However, as I mentioned in Chapter Four, the university did not announce its strategy during the time I was at the *Sentā.* This led Kuroki to avoid fixing the definitions of *FD* and *SD* so that it would still be possible for the Project to be fitted to the institutional

strategy. As a result, the Project members had to work without having a shared understanding of key concepts. What was the impact of having lack of consensus on the Project members' understanding of the role and their professional identity?

I also describe how the Project members paid attention to understanding their position in the community of the university. They did not want to appear to be imposing the support programmes on university members, which was why they wanted to go along with the institutional strategy about *FD* and also to emphasize its needs-based approach. The negative image of *FD* widely shared among university members in general made them act carefully. In other words, they wanted to keep a harmonious relationship with other members of the university. However, several incidents made the members think they were excluded from the community from the beginning. The Project members were at a loss as to what they could do without having any interactions with university members. Eventually, each member of the *Sentā* approached the situation differently.

In the second section, I describe the weight of the reality and differences in the reactions of the Project members to it. Once they began promoting and offering the programme, the members had to face reality. Until then, they were able to design the programmes in their

imagined reality; in other words, it was a desk plan. I introduce one episode that revealed how some members did not have any actual sense of the running of the support programme. I will also show several episodes in which the Project members had to support faculty members and the impact of the experiences on the member's understanding of the role. In the eyes of the faculty member or the participants of face-to-face programmes, the Project members were all *senmonka* (experts) of some kind, regardless of the position they held at Sakura University. In other words, Project members faced pressure to perform as a *senmonka*. The gap between the given position as a *senmonka* and one's projection of his/her position in the university and professional identity also caused unsettling feelings among the members.

In the last section, I explore the effects of career prospects and lived experiences on each member's choice of professional identity. The imbalance between the positions of junior faculty members or contract researchers within the university and the amount of responsibilities they were given caused confusion among them. They felt what they had to deal with was unreasonable.

5.1 Confusion about Appropriate Positions

5.1.1 Understanding the Project and Role

New members of the Project made efforts to understand how the *Sentā* was running the Project and to start making contributions to it. However, there was very little opportunity for the Project members to talk about the Project in detail. When Yoshida and I joined the *Sentā*, Kuroki gave us an overview of the Project and the *Sentā*'s activities on the first day. During the first week, I was basically left alone with the computer connected to the network so that I could have a look at the documents and minutes of meetings. Kuroki expected Yoshida and I to come up with an idea for online courses. He told me that I was the specialist in the field of higher education and the Project needed an online course about higher education. I asked what kind of online courses on higher education they needed but Kuroki only said it would be up to me. I did not have a chance to watch an example of an online module Kuroki had already created until a month later, so I had little image of what an online module looked like. In addition, I did not know how to create an online module. I wrote in my journal that I had very little idea of what my expected role was. Here is a small episode. Makino joined the *Sentā* two months after Yoshida and I joined. On the first day she asked, "So what is your role? What do you do?" Yoshida and I looked at each other and said, "We've been wondering about that for two months! We've been neglected!" We were joking but it was

partly true. During the first two months, Yoshida used to say, “I think we should just do what we want to do. If they need us, they will tell us.”

ICT-FD Project meetings were the place to discuss plans and issues regarding the Project. Members sat in the meeting room at a round table. The Project meeting was held once a month and usually took about one to two hours. Kuroki sat at the front and chaired the meeting. He would prepare a handout with topics for discussion mostly related to overall scheduling of the Project. Each member was expected to bring his/her own handout to explain individual progress. What struck me the most during the first three meetings was the quietness. In my field notes, I described the appearance of the meeting room, the seating arrangement of the members, and how Kuroki led the meeting, but there was little description of how the members interacted. It felt as if the meetings were held to check on people’s progress rather than to discuss the design or delivery of the Project. For example, between April and June, members often talked about the online course materials that they were developing individually. This was not done to check the contents of the material but rather to arrange the filming schedule.

In order to develop online course material, at first the Project member needed to prepare a

PowerPoint presentation and the narration manuscript. They hired a professional announcer to read the manuscript. Sano and part-time students filmed it and compiled the PowerPoint presentation. On the screen, you would see the PowerPoint presentation and the face of an announcer. Because they hired a professional announcer and used part-time students, it was necessary to arrange a day to film several online courses. Therefore, during the meeting, the Project members needed to check each other's schedule, which became the main topic of the Project meeting during the first six months of creating online course materials intensively.

During the second meeting, I suggested that the *Sentā* develop online training material on the historical background of faculty development. In fact, I was not sure if what I was suggesting would be in line with the purpose of the Project and I wanted to know other members' opinions. However, Kuroki never asked about the detail of the material and others were equally quiet. It was considered an individual members' responsibility to develop good quality online training materials according to the plan. In other words, Kuroki treated each member equally regardless of the type of contract they were employed on. This indicated that the priority for Kuroki in managing the Project was to follow the schedule as stated in the application to the government for funding.

The lack of discussions in the meeting created a sense of uncertainty about the Project among contract researchers. During the meeting, the overall picture of the Project or coordination of individuals' work was rarely discussed. As a consequence, contract researchers expressed their anxieties over not sharing the same understanding of the Project as other members. Here is another example. Makino and I had a lengthy conversation about *SD* within the framework of the ICT-FD Project. Makino was interested in developing online course materials for *SD* but she was not sure what kinds of topics should be covered as *SD*. As I introduced in Chapter Four, Kuroki was working with the careers centre, which he called *SD*. Kuroki recorded various seminars the centre organized, edited the video and put it online for the centre. As I explained before, Makino did not understand how this could be treated as *SD*. She said that if Kuroki was giving training to the administrators on how to record and edit then it would be *SD*. During the meeting, she asked about the *Sentā*'s support from the administrative office and tried to understand what the *Sentā* meant by *SD* within the Project. To sum up, Makino was not able to get a satisfactory explanation from Kuroki about the Project's definition of *SD*; therefore, she decided to follow her understanding of the Project and the concept of *FD* and *SD*. In an email to me on 12 June 2008 she said:

> As far as I can see from the description of the Project, the ultimate goal is to improve the quality of university education, and from the discussion at the meeting I understood that as long as it meets such a goal, it is fine to do anything in the Project. So we do not have to worry about what 'ICT-enhanced education' means or what *SD* means. […] I don't think Kuroki actually has a definite and shared overall image of

the Project.

The contract researchers were hired to complete the Project. But they were not given proper instruction on how to go about it. Therefore, they began taking their own approaches to the Project that were based on their previous experiences and knowledge. At the same time, full-time members were also junior in the university and were not able to control the management of the Project. This kind of situation influenced Kuroki's choice of management style.

5.1.2 Confusion Regarding Appropriate Positions within the *Sentā*

Positional relationships among Project members were ambiguous. There were several professors in the Project team but on a day-to-day practical basis only the people in Office A and Office B were involved with running the Project. At the *Sentā*, Kuroki acted as the virtual leader of the Project; therefore, contract researchers expected him to be responsible for overall management and coordination of the Project. However, Kuroki seemed to have a different idea about how to manage the Project members. Once, in a conversation over tea in October, Kuroki said:

> The ideal boss for me is someone who does not interfere with the work of individual subordinates and gives them autonomy. The boss's job is to apologize and take the responsibility if subordinates make mistakes.

In actual fact, Kuroki rarely controlled the practices of other members of the Project. It was

perhaps to do with the similar situation they all were in. All contract researchers signed one-year contracts with a possibility of extension until the end of the Project, which meant another year. Kuroki, who was a full-time member of the *Sentā*, was on a five-year contract. As a result, members of the *Sentā* had to continually look for a job while working for the *Sentā* and, when they found a job, they were able to break the contract. For example, the *Sentā* hired two contract researchers in 2007; one quit at the end of March 2008 as she found a full-time lectureship at another university. This affected the schedule of the Project greatly. Kuroki was also applying for jobs and when contract researchers found out about it they questioned who would be responsible for the Project if he found another job. From Kuroki's perspective, though, he was also just a junior faculty member and was not in a position of responsibility with regard to the Project. At the same time, he was also working to extend his contract with Sakura University, which made him careful about his acts and who he networked with. Although Kuroki preferred a flat management style, he also kept a certain level of power in the *Sentā* by keeping certain information to himself. During the meeting, there were occasions when someone brought up issues to discuss or questions, upon which Kuroki would say "In fact, it has already been discussed at…" and disclose the information. It is not clear if he kept the information to himself intentionally or not. Kuroki's behaviour confused contract researchers. Furthermore, the unclear management structure sometimes

created conflicts among the members. I introduce one episode.

ICT-FD Project members were preparing for the ICT-FD Project forum that was going to be held on 30 January 2009. The *Sentā* had asked the president to make the opening remarks and the vice-president to make the closing remarks back in September. At that time, contract researchers were not involved with the forum at all. Kuroki and Ishida were involved with the paperwork, including such matters as reserving a university hall and contacting the president's office. They were familiar with the procedures because of their past experiences. Then, the schedule of the forum kept changing and it was only at the end of November that the timetable was fixed. By then Makino and I were heavily involved with the Project and I was responsible for coordinating the forum. Compared with the original timetable that Kuroki sent to the president's office in September, the overall time of the forum had been extended by 30 minutes. On 19 January 2009, two weeks before the forum, the president's office made an inquiry about the timetable to Ando, the administrator at the *Sentā*. The secretary pointed out that the timetable on the university's website showed a different schedule. The vice-president had another appointment after the forum; therefore, he would not be able to act as the speaker if the forum was going to finish 30 minutes later than the original plan. When I arrived at the office, Ando told me that I made a serious mistake by not

informing the president's office of the new timetable much earlier.

At this point, I was convinced that it was my mistake and I should take responsibility. After discussing this with Kuroki and Yamamoto, we came to the conclusion that Noda and I would have to see the president and vice-president and apologize. The choice of Noda was made because he was the vice-head of the *Sentā*. However, when Makino heard about the incident later on, she said, "Well, it was your mistake not to recognize the change of time but it is Kuroki's responsibility to make sure everything is arranged properly. As contract researchers, we can't really take any responsibilities even if we work like the full-time staff and we don't know how the formalities work in this university." Another part-time staff member who worked for a different Project shared the same view. On 23 January, Noda and I went to see the president and the vice-president to apologize and explain the new timetable of the forum. Makino made the comment in her interview on 5 February 2010 that this incident made her think that contract researchers were in a very vulnerable position.

In this episode, the confusion regarding appropriate positions and responsibility became apparent. Kuroki's manner indicates he treated members of the Project equally without distinction. As a result, he allocated jobs with responsibilities to contract researchers and

gave autonomy as well. On the other hand, Makino drew a clear boundary around her position. Her reaction showed that the distinction between the full-time staff and contract researchers lay in the amount of responsibilities. In her understanding, contract researchers were responsible for their work and full-time staff had the responsibility to supervise and manage contract researchers; therefore, to her Kuroki's decision appeared to be irresponsible.

The fact Noda had to come with me to apologize shows that although it may be acceptable within the *Sentā* for the Project members to work on equal terms and carry equal responsibilities regardless of their position, once they went outside the *Sentā* university members made judgements about their responsibilities depending on the position each held. In other words, even if a contract researcher was responsible for something, the full-time faculty members, preferably an associate professor or a professor, should appear in public to take responsibilities. The next section shows how administrative members at Sakura University treated the contract researchers external to their network.

5.1.3 Administrator's boundary

There were several occasions that made contract researchers feel they were not included as members of Sakura University, especially by administrators. The practice of exclusion made it difficult for contract researchers to carry out the Project and the sense of alienation led them to question their position, role, and professional identity. Problems occurred when contract researchers intentionally or unintentionally challenged the administrative boundaries of Sakura University. For example, in the library incident I discussed in the previous chapter, Makino and I were accused of visiting the library without making a proper appointment. I discussed the role of *tetsuzuki,* or formalities, as a kind of gatekeeper to protect vested interests in the university. *Tetsuzuki* seems to have two aspects: an official one and an unofficial one. The official *tetsuzuki* is the standardized one; therefore, by following *tetsuzuki,* anyone would get the same service. The unofficial *tetsuzuki* is more like *nemawashi,* or negotiation behind the scenes. One needs to know the appropriate person to talk to, otherwise *tetsuzuki* fails. This means an individual needs to know the network of people in the university and to be in the network him/herself. An individual gains strong negotiating power when he/she knows both official and unofficial *tetsuzuki*. In the case of Makino and I, neither of us followed either form of *tetsuzuki*. Moreover, there were other examples.

On another occasion, I was accused of sending an email to the president's office. I contacted an administrator in the president's office to make an appointment with the president and vice-president on behalf of Kuroki and Noda, the sub-head of the *Sentā*. Soon after, the president's office contacted Yamamoto to complain about my act. I was told that a contract researcher should not be sending emails directly to the president's office and I was not even allowed to apologize to the administrator. In another incident, I was again told not to send emails to the president's office. In this case, the president and the vice-president attended a forum the ICT-FD Project had organized to give an opening and closing remark respectively. After the forum, Kuroki reminded me to send a message to thank them for their time. As I was now aware of the importance of using the right channel, I asked Yamamoto whom I should send the email to. In her reply, she said, "Please never send email to the president's office. I will forward the email for you to the secretary so send it to me" (2 February 2009). Those incidents implied that administrators had a hierarchy of university staff in mind. Ishida thought these incidents were strange because it never happened to him, although he was also on a contract. Kuroki also could not think of a reason why a contract researcher should not contact the president's secretary directly. Therefore, the administrator's boundary was not necessarily clear but at least those who dealt with the *Sentā*'s staff did not expect contract researchers to get involved with the organizational matters of Sakura University,

which indicates that, in the structure of the administration, contract researchers were 'outsiders'. For example, contract researchers were not allowed to borrow reserved journals and books from the library without asking Yamamoto to call the library beforehand. Regular faculty members of the university were able to do this on their own by showing their identification cards. Hereafter, I introduce another episode in more depth to show how administrative staff expressed uneasiness about working with contract researchers.

Deciding to develop online materials for *SD*, Makino resolved to conduct interviews with administrators in different administrative offices of the university to understand their needs. By then she had had a chance to work with one of the administrators in a section of the university. Thus, she decided to send an email to the administrator, who I call Tanaka. In her message, she explained that she would like to interview Tanaka to better understand the section's work and to find out what kind of professional development in relation to ICT skills might be needed. In order to make the interview sound informal, she suggested that the interview could be done individually or with Tanaka's colleagues over coffee or tea. She also assured him that the interview data would be kept confidential and any private information would be made anonymous. In the reply to this request, Tanaka asked a few questions about the interview and mentioned:

> …depending on the kind of online materials you are planning to develop, perhaps it

might be better to go through the appropriate section. In that way, perhaps, the communication might be conducted smoothly…" (22 July 2008)

At this point in the communication, it was not clear what exactly Tanaka was cautious about but Makino interpreted this message and thought that Tanaka was afraid of overstepping his position by working with the contract researcher. The fact that he was one of the junior administrators in the section also influenced Makino's judgement. In her message to Tanaka she explained that the Project was still in the process of developing online materials for *FD* and *SD*; therefore, the *Sentā* had not yet officially worked with the section that was in charge of professional development. She pointed out the fact that Tanaka was not the only person she had contacted and again emphasized the confidentiality of the interview. Before she sent the message to Tanaka, Makino asked me to check the message. She wanted to know if her message sounded too serious or formal. She wanted to make sure that Tanaka would understand that the interview would be informal and casual. I said the message sounded okay so she sent it. Here, it is clear that not only Tanaka but also Makino was checking to see if she was behaving within the boundaries of the given position.

There was no reply for three days. Makino and I visited the careers centre on 29 July to talk with Tanaka in person. He was on a business trip at that time. Makino waited another week but there was still no reply. Makino decided that Tanaka would not agree to be interviewed

so she wrote to Tanaka saying not to worry about the interview anymore on 8 August. Tanaka replied on the same day:

> I am sorry for not replying to your previous message. […] The reason I was not able to accept your request was because I was not sure if you needed to get permission from the professional development section (for administrators) because their main responsibility is to offer professional development opportunities…

This message revealed that Tanaka was concerned with the territories of each administrative office in Sakura University. He seems to have had trouble finding the appropriate position of the Project and Project members in relation to various sections of the administration. He concluded that, in his understanding of the boundaries, contract researchers were outsiders and the Project had not been appropriately located yet.

This incident led Makino to believe that her position did not give her the access to go inside the organization and work with staff. She felt that her position imposed limitations on her acts. She also felt that there was a lack of understanding among university members about the Project. It was rational for Project members to think the university would support the Project because it was one funded by the government. However, a number of incidents made them think that it was not the case, which made it difficult for Project members to decide how to go about proceeding with it.

Perhaps the administrators needed to act as guardians of the organizational culture. It is understandable when we pay attention to the fact that 70% of academic staff at Sakura University are contracted, or *hijōkin*. Only 30% are full-time academic staff. *Hijōkin* academic staff would come to the university only to give lectures and usually they were not involved with any administrative work. Those academic staff revolved in a short cycles while administrative staff stayed for many years. As a result, an administrator like Yamamoto became the source of information when a new faculty member tried to understand the structure of the university.

I also argue that the conservative nature of administrators is not only unique to Sakura University. For example, I once attended a seminar for junior university administrators. A group of junior administrators from various different universities formed a network and organized a seminar and workshop to promote their professional development voluntarily. They were highly motivated to improve the work of administrators and the university in general. When I asked if it was acceptable for me to talk about their activities, the leader said:

> You can talk about the activities we do but please never mention anyone's name. Some of them keep the fact that they have joined this kind of network a secret from colleagues because sometimes the senior administrators do not like the juniors to take part in this kind of workshop.

I asked why it was not well regarded to spend time on professional development. The leader said, “I don’t know. Maybe they do not like the idea of competition. Maybe the senior administrators worry that the junior administrators will take over their work.” During the seminar, the members complained about the difficulty of introducing new ideas because of a lack of support from other colleagues and the university. It is not in the scope of this study to investigate the organizational culture of university administrators but these episodes indicate the conservative nature of the wider administrators’ community.

In short, the Project members were isolated in the university, and they had little trust in each other as well. This led to a lack of consensus about the Project. There was no one to take responsibility for the Project. In addition, they did not have enough information to make decisions about the practices of the Project. I introduced how Makino had trouble getting an appointment with an administrator to ask about *SD*. Makino and I ended up conducting interviews with administrators at other universities who we met at seminars and workshops. Under such conditions, the members inevitably took different approaches to executing the Project.

5.2 Impact of Lived Experiences

5.2.1 Handouts and the Help Desk

The Project members concentrated on developing online course materials in the first half of the year. Therefore, they lacked a sense of the reality of providing support programmes and the implications. None of the Project members except Makino had previous experiences of giving support to university members. Often, Makino was frustrated by the Project members' overly optimistic outlook on the management of the support programmes. Below is an episode that shows Makino's frustration.

During a Project meeting on 9 June 2008, Ishida pointed out the necessity of promoting the support programme among university members because it was already the second year of the Project. In their plan, they would start running the support programme from academic year 2008, evaluate it, and then improve it in academic year 2009. Kuroki and Ishida discussed the target number of participants. In order to meet these target numbers, Ishida suggested circulating information handouts to university members. Kuroki asked me to work with Ishida. Ishida said that he would draft a letter to ask for permission to circulate the handouts to the university's executives and would send it to me. Ishida and I agreed to have a meeting on 13 June to draft the handout together. It was the first time we discussed any plans to

actively promote the Project within the university.

On 13 June, Ishida and I had a meeting in Office B. Makino was also working there but did not take part in the meeting itself. After we discussed the letter, Ishida proposed that we think about a catchphrase to put on the handout. He was good at playing with words so immediately he came up with several different versions, which all included the term '*FD*' or 'improving teaching'. I commented that, "From what I hear from other *FD* practitioners, it seems these days as soon as the faculty members hear the word '*FD*' they show resistance or even express hatred of it. So perhaps we should avoid using the word." Ishida was surprised: "Oh, I didn't know that I should not use the term '*FD*'!" Makino was surprised by Ishida's reaction and laughed a bit; she later told me she was surprised to hear Ishida's comment about *FD*, believing Ishida to therefore be ignorant of the current situation related to *FD*. In fact, Ishida and Kuroki found it incomprehensible that faculty members did not want to improve their teaching. To them, reflecting on and improving one's own teaching was part of academic professionalism. Kuroki in particular often expressed how he would prefer to teach rather than to do research.

I said that once the university members started to use the online training programmes they

might contact the *Sentā* to ask questions. I asked, "Will the *Sentā* deal with individual questions? If yes, who will be responsible for that? Does it mean the *Sentā* is going to set up a help desk?" These were the questions Makino raised when I had a conversation with her before the meeting. Ishida said, "Yeah, why not! We can set up a help desk as well if necessary!" By then Makino was in the conversation. She asked more detailed questions:

> But who is going to give support to university members? Where will the help desk be set up? I know from my experiences at Kiku University, sometimes the faculty member do not feel comfortable asking questions if there is no privacy. Also, I don't think setting up a help desk from the current members of the *Sentā* is realistic. The university members expect someone to deal with their enquiries on the spot. They would not want to wait for answers. But as you know, not everyone works for the *Sentā* everyday so we have to think about that, too.

I added:

> To be honest, I don't feel confident enough to support someone with ICT. I myself am learning at the moment. From my point of view, it would only be Kuroki, Ishida, Yoshida, and Makino who would be able to support others.

Ishida said that we were very cautious and it would be better to discuss the matter with Kuroki as he was responsible for the management of the Project. Ishida mentioned that Kuroki might already have a plan for such matters. The meeting ended.

On 16 June, Kuroki, Ishida, and I had a meeting in the meeting room. We discussed the letter, handout, and all other matters. There was not much to say about the letter. He said he would check with Yamamoto about the *tetsuzuki* (formalities). After a while, Ishida mentioned

Makino's concerns. Kuroki said that Makino was too cautious, although he also said it was a good thing. He said that there would not be anyone calling our *Sentā* even if we circulated the handout. Kuroki added that if people started to contact the *Sentā* for support with ICT, then it would actually be a great opportunity for the *Sentā* to appeal to the university. Kuroki said Makino was experienced but she also needed to realize that Sakura University was different to Kiku University. The meeting ended.

On 18 June, Kuroki came to Office B to chat in the afternoon. Makino brought up the topic of the help desk and started to ask detailed questions such as which administration office would be responsible for maintaining the facilities in lecture rooms and other IT-related matters. It was the Facilities Section. Makino suggested working with the Facilities Section so that the *Sentā* would be able to give better support to the university members. She said:

> For example, if a professor calls us to ask if he can bring his own computer and use PowerPoint in his lecture, we won't be able to answer if we don't know if his lecture room has the right projector and screen. […] Maybe he has to apply for a different lecture room in order to use his computer. We need the information from the Facilities Section.

Kuroki said the Facilities Section was very conscious about their territory so they might think the *Sentā* was trying to interfere. Makino argued that, by working together, the *Sentā* and the Facilities Section might be able to reduce the workload. Kuroki hesitantly said, "To reduce the workload is not necessarily a welcome idea because people who work for the

section could lose their jobs." Makino argued that, even if that were the case, the Project members still had to think about giving the best service they could because the people who might use the support programme would not care about politics behind the scenes. Makino insisted that unless the *Sentā* prepared sufficiently to start giving support to university members, it should not be promoting the programme. Kuroki replied, "Well, you have a point but it is sometimes better to make a move first. Anyway, there won't be many people contacting us so we should be able to deal with the situation." They argued for a while but did not reach any agreement.

5.2.2 Discussion

What was the argument between Kuroki and Makino about? Makino emphasized the necessity for better preparation on the side of the *Sentā* before promoting the support programme. Her arguments were based on her previous experiences and judgement about the *Sentā*. Kuroki showed reluctance to take Makino's advice partly because he believed that barely anyone would contact the *Sentā* for support. His judgement was based on his experiences at Sakura University. As shown in the previous section, the level of consciousness as a practitioner seemed to differ among members, which affected their attitudes toward the practices of the ICT-FD Project. The differences in responses reflected

their previous experiences and professional identity.

The differences in attitudes were also observed in the way they developed online course materials. When Kuroki and Ishida developed their online materials, they used instructional design theory and argued that by using the theory their online training materials would be easier for learners to use. Their choices of topics were supported by learning theory, studies of ICT-enhanced teaching, and methods of evaluation and curriculum design. Both Kuroki and Ishida used their specialized knowledge and developing those materials was not in vain because, as Kuroki mentioned, "I can change and use these materials in my class." The applicability of skills and knowledge introduced in online materials was not discussed at all. For example, some of the materials Kuroki developed focused on creating e-learning course material. However, in order to create e-learning course material in the way Kuroki suggested, an individual has to have specific software and equipment. At that time, there was no such facility at Sakura University through which individual academics would be able to use such material. Therefore, his online course material was not applicable at Sakura University. Kuroki's justification was that one of the aims of the Project was to open up resources to the public so that other universities would also be able to use them; therefore, it was not a good idea to create context-specific materials. Makino criticized their approach as lacking

'*hosupitaritī* (hospitality)'. I asked her what she meant. She explained that '*hosupitaritī*' was one's attitude in trying to understand the person he/she is dealing with and to react in a way the person might want. In her opinion, '*hosupitaritī*' was a critical value for those who were in the position of supporting others, including *FD* practitioners. Differences in attitudes may reflect their definition of a good *FD*/SD programmes. Kuroki and Ishida put emphasis on the quality of the contents while Makino seemed to emphasize the applicability or usefulness of the contents. This is linked with each member's sense of professional values and identity. Makino was always aware of the environment that academics and non-academics were in at Sakura University and tried to think what might be useful for them to learn. She often made reference to her experiences at her previous university. At Kiku University, she was involved with establishing the computer support centre and she worked there for three years. Therefore, she said she knew how difficult it was to support and train faculty members in relation to ICT skills and knowledge. She often said:

> Faculty members are very busy and selfish. They want to learn only when they need the skill. […] Unless ICT makes it easier for them to prepare for the lectures or whatever work they might be doing, they will not use it. […] Honestly, I don't think faculty members would be interested in making e-learning course materials unless the university says that they would be able to replace their own lectures with the e-learning courses. Otherwise, what is the point! Or, for example, if it takes longer to prepare for the PowerPoint presentation, why would they be bothered to do that!

Her belief – based on her past experiences – was that faculty members only appreciate information they could use from the very next day. She often said, "If the service is good, it

sells well. *FD* is the same."

5.3 Career Prospects and Professional Identity

In the eyes of the Project members, the university did not give full (unconditional) support to the Project and the *Sentā*. A number of incidents made the contract researchers, who made up most of the *Sentā*'s researchers, feel they were in a vulnerable situation. They were under pressure to meet the requirements of the government's funding. However, the Project members were aware that the future prospects of the Project after the end of the government's funding were uncertain. Under such circumstances, how did the members make sense of what they were doing and what motivated them to work hard to get the Project going? Contract researchers worked overtime without compensation. Their regular working hours were seven hours a day but often they worked over 10 hours in the office and took work back home. Why did they do that? What was the level of fulfillment of members?

5.3.1 Uncertainty about the Future of the Project and Motivations

Difficulties with promoting the Project at Sakura University made members aware that the future of the Project was unclear. Kuroki mentioned a couple of times at the ICT-FD Project meetings that it would be impossible to run the Project without full financial support from

the university, which he doubted the university would give. Kuroki was trying to develop a strategic plan to make the university see the usefulness of the Project. However, nobody knew how he was trying to proceed with that as he kept everything secret. Ishida, Makino, and Yoshida all predicted the Project would be terminated once *GP* ended, although one of the purposes of *GP* was to help the Project create a good foundation so that it would be kept running. Completion of the Project was one of the driving forces for members to work hard. However, because of the prospect that the Project might be discontinued, members sometimes had difficulty motivating themselves: as Makino often said, "If there is no future with the Project… I don't know how to motivate myself to keep on working hard…"

There were differences in motivation between Kuroki and other Project members. For Kuroki, successful completion of the Project mattered not only because of the funding but also because it would affect the *Sentā*'s future prospects, which would then affect his personal career path. As mentioned earlier, Kuroki did not have a PhD at that time and he knew it would be difficult to find an academic post without such a degree. Kuroki reiterated his desire to stay at Sakura University permanently in conversations at various points in the year. He said he just wanted to have a stable job and he was happy with his position, pay, and working conditions. His desire to stay at Sakura University affected his decision-making.

He was aware of the importance of having the right network and connections with the right people in power in order to secure his position, which he understood from his experiences at Sakura University. Hence, he frequently talked about politics. The following episode is an example that shows how he went about conducting the Project.

In the application for *GP* funding, the *Sentā* promised to organize face-to-face workshops. The workshops employed blended learning methods by combining pre-workshop online training and face-to-face workshops to maximize the learning outcome as well as to minimize the time spent in face-to-face workshops. In April, Kuroki suggested each member come up with a workshop idea by using the online training materials each had developed. During the second meeting in May, Kuroki suggested a plan for a workshop. The topic was how to create e-learning course material. I was not sure who might want to learn such specific knowledge so I asked. Kuroki said, "I have some prospective faculty members who might be interested in this programme." According to Kuroki, the division for religious studies was planning to replace some of their lectures with e-learning courses so they wanted to learn about creating such materials. In fact, Kuroki and Ishida organized a workshop for them in 2007 upon their request. Kuroki said, "I am friends with the head of the division so I will ask if he might be interested." However, nothing happened in regard to the workshop

after that. In November, I asked Kuroki about it. He said he had not had the chance to discuss it with the head of the division for religious studies. In December, I asked again about the workshop. Kuroki gave me the same answer. In January 2009, I asked the same question. This time Kuroki said that it would be difficult to organize such a workshop because he was busy.

There are several points to pay attention to in this episode. First, Kuroki came up with the idea of the workshop knowing that he would be doing a favour to the division of religious studies. Sakura University is a Christian university and treats religious study as compulsory for all students. Therefore, the division of religious studies was a core section of the university. By working with the division, Kuroki would be able to promote the Project and the *Sentā* to the university. He would be able to create a network with faculty members in religious studies, which would be advantageous for him in relation to keeping his position at Sakura University. Second, one of the challenges of organizing a workshop was to attract a sufficient number of participants. In order to attract university members, the Project members had to consider the needs of university members very carefully. In Kuroki's suggested plan, he was strategic about picking a topic that the division for religious studies would need. This approach was possible only because Kuroki had been involved with Sakura

University for many years. Third, Kuroki sounded passive about the workshop. It sounded as if he was waiting for the division for religious studies to approach him. It was possible that he was trying to avoid standing out by making a move, as he said repeatedly "It seems it is not a good time for the *Sentā* to do anything that would make it conspicuous." Finally, Kuroki gave priority to other factors instead of achieving the plan of the Project.

Unlike Kuroki, contract researchers were clear about their fixed-term contracts; therefore, it was natural to think they would not pay much attention to the future of the *Sentā*. However, it was important for them to run the Project successfully because other universities would judge their abilities by looking at the Project. Also, there were many opportunities for Project members to talk about the Project in public, such as at open forums, seminars, and conferences. These opportunities influenced contract researchers' attitudes toward the Project. Moreover, differences in attitudes toward the Project also came from the time spent on the Project. Kuroki was involved with many other projects and he also had a course to teach. However, Makino and I, for example, spent all of our working hours on the Project. Therefore, the various *Sentā* members showed different levels of commitment to the Project.

5.3.2 Lived Experiences and Professional Values

The Project members organized several workshops. During the time I was at the *Sentā*, it was only at the workshops that Project members had a chance to work with university members directly. Those workshops were open to other universities. As a result, more than 60% of participants were from other universities. The experiences of the Project members acting as facilitators at those workshops had an impact on the members' professional identities. For example, at one workshop we introduced methods for using PowerPoint to enhance students' learning. Makino and I acted both as instructors and facilitators. At the beginning of the workshop, Makino introduced herself as a specialist in educational technology and referred to me as a specialist in higher education and *FD*. She used the term '*senmonka*', which literally means a specialist or an expert. This label '*senmonka*' gives a certain authority to the person. During the workshop, the participants expected, for example, Makino to know all about educational technology and to give them the best advice about the use of PowerPoint, as well as to be able to provide various examples of the use of PowerPoint in classroom teaching at Sakura University. It was not appropriate for Project members to use their position at Sakura University as an excuse for not knowing much about Sakura University. To the participants, the Project members were *senmonka* who would be prepared to give guidance and advice to them. The experience of running workshops raised

the sense of responsibility, which contributed to forming the practitioners' identities. After the workshop, the Project members talked about the needs they identified and potential themes for the next workshop. They also talked about how they might better prepare for the workshop and be a better facilitator. The impact of lived experiences challenged the way the Project members saw their professional identities and values. They were naturally discussing issues from the viewpoint of participants. This made me understand why Makino had a strong tendency to think from a practitioner's point of view when she was developing online training materials and themes for workshops. Her years of experiences as a member of the support staff in the computer centre at Kiku University had developed her professional identity as a practitioner. Whether she was aware of her practitioner's identity or not is a question but the way she always questioned the Project from the faculty's point of view indicated the practitioner's view was embedded in her professional values. This fact made her different from all other Project members, who had no experience of giving support to university staff members.

The experience of acting as a practitioner also created a dilemma. A *FD* programme that is useful to faculty members does not necessarily contribute to research outcomes. Many *FD* practitioners, like the Project members, hold an academic post, which means they are under

pressure to produce research as well as to provide useful *FD*. For example, a professor who acted as *FD* practitioner at a private university said to me, "I wish I only had the role of a practitioner or a faculty member. Then I could focus on the job." This was a comment he made after visiting a centre for teaching and learning at a university in the UK. There, he saw staff members working professionally as support staff. I talk more about the dilemma *FD* practitioners face in Chapter Six. What I want to point out here is that thinking purely about providing *FD* programmes that fit the needs of the faculty and administrative members may promote institutional faculty development, but *FD* practitioners are under pressure to carry out academic research as well. This is an issue triggered by having two professional identities, as both an academic and a practitioner. The Project members had to meet various demands. Sometimes, they had to prioritize which activities to put more of their efforts into. In a way, they had to decide whether to focus on developing their identity as a practitioner or as an academic.

Ultimately, though, it depended on the individual how he/she separated, combined, perceived, or ignored the role as an academic and a practitioner. How did they define his/her role? What were the things that influenced his/her definition of professional identity? I began to focus on the use of the term '*gyōmu*', which means 'duty'. The way the Project members used '*gyōmu*'

suggested each individual's perception about the work he/she was involved in. The use of '*gyōmu*' indicated the individual did not consider the work as something beneficial to them academically but as something he/she had to do as part of the job. The difference between work considered '*gyōmu*' and that which was not lay in the different levels of commitment. For example, Sano gave me advice in April that I should just decide what to do during the year; otherwise, I would waste time dealing with *gyōmu.* Here, Sano meant work not related to teaching or research. He said, "When I joined the *Sentā*, no one explained to me what I should be doing. So I kept quiet and observed for a couple of months and decided what my own work would be." Some members used '*gyōmu*' when carrying out seminars and workshops as part of the Project, which indicated for them that a researcher's identity was central. Ishida and Yoshida put emphasis on the research part of the Project and established themselves as researchers instead of practitioners. Ishida always talked about potential research during the meetings. He told contract researchers, "Don't lose yourself in *gyōmu*. Make sure you carry on the research. You must use the opportunity here to build your research outcomes." In his view, as all of the junior members of the *Sentā* were on a fixed-term contract, in order to find a new position the members had to build their research profiles. He knew from his experience that activities such as organizing *FD* workshops would not help an individual to find an academic post. Therefore, he considered duties

including running the Project as *gyōmu*. Kuroki and Yoshida shared a similar understanding. By putting an emphasis on the research component of the Project and their work, Kuroki, Ishida, and Yoshida seemed to accept the working conditions. Financial issues related to the Project also had an impact on their views. They knew they had little possibility of working on the Project once the government's funding ended because they did not think the university would allocate the budget to continue the Project. Therefore, they naturally paid attention to building their own profiles.

Makino had a slightly different view. She also was concerned about her next job, but her experience of running a similar Project at Kiku University reminded her of the joy she got out of the work. This is what she said:

> I enjoyed the work at Kiku University. We spent hours discussing ways to improve and promote our office. …when we discussed we brought in our expertise to analyse the situation… I think there will always be a need to support the use of educational technology…

The project she was involved in at Kiku University continues to offer services even today; therefore, she knew there was a possibility that the university would continue the Project if it was truly useful. Whether she wanted to continue working at Sakura University or not was unclear, but in her view it was worth making an effort to make the Project as useful as possible, which meant the Project members needed to show '*hosupitarithī* (hospitality)' and

offer steady services until university members became convinced about the usefulness of these services. Therefore, she did not treat running the Project as merely *gyōmu*. For her, *gyōmu* meant unnecessary paperwork. She also did not make a distinction between being a practitioner and an academic, something I will discuss further in Chapter Six.

Conclusion

This chapter attempted to describe multiple elements that affected each member's decision-making and way of thinking about the Project. I identified the effects of personal trajectories, career prospects, lived experiences as *senmonka*, and professional values on how each member went about the role of *FD* practitioner and running the Project. There is no simple cause-and-effect relationship among each element. From the university's perspective, it is understandable that they deferred their judgement about the *Sentā* and the Project in order to sustain the organizational culture. There was no guarantee that the Project would be beneficial for the university without seeing the outcome. On the other hand, it is also understandable that the Project members were eagerly seeking institutional support because their time was limited and they needed to achieve the outcomes they had promised to achieve in the proposal for government funding. At the same time, from the perspective of the contract researchers, they were hired on yearly contracts; therefore, they were even more

anxious about making progress on the Project. It was hard for them to understand why the university would not support the Project. The Project members thought that by creating online course materials on the use of educational technology to support teaching and learning and other related topics university members would be able to watch these materials whenever they wanted and wherever they were. The Project was designed in such a way to give autonomy to university members instead of imposing *FD* in face-to-face seminars and workshops. In the eyes of the Project members, it was a win–win situation for the university as institutionalized *FD* was mandated but they were able to give choices to faculty members. They made the assumption that there was some kind of power game behind the scenes about the position of the *Sentā* in the university, but whatever the true reason might have been it was beyond the Project members' abilities to deal with the situation.

Once they found out that the university was not providing much support to the Project, the Project members took different paths to deal with their given roles. Makino, who had experience of providing a *FD* service to faculty members, put the emphasis on the practitioner's role in order to make the Project as useful as possible. Kuroki, who was seeking to establish his career path at Sakura University, used the Project as a means of playing politics. Ishida and Yoshida did what they had to do with the Project and spent the

rest of the time on research to help them find an academic post. Eventually, only Makino and I were dealing with the Project and the others faded away. Ishida became responsible for another funding project so he eventually withdrew from the Project team. Yoshida also became busy with other responsibilities so he rarely came to the office. Kuroki focused only on the development of the Learning Management System for the Project.

Uncertainties about the prospects of the Project affected the motivation of Project members. Generally speaking, all the members were not so keen on promoting the Project any more towards the end of the year. It was interaction with university members through workshops and other occasions that encouraged the Project members. The participants of the workshops usually showed satisfaction and appreciation for the learning opportunity, which helped the Project members to see the usefulness of their activities. Although the future prospects of the Project were uncertain, the Project members were able to see that the role of *FD* practitioner was not meaningless.

In the next chapter, I follow Makino's encounter with *FD* practitioners from various other universities. Her interaction with those practitioners and experiences at various different networks and academic societies reveals what is being imagined among *FD* practitioners in

Japan.

Chapter Six: Identity and Career Issues of Junior Academics as *FD Tantōsha*

Introduction

Chapters Four and Five introduced the life of the Project members within Sakura University. Descriptions of the members' everyday life identified multiple elements that created a complex working environment the members had to live in. To deal with the complexities and fulfil their duties, and to also manage their individual career path, each member began to rely on individual past experiences, professional values, and career prospects to make decisions about their work and professional identity. It became an isolated experience, especially for the contract researchers who were also excluded from the community of Sakura University. Hence, their interaction with other *FD* practitioners from various universities became important to gain information, reflect on the situation they were in, and to foresee the future development of *FD*. Therefore, we now move on to look at *FD* practitioners in relation to their various networks and communities.

In general, *FD* practitioners were called *FD tantōsha*, which means a person responsible for *FD*. For example, the network for *FD* practitioners in Tokushima prefecture is called '*Tokushimakenka FD tantōsha kaigi.*' The Office for Educational Planning and Research at

Ehime University publishes a handbook for *FD* practitioners titled '*FD tantōsha hikkei manuaru* (Must-have manual for FD practitioners)'. But '*FD tantōsha*' is a multifaceted term to describe the role and responsibilities of the position. '*FD tantōsha*' can be a full-time or a part-time position. It can imply an individual has expertise in *FD* or does not. It can be the name of the position or a label of a profession. Therefore, '*FD tantōsha*' creates a semantic space for *FD* practitioners to negotiate their professional identity and territory in the land of higher education. I argue that the term '*FD tantōsha*' is a key term to identify questions regarding professional identity among *FD* practitioners. As a new 'profession', the *FD tantōsha* exists on the periphery of the higher education landscape. It is natural reaction for *FD tantōsha*, especially those in their twenties and thirties, to need to make sense of their experiences and to develop their professional identity and career path, as we saw in Chapter Five. Their use of language, expressions, and choices reflect their interpretation of their experiences. Their decisions about who to relate to and socialize with and how to inhabit their given role reflect their efforts to situate the work of *FD* within the changing landscape of higher education and their identity. This chapter attempts to capture the efforts of junior academics acting as *FD tantōsha* to make sense of this new role and of the factors that affect their decision-making. Hereafter I use *FD tantōsha* to describe *FD* practitioners.

In particular, I draw on the case of Makino. Makino's experience is particularly critical because she had no prior knowledge of the field of educational studies, *FD*, and the people involved. She is the 'outsider' entering a new field and feeling it to be 'unhomely' (Bhabha cited in Manathunga, 2007). Makino was searching for a 'comfortable place', as she expressed it, to situate herself in this new field and establish her identity; thus, she tried to make sense of the field by observing, discussing, and comparing it with her original disciplinary background of physics. I begin the chapter with Makino's narrative (Section 6.1). My analysis of her situation is supported by observations at various seminars, workshops, and conferences on faculty development, together with in-depth interviews that I conducted over two years with 25 *FD tantōsha* and academics[20] (Section 6.2).

My analysis of interview data showed that the life of junior academics is full of uncertainties, which further push them to wonder about their identity and career. First, I discuss this generation's experience as a backdrop to allow better understanding of their discussions. I go on to introduce different experiences in dealing with this new identity and role as a *FD tantōsha*. The first is the story of one *FD tantōsha's* decision to understand and promote the role as a new professional identity by using the term '*FDer* (*fakaruthī diberoppā*, faculty

[20] Please see the Appendix 5 for information about interviewees.

developer)'. The concept of the '*FDer'* stirred up discussion about identity and career among junior academics. The second is the story of junior academics treated as specialists and known as a '*FD senmonka* (*FD* specialist)'. They express unsettled feelings about this title, because of the gap between their expertise and the impression that the term *FD senmonka* gives to others. The last is the story of the Japan Faculty Development Network for Junior Researchers (JFDN Jr). It gives the example of junior academics who decided to adopt the relatively neutral label of *FD tantōsha*. The notions of 'identity' and 'community', from which Makino's story was constructed, connect aspects of the interdisciplinary subject and academic identity, community and individual decision making, the response to government policy, and the formation of a 'new' academic profession. The example of *FD tantōsha* thus illustrates more general themes in the study of the academic profession, both in Japan and more broadly.

6.1 Makino's Story

Makino has a doctorate in physics. Since completing her doctorate degree, she carried on her research in physics in addition to working at different universities, where she worked as an ICT assistant, a lecturer in IT literacy, and a contract researcher for the ICT-FD Project. In Japan, it is often the case that people with doctorates with a science background who are

unable to find an academic job in their disciplinary fields to go on to teach IT literacy to undergraduate students.[21] She was a member of a physics research group at Kiku University where she received her doctorate, so she usually worked until 19:00 or 20:00 at Sakura University and went to Kiku University to research after work or on Saturdays.

In getting involved with *FD*, Makino had two options: to treat *FD* as '*gyōmu*' or practice *FD* and carry out research based on the practice. As I mentioned in Chapter Four, '*gyōmu*' literally means 'business affairs' and 'duties'. In the context of Japanese universities, academics use '*gyōmu*' to refer to anything that has nothing to do with academic work such as research and teaching. It also implies that the work is allocated to them as part of their duties to the university. For example, some academics call the centre responsible for *FD* the '*gyōmu*' *sentā*', because *FD* is neither research nor teaching. This is another reason why a *sentā kyōin* (academic working for a centre) is considered to not be a real academic. Makino did not want to see *FD* as *gyōmu* because she did not want to just carry out necessary tasks to fulfil her job responsibility. She chose to treat *FD* as part of her academic work and integrate research into practice.

[21] In the case of graduates with a humanities and or social sciences background, usually teaching English as a part part-time lecturer is an option.

Her dilemma was whether to continue her research in physics and try to find an academic position in her discipline or concentrate on *FD* and change her academic field to education. She said:

> The job market for academic positions in physics is fierce and I know it would be just impossible to find an academic position in physics. I know that I am not an excellent researcher in physics. It is a fact. My mentor suggested that I should stop my research altogether and focus on other possibilities. But once I stop researching in physics, I would lose contact with physics *gyōkai*[22]. I don't know if that's what I want.

She expressed a strong sense of belonging to the field of physics. G*akkai* (academic society) is an integral part of academics' life in Japan, not only for academic reasons but also as a place for networking and training and mentoring the next generation of researchers. In the case of Makino, she had been involved with the physics *gakkai* since she was doing her Master's degree. She knew most of the researchers in her particular field very well. For her, the *gakkai* was like a big family. In fact, she sometimes called her mentor '*otōsan*', which literally means 'father'. What her expression reveals, though, is that Makino thinks her research activities make her part of the community; therefore, once she stops she is afraid she will no longer be a part of it anymore.

I asked her why she needed to consider having education as her new academic field instead

[22] '*Gyōkai*' literally means 'the business world' and 'the industry'. When academics use this term it either means the field of specialization, the academic society, or higher education more broadly.

of just carrying out *FD* activities. She explained that she was trained to be a researcher so whatever work she did, she would naturally be trying to understand and analyse the situation, the mechanisms, and to suggest better way of doing things. This meant she needed to have a place to present her research. She said:

> I don't want to practice *FD* as just *gyōmu*. If I have to do routine work, I would rather not get involved. If I can dig and find some kind of …what I would call in physics *shinri* (truth) or how and why certain things work and other things do not work, then that's the time I find my job interesting. Then, I do not mind the *gyōmu*.

She added that in order to deal with academics, it would be best for her to be an academic: "A patient would understand best the feelings of other patients." This was one of her core beliefs about the position of *FD tantōsha*. She expressed a similar view when she discussed *SD* at Sakura University (see Chapter Three). She mentioned the benefit of having experience of working as an administrator as a background to working with administrators, because she thought it meant she better understands them.

Another point to be considered for Makino was her choice of academic field. As explained previously, she was trained in physics. However, in her perception, in order for her to sustain her academic identity while carrying out *FD* practices, she needed to have an academic forum where she would be able to present her research on *FD*. At that time, there were three *gakkai* where *FD tantōsha* presented their research on *FD*: the Liberal and General

Education Society of Japan (LGES), the Japan Association of Higher Education Research (JAHER), and the Japan Society for Educational Technology (JSET). There were also some regional consortiums where *FD tantōsha* were able to report on their activities, such as the Consortium of Universities in Kyoto and the Nagoya Consortium for Faculty and Staff Development. Those *gakkai* and networks all served different purposes. Makino gained her understanding of the 'landscape' of *FD* by attending meetings and conferences, talking with people, and observing their practices. In other words, she was searching for her new 'community' so that she would be able to work on building her career in it. She was in her late 30s, so she wanted to find a tenured position and, as she put it, 'settle'.

As for her new academic field, she was considering the field of educational technology. By the end of her first two years at Sakura University, she had done three presentations at JSET conferences, so she was gaining confidence. Her concern with the field was that, "I still don't understand what it means to specialize in the field of educational technology and I don't know if I am attracted enough." She found the field of educational technology and physics were fundamentally different in terms of the structure of the body of knowledge. Thus, she found it hard to understand how one could be a good researcher in the field of educational technologies. I will discuss this point more deeply later in this chapter. In the end,

she decided not to quit her research in physics but continues to seek research topics while practicing *FD* because, "I think having a disciplinary background is beneficial for me in this interdisciplinary field of education. I need to have a backbone to rely on." How did she come to her conclusion? What are her understandings of 'discipline' and 'academic identity'? What are the differences Makino identified between physics and the field of educational technology and what do they mean to her? Finally, through her interactions with other *FD tantōsha* and academics in educational studies, what kind of landscape of *FD* has Makino drawn and how does it affect her decision making about her future?

6.2 Situation of Junior Academics

6.2.1 Making Sense of the Status Quo and Shared Experiences

After the introduction of *FD* in 1990s, there was what *FD tantōsha* call a '*FD baburu* (bubble)' in the academic job market. The use of 'bubble' indicates that they predicted it would burst sooner or later. Universities created full-time posts typically in the centre for university education and in many cases hired PhD students or junior academics in educational studies or higher education studies before they completed their PhD thesis or right after completion. Their specializations were varied: motivation, pre-school education, higher education policy, educational technology, and curriculum development. In Japan,

once a doctoral student completes three years of course work, he/she tends to leave the university with the title *hakase katei mannki taigaku* ('completion of PhD course work') and start working. Generally speaking, PhD students can only stay in the programme up to eight years, although they hold the right to submit their thesis after this. When a student submits and passes their oral examination, he/she finally receives their doctorate. Those junior academics who start to work before completing a doctoral thesis are therefore pressured to get the degree, otherwise the university is not able to promote them any further. Similarly, junior academics with doctorates are under pressure to build a research profile.

Another element that seems to affect junior academics' identity and profession is the university's strong emphasis on the '*jissen* (practice)' instead of '*kenkyū* (research)' part of *FD*. The universities are mandated to have institutionalized *FD*, which means they need to be able to prove that they do carry out *FD* practices:

> The university sees *FD tantōsha* as *sokusenryoku* (i.e. able to complete tasks immediately) so they are expected to do a good job immediately. They don't even have time to stop and think what their specialties might be.
>
> Saito, a professor and *FD tantōsha*

As a result, junior academics tend to feel they are expected to 'do' something from the day they are hired. Sometimes, they are told to do so. Tanaka, a *FD tantōsha* at a national university, said:

> During the job interview, the interviewer told me not to carry out any research between 9:00 and 5:00 because the post [that Tanaka applied for] was created to

> carry out '*jissen* (practice)'. So I told him that I am trained to research and it is impossible for me not to research.

She negotiated with the interviewer to give her a desk and a computer so that she would be able to research after working hours. Many junior academics mentioned the difficulties of keeping their research profile while dealing with *jissen*, but understanding the importance of having a good publication record they often faced the stress of balancing the two.

Inevitably, junior academics in *FD* tend to carry out practice-based research such as the one Makino carried out titled 'Promotion of education with ICT by supporting interactions between academic staff and non-academic staff'. As explained earlier, the academic backgrounds of junior academics are varied and therefore these practice-based research topics do not necessarily reflect their original specialties. The purpose of the research tends to be to improve the effectiveness of '*jissen* (practice)' and at the same time to give credibility to their practice. However, some senior academics do not see this practice-based research as proper research. During the buffet dinner at the 10th Annual JAHER Conference, a professor in sociology of education mentioned to another professor in conversation that there was too much practice-based research, too many '*sentā kyōin*' (an academic affiliated with a centre and not a faculty), and too little research with a sound academic foundation. He said many of the presentations are just '*jissen hōkoku*' (a practice reportage). Saito

commented:

> As a practitioner, one would not take risks. […] Junior academics in *FD* tend to learn how to practice *FD*. As a result, they end up acquiring techniques to practice *FD* but might not have the chance to learn to expand their epistemological awareness to understand the situation on a conceptual level. That worries me.

Tanaka remembered having been criticized for being in between a '*kenkyūsya* (a researcher)' and '*jissenka* (a practitioner)' because of her approach to research. She did her postgraduate degree at an institution famous for its research-intensive approach. She said:

> I remember when I was in the first year of the PhD programme and I was asked to choose if I would later be a *kenkyūsya* (a researcher) or a *jissenka* (a practitioner). It was such a tough question because I thought even if I become *kenkyūsya* I still wanted to get involved with the practice. […] Now I look back and think that it was not a good question to ask. The generation above us who have received traditional training to be *kenkyūsya* would probably find it hard to understand but my generation of *kenkyūsya* is kind of standing between the practitioner's position and the *kenkyūsya*. […] In a way I am a 'new type' of *kenkyūsya*. […] I think these tendencies are proof of a changing environment around the university.

Tanaka indicates that senior academics consider *jissen* and *kenkyū* to be two separate things. In their eyes, one can either be a *kenkyūsya* or *jissenka*, a view with which she disagrees. Tanaka takes it as a challenge to convince the senior generation of academics that acting both as a practitioner and a researcher and including practitioners' viewpoints into research is the new approach in the field of educational studies. This quote implies that junior academics are in tune with what they see as the changing nature of the academic profession whilst senior academics question junior academics' credentials as *kenkyūsya*.

Junior academics who act as *FD tantōsha* share a lot in common, such as their sense of the uncertainties of the position, academic identity, and career path. Because they are starting their career in untypical and new academic posts, their main discussions when they meet tend to be about their professional identity and career path. They often face difficulties because they have to handle *FD*-related work that has no defined boundary, which leads them to be responsible for multiple tasks. They are only juniors with little experience in the university, but the position of *FD tantōsha* forces them to deal with senior academics. In addition, the *FD tantōsha* position is not a traditional position in the university because it is neither an academic nor an administrative position, meaning there are no role models or career paths to follow and often they are not even affiliated with faculties. Naturally, junior academics acting as *FD tantōsha* began to link with each other to share their experiences and concerns. On top of that, *FD* was not well defined, which made their work even more complicated.

Makino realized that her dilemma about career and identity was not unique to her case after interacting with junior academics on various occasions. These lived experiences contribute greatly to the formation of their view on the profession, including its responsibilities, expected knowledge and skills, and ethics. Junior academics, in that sense, have similar

experiences that lead them to construct a collective voice, culture and identity. Inevitably, their view and understanding of *FD*, the role of a university, and university education is different from academics in their fifties, which was something perceived by both junior and senior academics.

Japan experienced a second 'baby boom' between 1971 and 1974, with its peak in 1973. People born then are called '*dankai no sedai junia* (baby-boom generation junior)' and Makino falls in this category. Makino often described her generation as an unlucky generation because, "We had to survive examination hell but when we were in the third year of our undergraduate programmes, the economy crashed so we then had to survive '*shūshoku hyōgaki* (the ice age in the job market)'." This generation of junior academics seemed to have a sense of crisis regarding universities. After this generation, the number of children being born started to decrease. Therefore, in the 1990s universities were beginning to worry about their own survival, especially private universities. There was an estimate that 40% of private universities would eventually go bankrupt because of the shortage of students. About 70% of Japanese universities are private universities and they rely on students' fees as their main income. With the number of children decreasing, universities stopped hiring new faculty but instead increased the number of academics on fixed contracts. Those lecturers'

positions with contracts were often for courses for first-year students such as foreign languages and IT literacy. In other words, those in peripheral positions in the university were badly affected, but not the ones in the faculties. Understanding the tough academic job market, junior academics tend to build their research and teaching profiles by trying to get involved with research projects, publish as many articles as possible, and carry out other activities such as teaching part time and working outside of the university. As such, current junior academics were affected from the beginning of their career, which led them to think that they needed to work hard and do well in whatever position they found themselves in, in addition to their research. Kobayashi, *FD tantōsha* at a private university in her thirties, expressed her concerns: "I actually am not sure if I want to stay in academia. It feels impossible for me to deal with all the demands and still manage to find the time to produce my own research outcomes." In a way, they do not have the boundary to protect themselves from the expectations coming at them from various directions because they are not in a faculty or, in other words, in the traditional discipline-based academic territory.

At the same time, junior academics seem to take it for granted that they should make efforts to make the university appealing to students by improving the lectures, curriculum, and welfare, as well as opening up information to the public. As a result, a junior researcher from

a private university said:

> Junior academics have a better understanding of the reality. Senior academics once had an easy life. What I mean is that they were able to focus on their research and not worry about the survival of the university. They didn't have to worry about the career path of students because the economy was growing. So, it would be difficult for them to change their view.
>
> Kimura, *FD tantōsha*

In other words, junior researchers are more sensitive to the pressure from society to prove universities' usefulness. As a result, *FD tantōsha* both young and old say, "In ten years' time, those *shinkaigyo* (deep-sea fish) will retire and the atmosphere of the university will change." '*Shinkaigyo*' was the term used to describe senior academics with a tenure position who did not respond to any efforts that an *FD tantōsha* made to improve university education, never attending any of seminars or workshops. One complained:

> There was this professor who argued that when he was hired the university wanted him to produce good research outcomes so his obligation is to do research and nothing else. How can I argue with this kind of professor!?

The *shinkaigyo* issue was often discussed in the seminars and workshops about FD, but recently *FD tantōsha* seem to agree that the best way to deal with *shinkaigyo* is to ignore them. They are protected because they have a tenure position, meaning the best *FD tantōsha* can do is wait until they retire. It is an interesting point to pay attention to that junior academics seem to agree that the issue of *shinkaigyo* is a generational issue. They do not seem to think that there could be *shinkaigyo* among academics of their generation and that the key factor might be to do with the nature of the academic profession in Japan.

Kimura talked about his junior high school friends who were not able to enter universities and said:

> …so it made me think about the responsibilities academics have as both an educator and a researcher in this society. […] I want to make a small contribution to the people of the same generation and the younger generation, and to innovation in society.[23]

This kind of view was shared among this generation of junior academics, creating an unspoken shared value in being an academic and an understanding of the academic profession. Having similar experiences and values, Makino expected to find a community of people she would be able to work with among those junior academics.

6.2.2 '*On*' and '*Shigarami*'

Makino soon recognized that many of the junior academics acting as *FD tantōsha* were graduates of Kyoto University. This made her look at the relation between the universities from which *FD tantōsha* graduated and their choice of affiliation with different types of academic communities. Those communities represented different approaches to and methods for *FD* and the role of *FD tantōsha*. Therefore, for junior academics, the community with which they were associated shaped the way they expressed their viewpoint about *FD*.

For example, there are two distinct schools of thought about the approach to *FD* that have

[23] This is taken from the follow follow-up e-mail conversation on 20 July 2009.

become influential in Japan. The two major divisions of approaches were '*dōryō-gata FD* (collegial *FD*)', represented by the Centre for Promotion of Excellence in Higher Education at Kyoto University (CPEHE), and '*senmonka-gata FD* (*FD* led by an expert)', represented by the Office for Educational Planning and Research at Ehime University (OPAR).

CPEHE claimed FD should take place in everyday setting within a collegial culture and that *FD tantōsha* should also be academics. They emphasizes the importance of peer learning and criticizes event style *FD*. What they claim is that those workshops and seminars detached from their daily context hardly make impact on their day-to-day teaching activities. Therefore, advocates of the CPEHE approach opposed seeing *FD tantōsha* as a specialist profession and regular academics as customers receiving a service. They emphasized the importance of research-based *FD* and that *FD tantōsha* should be *kenkyūsha* (researchers).

OPAR, on the other hand, emphasized the benefit of having a full-time *FD tantōsha* to improve students' experiences in the university and promoted the professional development of *FD tantōsha*. CPEHE and OPAR publicly criticized each other's approach, attracted supporters, and became influential in the field. Those *FD tantōsha* who graduated from Kyoto University tended to support the approach of CPEHE, although they were not strongly

opposed to the OPAR's approach. Yamada, a senior researcher in higher education, analysed this response, saying "They are probably waiting to see what might be the best option for them in terms of their future career development." His analysis was accurate to some extent because of the practice of recruitment. Although Japanese universities have a public recruitment process in place, first-hand information about an *FD* practitioner's position is often offered through personal contacts. Kato, *FD tantōsha* at a national university, said it was understandable because of the nature of the position:

> *FD tantōsha* have to deal with administrators and faculty members at the university a lot. So it is critical for the practitioner to be good at communication and also to be tough. These kinds of qualities are hard to see from the job interview alone. Also often *FD tantōsha* work as a team so if they have totally different approaches to *FD*, it would be just disaster.

In fact, many junior academics found their first position as a *FD tantōsha* through the introduction of his/her supervisor or seniors. For Makino, finding out about those fractions was new and also it was surprising to find out how the connection played a critical role in receiving information, finding a job, and being invited to participate in research projects. However, career development was not the only factor that influenced the decisions of junior academics about *FD* approaches and methods.

Judging from the interviews, the sense of '*on*' – which means one's feeling of gratitude –

seems to play a critical role in deciding one's position among different communities. Kato, Sasaki, and Kimura all mentioned the existence of senior academics who helped them with their career path. They all changed the field of studies in their postgraduate courses due to unexpected reasons, which forced them to look for someone else to give them supervision. Comments like the following were commonplace:

> I owe Professor X because he/she helped me, motivated me, and invited me to join the research project when I didn't have anyone to rely on. I feel I need to do *on gaeshi* (pay him back).

Kuroki and Ishida from Sakura University also expressed similar views about Noda. They remembered how Noda helped them and invited them to work with him when they were PhD students, meaning they felt the need to support him back. As such, the sense of '*on*' creates a moral responsibility. It is not just about showing one's appreciation. When those junior academics expressed their sense of '*on*', it also meant their sense of obligation to pay the person back or a deep-seated loyalty. This sense of 'obligation' sometimes created '*shigarami*', which prevented people from making decisions and taking actions without considering what others might react. '*Shigarami*' literally means the 'ties' and 'bonds' that connect a person to a person, to a family, to a community, to an organization, to a society, and so on. '*Shigarami*' is often used to express a situation where one's decisions and actions are restricted or affected by the ties binding the person to something. Kuroki expressed the

sense of '*on*' as well as '*shigarami*' to Noda because he felt the sense of '*on*' restricted his decision to reject Noda's favour. As a result, Kuroki felt '*shigarami*' to Noda affected his performance at work. At the same time, '*shigarami*' seems to indicate a sense of acceptance of the situation, especially when it exists in the community. The feeling of '*shigarami*' indicates one is a member of the community. For example, Makino said:

> The fact that you and I do not have any affiliation in the field of higher education, educational technology, and *FD* makes it possible for us to do things freely because we both do not have *shigarami*.

Her quote was positive, but she realized that not having *shigarami* also meant she was an outsider in the fields of higher education, educational technology, and *FD*.

This section described the situation that junior academics were in and some of the elements that seemed to affect their viewpoints and decisions about their academic identity and career path. Junior academics are in a newly created position, face a tougher job market, are pressured to act as *FD tantōsha* as well as to have a good research profile, and find themselves bound to certain fractions within the field. They are in a complicated situation. In the following sections, I introduce one case in which one junior academic made the decision to create a new professional label and identity, namely '*FDer* (faculty developer)'. It highlights the noncommittal position of other junior academics and the reasons for their

hesitation around making clear claims about their identity and profession.

6.3 FDer: Creating a New Career Path

One of the concepts that stirred up the discussion about the role of *FD* practitioners is '*FDer*', representing the idea of the role of the faculty developer as a profession. The concept of *FDer* introduced a new way of understanding the role and its career advancement. Wada is known to be the person who introduced and has been actively promoting the idea of the *FDer* in Japan. In this section, I describe how he came to see himself as a *FDer*. I conducted in-depth interviews, attended his workshops and seminars, and had conversations over a period of three years since I first met him in 2007. He is in his late 30s and therefore he is in the same generation as other junior academics but unlike others he made the decision to create his own career path. What was the drive for him? What made it possible for him to make the decision? I then explore what junior academics including Makino think about the idea of the *FDer*. It became clear that *FD tantōsha* are not against the professionalization of faculty development practitioners but that many resist calling themselves *FDer*.

6.3.1 Wada's Story

Wada is an associate professor at Hinoki University. He joined that institution as a lecturer in

the centre for university education in 2002 after completing the PhD coursework but not his PhD thesis. His main task was *FD*. His original research interest during his postgraduate programme was vocational education. Therefore, he did not have '*shigarami*' binding him to a particular senior academic in the field of *FD*. In addition, he got the position at Hinoki University by applying for a publicly advertised position, which indicates he did not have to feel '*on*' in getting the job.

Office of Educational Development (OED), where Wada works as the vice head, provides various forms of support to faculty members in the university, such as personal consultation, workshops, and seminars on teaching techniques and issues related to education and students and for support departments and faculties to organize own activities to improve education. OED also organizes public seminars and a regional forum for *FD tantōsha* at other universities. OED has sections with separate responsibilities and focus.

I visited OED in 2007 for the first time. At that time, OED was not enjoying the reputation it has today within and outside Hiroki University. Wada's name was only just becoming known among *FD tantōsha*. The office was situated on the third or fourth floor in one of the buildings on the main campus. The corridor was dimly lit with the light coming through the

windows. With the grey door of the office shut, it did not have a welcoming atmosphere. I walked into the office and the assistant took me to the other meeting room, where they displayed their publications. I talked about my initial impression when I had a chance to talk with Wada in 2010. He smiled and replied that the office had moved to a better place.

During the interview, I asked about his reasons for promoting the professionalization of *FD tantōsha*. According to him, it was a natural reaction drawn from his years of experiences as a practitioner. When he started to work as a practitioner, there was no role model and he was not sure what was under his responsibility and what was not. The university brought everything related to university education and students to OED, such as students' evaluation of lectures, students' consultation, curriculum development, orientation for newly appointed lecturers, and organizing seminars and workshops about teaching skills. He was overwhelmed with the work during the first few years. As he developed a better understanding of his role, he began to create a boundary around the *FD tantōsh*a'*s* work. It took seven years for him to restructure the office and prioritize tasks. Therefore, at first his motivation came from the desire to sort out his job responsibilities.

Then he began to realize that in order to be a responsible practitioner, he needed to gain

more specialized knowledge. For example, it was stressful for him to talk well in front of experienced professors about teaching. He said cheekily: "I even changed the way I dress and present myself. For example, I learnt how consultants dress and changed my wardrobe so that I look trustworthy and confident." He clearly expressed his commitment to carrying out *jissen* well. He also recognized it was not a kind of work one can do while working as a regular academic, which requires one to research and teach. He began to search for a role model and naturally investigated the situation in the USA and the UK because the term 'faculty development' was imported from these countries:

> At first I used the term '*FD faciritētā* (facilitator)' because '*faciritētā*' sounded right for what I was doing at that time. Then I came across with the term 'faculty developer' when I attended the POD conference in the USA. I decided to use 'faculty developer' because the term has a stronger impression. In order to make the work of *FD tantōsha* seen in public, I began to use 'faculty developer' intentionally.

He paid attention to the models of faculty development in the USA and began to interact with them by visiting them. He began to build a model for a *FDer*.

I asked what might be the necessary elements that a person should possess in order to be a good *FDer*. I said, "It seems you must have '*netsui* (passion)' for what you are doing." He said:

> I don't understand why people talk about '*netsui* (passion)' as the critical element of being a faculty development practitioner. […] For me, it is my job and I think about how to carry out my job well. Of course, having *netsui* (passion) is important as a

> practitioner but it can't be everything. […] I want to understand what kind of profession *FDer* is and what a *FDer* needs to have as professional knowledge and skills.

Listening to his answer made me realize my own prejudice. When I asked the question, I had a thought that academics who act as *FD tantōsha* were doing extra work, which was why I suspected they would need to be motivated with '*netsui*'. I then asked him if he was committed to living as a *FDer*. He answered that it would be an interesting profession because he would be the pioneer, but he was still not sure if such a profession might match the context of the Japanese university. Although Wada showed strong interest in the professionalization of *FD tantōsha*, he was still not fully 'up front' about the promotion of the *FDer* as an established career back in 2007.

About a year after this interview, I attended a seminar for *FD tantōsha* where Wada was invited as a guest speaker to talk about how to plan and practice *FD*. After the seminar, I approached him and asked how he was doing. He told me that he had been invited to universities all over Japan to talk about his strategies and approaches to *FD*. It was obvious that he was gaining a reputation as an *FD* practitioner. A couple of months after the seminar, I attended one of his workshops titled 'Training Seminar for *FDer*' on 10 and 11 September 2008. The aim of the workshop was to learn how to plan a *FD* activity. It was held in Tokyo,

away from Hinoki University, and 61 academics and non-academics from various universities took part. Therefore, there was a sense of excitement among the staff from Hinoki University. In the workshop, they used a self-produced handbook titled 'The Manual for *FD tantōsha*'. It was designed like a workbook with step-by-step guidelines, meaning one could plan a *FD* activity by following the steps. The workshop included lectures, individual exercises and group work. Participants were expected to come up with a plan by the end of the second day. They were encouraged to work together with the people from the same university so that they would actually be able to use the developed *FD* activity. There were only about ten people who had not come with their colleagues. On the second day, we were asked to put the plan on the boards that were placed where we had lunch. During the lunch, we were encouraged to walk around and use sticky notes to leave comments on each suggested programme. In this way, participants were gently forced to actively and seriously take part in the workshop. Everything was designed to be practical and useful for the participants.

In general, participants worked actively during the group work and seemed to be positive about their experiences. One said that he learnt so much from the way OED organized the workshop. Another said that by learning how to organize the *FD* programme, he realized that

he was trying to do too much in one activity in the past. The person behind me told me, "I wish we had more time to talk about issues related to *FD* with other participants because I am learning a lot by talking with them." He was one of the participants attending without his colleague(s). He also mentioned that without the support of the university his plan would not work. He felt there were too many hurdles to clear before he could actually carry out a *FD* activity. It reminded me of the significance of the institutional support Wada had successfully obtained from the university for his current career. Since he joined OED, he had not just gained skills and knowledge as a '*FDer*'; he had managed to convince the executives of the university to see the point of having a full-time *FD tantōsha*. He had, for example, successfully negotiated to lessen his teaching obligations.

At the end of the workshop, participants received a certificate recording their completion of the basic course for a *FDer*. Wada repeatedly said, "Please do carry out the activity that you planed today" as if he was trying to remind participants that the workshop was not about making them feel good by doing something about *FD* but it was about showing participants to be strategic about *FD* activities and to be responsible. However, it was not clear if participants saw themselves as *FDers*. From the job titles listed in the participants' name list, many of them, especially the senior participants, seem to have been in a practitioner position

for a certain number of years, calling themselves '*FD tantōsha*'. One said in the conversation during the lunch:

> I know universities need to change but I don't really believe that *FD* can change the attitude of faculty members. Nevertheless, I want to do something useful and that's why I am trying to find out what might be good *FD* practice.

The sense of responsibility and wanting to be 'useful' was shared by most of my interviewees and those I met at conferences and seminars. Kobayashi, who was also attending the workshop said, "I am hired so I want to make sure I do useful work for the university." These quotes suggest that doing well with *FD* did not necessarily have anything to do with one's identity or profession but was about job responsibility. The previous quote about the importance of institutional support adds a hint of an excuse, saying "I am responsible for my job but I am just a *FD tantōsha*. If there is no institutional support then I won't be able to play the role well. (But it is not my fault.)" Such comments revealed how *FD tantōsha* dealt with the unstable and dependent nature of their role. Adopting the label *FD tantōsha* allowed people to have the space to make excuses for not being able to carry out successful *FD* practices.

Wada's confidence was supported by his interactions with practitioners in other countries. Wada had chances to stay at a centre for teaching and learning in the USA and the UK on

sabbatical. He worked with the staff of those centres there and visited a number of universities in both countries, attended POD and SEDA's annual conferences, and other conferences related to faculty development and teaching and learning in higher education. Through these experiences he began to say, "*FD* is globalized. It is a globalized phenomenon." He was excited to see the growing movement of faculty development and wanted to be part of it. In a way, he found a community of like-minded people in other countries and their endeavours and experiences convinced him about the value of his decision.

In 2009, I asked him again about his identity as *FDer*. This time he said:

> Honestly, I don't really see myself as a good researcher. For a long time, I was not sure if being an academic would be the ideal for me because I was always interested in practice and research. […] So, when I started to place myself as a *FDer*, I felt comfortable in the university. I feel there to be something I could contribute to the university. *FDer* is the job that combines practice and research. That's what I like about it.

This was the first time I heard Wada expressing his feelings about identity, identifying himself as a '*FDer*' and defining it based on his own experiences and thinking he had found the way to situate himself in the landscape of higher education. Moreover, he found other people in other countries to make him feel part of a community.

6.3.2 Establishment of a Community for *FDer*

There were other *FD tantōsha* who had similar views and experiences as Wada. They were also convinced with the idea of professionalization of *FD tantōsha* and established an association for *FDers* in Japan. On 27 September 2009, the Japan Association for Educational Development in Higher Education (JAED) was established. It should be noted that the funding members, for some reason, decided to use 'educational development' instead of 'faculty development'. The aim of JAED is to create '*ba* (the space)' for *FDer* to exchange information, to offer opportunities for professional development of their own, to train the next generation of *FDer*, to cooperate, and to act as a lobby group in relation to HE policies[24]. In order to become a member, the candidate has to fill in the application document in which he/she needs to explain their experience in *FD* practices at different levels within the university. The candidate also needs to get two reference letters from existing members. Members would be assessed every five years to ensure that they are continuously carrying out self-development. Those requirements underline JAED's underlying message that they only want people serious about *FD* practices. JAED aims to be a professional body; it is not surprising therefore that it promotes exclusiveness. However, the use of '*ba* (the space)' instead of a professional body indicates some hesitation in regard to promoting the image of

[24] http://www.geocities.jp/jaed_homepage/ (checked on 30 August 2010)

the *FDer*. They are aware of the criticisms and hesitations other *FD tantōsha* express. Among the members, there were a range of imaged of the *FDer*, from *FDer* as a full-time profession to *FDer* as part of the academic profession. JAED has only just started, meaning it is too early to analyse what the impact of this association might be. Nevertheless, the establishment of JAED can be considered a milestone in attempting to create a new path and professional identity for *FD tantōsha*.

6.3.3 The Mixed Reaction of Junior Academics

Once the term '*FDer*' began to attract the attention of the *FD tantōsha* and researchers of higher education studies, *FD tantōsha* started to ask among themselves: "Would you call yourself a *fakarutī diberropā* (faculty developer, *FDer*)?" The reaction of junior academics to this question was mixed.

I attended a semi-closed seminar for *FD tantōsha* in May 2009. The purpose of this seminar was to discuss the professionalization of *FD tantōsha* and David Baume, the former head of SEDA, was invited as a guest speaker. Eleven participants were all active *FD tantōsha* from various universities and had interests in the topic. At the beginning, participants introduced themselves. There was only one person who said, "My name is so and so. I am a *FDer* at X

university." Others typically said, "My name is so and so. I have been involved with *FD* for Y years. My background is such and such." I thought this implied something about how they see their profession. Baume talked about the professional standards and framework for teaching in higher education and academic development. After his presentation and discussions, he said as his final remark, "I hear many of you are new in faculty development and academic development. So I say welcome. This is a great profession. And it's a new profession." As soon as the seminar ended, the person who sat next to me said to her colleague, "…I am not sure if I am a *FDer*…"

After the seminar, I talked about my research topic with Baume. He said, "It seems they (participants) seem not to quite understand what their profession is. It would be useful for someone to put a mirror up and show them who they are." This quote showed that he came with the idea that there was a group of Japanese *FD tantōsha* who wanted to establish a new career. But there seemed to be a gap between how Baume and the participants saw the seminar. The gap became clearer during the question and answer time. One male participant asked about the developer's career path. He asked, "Who will become developers? How do they become one? Do they volunteer or get appointed? […] Do they need qualifications?" Baume answered that there was no qualification as such that developers needed to obtain. He

added that SEDA gave fellowships to about 50 people as qualified developers but there were more than 1,000 developers in the UK, so "We [SEDA] have not covered the market." He explained that people entered the field of academic development for various reasons. Listening to Baume's explanation, the atmosphere of the room softened slightly as people in the room relaxed their facial expressions; some of them nodded as if they were finally beginning to see the actual picture of developers in the UK.

This kind of reaction was found when I attended POD in October 2009 as well. Makino and I attended the 34th POD Annual Conference to give a poster session about the ICT-FD Project. There were 38 Japanese participants from different universities, although POD was meant to be for developers in the USA. Among other nationalities, Japanese was the biggest foreign group. On the first day, Makino and I attended the workshop for new developers. There were about 70 participants and about 70% of them were female. Four facilitators led the workshop that covered topics such as understanding the role of faculty developers, the knowledge and skills needed to be a developer, understanding assessment and evaluation, and building a good community of people. Those facilitators gave us tips to carry out faculty development successfully, such as being aware of politics and having research evidence. During the workshop, one participant said, "Well, I don't call myself a developer because I am not just a

developer but I also teach." One participant said, "We use 'professional development' instead of 'faculty development'." Another participant added, "We don't use 'development' either because it is controversial. We use 'teaching and learning'."

On the second day of the conference, Makino said to me:

> I see now that developers in the USA and practitioners in Japan are no different. I thought *FD* in the USA was much more advanced and specialized but after listening to the workshops, I realize they have similar issues and difficulties as we do and developers are not only developers but also teachers and researchers at the same time.

She sounded relived. Takahashi, an administrator from a private university, expressed a similar view. Takahashi had been working for a private university as a *FD* coordinator for over five years. At her university, it is the administrator's job to coordinate *FD* activities so she is an administrator. After she became involved with *FD*, she studied for a Master's in higher education studies. It was her second time at POD and she said:

> From my observation, the boundary of developer as a profession seems to be very loose in the USA. People say they are developers but at the same time they call themselves academics or administrators.

Generally speaking, Japanese *FD tantōsha* think that *FDer* is a recognized professional position in the USA and Japanese *FD tantōsha* have a long way to go to catch up with them. But those who had a chance to interact with practitioners from those countries realized the professional position and identity of faculty development practitioner was as ambiguous as the one in Japan. They seemed to feel better for knowing that the position of faculty

developers did not have to be clearly separated from academic identity.

The biggest concern about the idea of the *FDer* was its career path. I asked Kobayashi a year after the workshop for *FDer* that OED organized if she thought the workshop was necessary for one to become a developer or if it was more for faculty development practitioners. According to her understanding, there was no such job as *FDer* in Japan, so the workshop should have been aimed at *FD tantōsha*. She added:

> I don't know if it is possible to create *FDer* as a new career partly because I have seen faculty members working together to improve education in the collegial manner, so having *FDer* might not promote *FD*. Also, I am not sure about the career path of *FDer* and honestly I don't think private universities would spend money hiring a *FDer*.

Two female academics I had coffee with after Baume's seminar expressed hesitance in relation to the idea of the *FDer*. One of them said, "I am neither a *FD* specialist nor a *FDer* and I don't think I am trying to be one." I followed this up in the interview with her on 15 September 2009, four months after the conversation. She was still not sure about the idea of *FDer*. She described the discussion about *FDers* as "*FD tantōsha*' searching for an identity" and, by drawing a boundary around the position, *FD tantōsha* were hoping to feel more relaxed. She expressed her concern that such a boundary might restrict the flexibility that those who were in their thirties have in pursing their career, and it might also impose a fixed model of *FD*. She then said:

> For someone like myself, who is still in a junior and fixed term position, it feels as if someone is trying to attract our attention by using the word '*FDer*'. It gives the message that 'If you become a *FDer* then your career would be guaranteed' …

As explained in section 6.2.1, this generation of junior academics is used to uncertainties and therefore it is understandable for them to have the desire to settle as well as doubts about given options. Makino expressed such concerns as well. According to her, the first generation of *FDers* might be able to survive because they actually have other specialties they would be able to pursue if *FDer* ended up not working. However, the second generation of *FDers*, if they were to be trained as *FDers* only, would not be able to survive if the universities were then to stop hiring *FDers*. She said, "It would be irresponsible for our generation to create a new career when we don't even know if the position might be sustainable." In her understanding, the first generation would have other communities to go back to if being an *FDer* did not work out but for the second generation the community of *FDer* would be the only place to stay.

6.4 FD Senmonka: A Given Label

In this section, I explore another controversial label for *FD* practitioner: *FD senmonka.* As mentioned earlier, '*senmonka*' refers to a person with specialized knowledge and experiences. It is often used to address an academic. Therefore, the term '*FD senmonka*'

implies the person is an academic with specialized knowledge and experiences in *FD*. However, as I discussed in Chapter Two, there was very little Japanese literature on faculty development apart from reportage of *FD* activities, which indicates *FD* is yet to become a field to specialize in. As a result, those so-called *FD senmonka* face a gap between the notion of '*senmonka*' and the self-awareness of their specialties. In an effort to match the notion of '*senmonka*' and to develop a profile as a researcher, many *FD tantōsha* attempt to research and present at *gakkai*. However, the characteristics of the interdisciplinary subject put the credibility of the research under scrutiny.

6.4.1 Implications of *FD Senmonka*

> I actually feel sorry for those young academics who work as *FD tantōsha* just because they have higher education studies as their specialization.
>
> Saito, professor and *FD tantōsha*

When junior academics specialize in educational studies (especially higher education), the university expects them to be a *senmonka*, an expert, and know what to do about *FD*. For example, when I joined Sakura University, both Kuroki and Ishida said to me that they needed a '*FD senmonka*' for the project. Makino used to introduce me to others as the '*FD senmonka*', especially at the workshops the *Sentā* organized for university members. This was purely because I specialized in higher education studies. Throughout the fieldwork, I

continued to pay attention to the use of '*FD senmonka*' and what it meant to be addressed as such.

I asked my interviewees what it meant for them to be treated as *FD senmonka* or sometimes as higher education *senmonka*. Kobayashi said:

> It makes me think a lot. Perhaps it is because higher education studies is a new field but I feel strong pressure to link research and practice and I have to be useful… also, even if someone calls me a higher education *senmonka*, I can't really say that myself because I am really just a junior. […] I feel responsible anyway because I am working in my research field.

This quote shows how the notion of *senmonka* led her to feel a heightened sense of expectations and responsibilities. However, on the side of those who were not *senmonka*, it seemed to allow them to leave the responsibilities with *FD senmonka*. Other interviewees shared a similar view. Unlike other field of studies, researchers in higher education studies are looking at higher education as a research field and at the same time they are working in the field. Therefore, naturally they become *FD tantōsha* as well as researchers. I asked Kobayashi how she would describe what she was doing as a *FD senmonka*. She said:

> What I am doing is preparing basic data about the university so that when professors or executives need to make some kind of decisions related to the university they would be able to refer to the data.

To the same question, Tanaka, *FD tantōsha* at a national university, said:

> In my university, each faculty is very independent like a company in itself. So our job is to get information from each faculty, put it together and deliver it to the outside to make sure each faculty is accountable. Also we fill the gap… such as by approaching

female researchers with support.

Kimura said, “My job is to be aware of the trends and movements outside of my university and speak out to raise the awareness of university members within.” There is a degree of hesitance about being treated as *senmonka* partly because of their awareness of the limits of their knowledge and insufficient experience as an academic. The nature of interdisciplinary subjects that allow researchers to use any discipline to look at any issues within higher education makes it hard for researchers to define their specialized knowledge. One can be looking at higher education policy through the lens of sociology. One can be looking at teaching and learning in a university through the lens of educational psychology. In other words, it is not a self-evident subject.

The paradox here is that other academics consider academics with education-related backgrounds as *FD senmonka* but the nature of those disciplines or academic fields creates self-doubt and brings questions about their own credibility. The label of ‘*FD senmonka*’ brought out identity issues in junior academics with an interdisciplinary background. With this in mind, I will follow Makino’s exploration of the studies of educational technology as an example.

6.4.2 Disciplinary Background: Educational Technology

Makino joined JSET after she joined the *Sentā*. JSET is one of the *gakkai* (academic society) for researchers of educational technologies. As she had no prior knowledge about the field of educational technology, she started to ask Yoshida about its research methodologies and theories. Yoshida suggested forming a reading circle to become familiar with the literature and discussions in the field. He invited Makino and me, as we were the only ones who did not have any background in the field, and picked two books; one was about the grounded theory and the other was about quantitative research methods. Interestingly, both books were on research methods. Makino and I would read a chapter each and discuss what the chapter was about in the meeting. Yoshida tried to explain and answer any questions we had. This reading circle ended after two months partly because Yoshida became busy with his PhD research. Makino and I continued to discuss what it meant to carry out research in the field of educational technology while writing proposals to present at the annual conference for JSET in October. Even after attending the annual conference, however, Makino was not sure about the field. In her second year at Sakura University, Makino's proposal for presentation at JSET was successfully accepted. Kuroki, Ishida, and Yoshida along with some other contract researchers complimented her on this achievement. In the interview on 5 February 2010, I asked how she felt about it and also how it affected the way she understood the field

of educational technology. She said:

> I just feel that there is no academic foundation in the field of educational technology because even I, without prior knowledge of educational technology, was able to write a research proposal for refereed presentation. So, in a way, I thought that I would be able to achieve a certain level of research profile in this field, which was a good thing to feel. […] For example, in the case of physics there is a firm knowledge foundation and unless you study the foundations thoroughly you can't compete with other researchers. And people can tell who is a good researcher and who is not and I know I am not good. It is scientific. However, with the field of educational technology, and *FD* as well, there is no such academic foundation.

In her understanding, a discipline has a shared knowledge basis and commonly used research methodologies, which was the reason why she had trouble understanding the field of educational technology. Yoshida explained that the field of educational technology was a field that was open for other disciplines. However, Makino expressed a sense of uncertainty right up to the end of my fieldwork, saying:

> I am still not sure what it means to conduct research in the field of educational technology. I don't feel the culmination of knowledge after two years. But if I were to carry out research related to faculty development, it seems JSET is the only place I can present my research.

In fact, there was a session specifically allocated to presenting research outcomes on the use of educational technology in promoting faculty development at annual conferences and research seminars. In 2010, the special committee for *FD* was newly established within JSET. It is yet to be announced what the purpose of this committee is to be but it is attracting growing interest among members on *FD*. Suzuki, an associate professor in the field of educational technology, said:

> It is kind of understandable why many researches at JSET focus on *FD* because the purpose of the field of educational technology is to improve teaching and learning by using technologies or by bringing in a technologist approach to solve the issues of education.

This quote shows the field of educational technology is a convenient field for *FD tantōsha* to resort to because it is an applied subject rather than a pure subject, which was why the number of junior academics acting as *FD* practitioners was growing over the years. JSET became one of the communities to belong to for junior academics who were balancing between *jissen* (practice) and *kenkyū* (research), and helped in sustaining their academic identity.

The label of '*senmonka*', however, meant people scrutinized the academic rigorousness of the field. Those junior academics called *FD senmonka* inevitably asked themselves "What am I an expert on?" This led them to realize how shaky their disciplinary community was. The rootless feeling was shared among members of JSET in general as well. For example, I organized a workshop at the annual conference of JSET in 2009 titled 'Searching the cross section of the field of educational technology and the higher education studies in the field of *FD*'. During the session, I used Becher and Trowler's metaphor of 'tribes' and 'territories' and asked participants to imagine what kind of tribe the field of educational technology as well as the higher education studies would be and write it down on the paper that I

distributed. 15 participants handed in the paper after the workshop. For example, a person who has 20 years of experience in the university as an academic in educational technology wrote:

> Field of educational technology – They are the people who inhabit a place between theory and practice. They are like Japanese during the period of economic boom after WWII. They are good at finding useful tools. They also are able to use different characters like Japanese.

Another person who is an administrator but is studying for a Master's at the moment wrote:

> Field of educational technology – It is like the United States. People share one vision of the States to create the nation. It is a mosaic nation where people from different parts of the world come and live together.

What those participants were describing are the characteristics of an interdisciplinary field. After the workshop, three postgraduate students came to me and told me that they had been thinking about their academic specialties. They said that the exercise of imagining the field of educational technology as a tribe made them see both the strength and weakness of the field. Makino asked them, "Well, if you are to teach a course at the university, what can you teach? Think about it." One said, "Hmm… I can't think of anything I can teach…" In the interview, Suzuki also mentioned that another cause of the uncertain feelings in the field comes from the fact that the field of educational technology, or educational studies in general, was neither rooted in an actual educational field such as schools nor in a discipline. What he pointed out was that those researchers are not actually teachers themselves and therefore actual teachers complain that the research outcomes do not necessarily benefit their

day-to-day educational activities. From the teachers' point of view, those researchers were '*senmonka*' with negative connotations. At the same time, because the field is not part of a discipline, the researchers do not contribute to the advancement of disciplinary knowledge. Suzuki said:

> It's time to discuss the future of the field of educational technology as an academic field. Unless we discuss why this field was created and how to place ourselves among other disciplines, the field will just deteriorate.

After seeing the discussions during the workshop I organized, talking with junior researchers in the field of educational technology, and observing the reactions of academics in other fields about the field of educational technology, Makino made up her mind:

> I am glad I have physics as my disciplinary background. I think it is important to keep physics as my disciplinary identity because otherwise other academics won't treat me equally as an academic.

In other words, the field of educational technology would not be treated like other disciplines in the eyes of Makino. Standing in an equal position to other academics was critical, in Makino's eyes, for acting as a *FD tantōsha*.

6.5 JFDN Jr: Staying Open to Options

Finally, I discuss the movement led by a group of junior academics and its implications. JFDN Jr was established in 2008 with 22 junior researchers from 20 universities as the core committee members (presentation, 18 July 2009). Here, 'junior' is self-defined concept and

not an objective concept: therefore, if one thinks he/she is a junior researcher even if he/she is over 40 years old, this person is a junior researcher. Generally speaking, members were mostly in their thirties. The purpose of JFDN Jr was to build a community for junior *FD tantōsha* who tend to work alone. JFDN Jr aims to support the promotion of research activities related to *FD* and *FD* practices, and to make the voice of junior researchers heard. The number of members has increased rapidly since its establishment and by February 2010, there were 55 members from 42 different universities. There is no formal process to become a member and no membership fee, acting like a social network such as Facebook. If one is interested, then one can just sign up for the mailing list. Members do not have any particular obligations.

Makino and I joined the network in May 2009 after an invitation from one of the members and attended the second summer meeting on 18 and 19 July 2009. The theme of the meeting was 'Let's think about new research topics that would contribute to educational improvement'. It was intended to make participants think about possible research topics from their current *gyōmu* (duties) through group work and brainstorming. 19 members attended. The leader of JFDN Jr presented on the status quo of junior academics by using the results of surveys JFDN Jr had conducted in 2009. In the presentation, the leader used 'junior

kenkyūsha (researcher)' instead of 'junior *FD tantōsha*' to address the members. The use of *kenkyūsha* indicated the intention of JFDN Jr members to position themselves neither as part of a profession nor as an expert. The term avoided having to provide a clear definition of the role of a *FD tantōsha*.

By using the results of the survey, the leader illustrated that the position of junior academics was affected by uncertainties, principally the uncertain position of the centre they usually belonged to and the uncertain career path of academics affiliated to a centre instead of a faculty. He argued that the role of junior academics should be to appeal to senior academics about the issues of current *FD* and also to be a role model of a researcher in the field of higher education for postgraduate students in their 20s. He concluded his presentation by suggesting that we should think of *FD* as meaning 'Future Dreams' instead of 'Faculty Development'. There was thus an underlying intention to see things positively and to think in forward-looking ways instead of just using the occasion go offload the stress from work on other junior academics.

Participants were divided into four groups with four to five members in each. Makino and I were in different groups. The facilitator of the meeting told us to come up with a research

topic and methodologies: “When you choose the topic, please do not worry about feasibility. Please forget about constraints and feel free to suggest anything you might be interested in.” This was another trick to make members take their minds off their daily stress. Encouraged by my interests, my group decided to investigate the professional development and identity of *FD tantōsha*. One said:

> I need to now look back and see what I have been doing as a *FD tantōsha* to understand what it is that I am doing in my career. It would also help me understand what it means to be a *FD tantōsha*. It would then contribute to the discussion about the professional identity of *FD tantōsha* for future generations.

The others agreed and one added, “I have been doing so many different things at the centre so I no longer know what might be called *FD* activities.”

After each group spent 30 minutes designing the research project, members were mixed up and each had to explain the research project to members from different groups. Then, members went back to their original group to share and discuss comments and questions they got from members of other groups. The first day ended there. On the second day, each group was expected to prepare a short presentation to explain the research project. After two days, everyone got to know about other members and their research approaches as well. One commented:

> It was very good to think about research because it forced me to think objectively about my work and how I might be able to turn my work into a research project. I don’t have any space to reflect like that when I work.

Makino said to me that the intentions were good but she ended up feeling uncertain about the purpose of the network: "After talking with members, I realize that everyone seems to be doing everything about *FD* and working alone. It seems no one enjoys working as a *FD* practitioner…" Another member I interviewed expressed a similar opinion. Kato said:

> I have to say I was disappointed with the meeting. I am extremely busy at work and I have to make real efforts to make time to attend this kind of meeting. I think it is good to meet people in similar positions and share but I think we should move forward. […] If we are going to think about a research project, we should think about a real research project! We have all those young researchers with different strengths so we should be able to do something substantial. If the purpose of the network is just to share experiences and build the sense of community, I will have to think about whether I want to be involved.

There was a sense that members were trying to figure out the usefulness of JFDN Jr for their own needs and benefits. The question remained: "Who should be responsible for deciding the direction of the network and its collective identity?" There was no discussion about the purpose and the future direction of the network itself.

The effort to be free from the politics of communities mentioned before was observed during the meeting. It could be another indication that JFDN Jr consciously or unconsciously was trying to create a space to think about an alternative academic career path. In the informal conversation during the JFDN Jr meeting, one of the core members pointed out that the name of JFDN Jr might not be appropriate because of its association with JFDN (i.e. the Japan

Faculty Development Network), which was led by the CPEHE. The biggest concern of the core members was that by being associated with JFDN, JFDN Jr might be considered as being against the idea of *FDer* pioneered by OPAR. After the meeting, they decided to use 'Junior *FD* researchers' network (*Wakate FD kenkyūsyaken nettowāku*)' in Japanese, although they kept JFDN Jr in English. Kimura said, "I want to create a movement with the same generation of academics. We are different and we need to find our way." According to Makino, though, the will to create a collective voice was not strong enough. She said:

> It is a pity that, although a good number of junior academics in the same generation is getting together at JFDN Jr, serious discussions about *FD* practices and approaches are not happening.

Judging from the conversations among members, through their attempt to come up with a research project to apply for government funding and the contents of the regular e-mail sent to the mailing list, JFDN Jr seems to see its role as a kind of union for junior academics. Their main message seems to be that political and institutional measures need to be carried out to improve the working conditions for junior academics acting as *FD tantōsha*, otherwise they would have no future in an academic career because they have no time for their own professional development. The critical point to make here is that, judging from their claims, what they seem to have in mind when they discuss an academic career is a tenured academic position which allows for research and teaching, as well as *gyōmu*. By emphasizing issues

surrounding working conditions, they intentionally or unintentionally avoid making any commitment to a particular form or identity of *FD*. And this network is the one that is attracting an increasing number of junior academics.

Conclusion

Makino's journey searching for a 'comfortable place' revealed the complexities of the life of junior academics acting as *FD tantōsha*. When she started out, she expected it to be a smooth journey because all she wanted was to find a new discipline to follow and a community of people to discuss *FD* research, practice methods, and approaches with. She visited seminars and workshops for *FD tantōsha* and several *gakkai*, where she expected to identify the differences in terms of approaches and disciplines easily. She was going to choose a place to belong to by comparing the differences. However, as this chapter described, her journey turned out to be full of twists and turns because the junior academics she met showed her that it was not only about how to make sense of the new role of *FD tantōsha*, but also, or perhaps more so, about their identity and career path.

Makino's journey revealed the fragile foundations upon which most junior academics acting as *FD tantōsha* were standing. Many of them were not academically confident because they

came from various research backgrounds away from FD, they had no PhD, and they were trained in an interdisciplinary field. Some senior academics in the field of HE criticized *jissen-* (practice-) based research as a mere reporting of *jissen* and not real academic research but they did not know how to defend their approach. Many junior academics were vulnerable to these kinds of criticisms against their academic credibility. Their academic identity was therefore fragile. Many of them started their career as *sentā kyōin* (academics in a centre) and *FD tantōsha* with a strong emphasis on *jissen*. From the beginning, they were not in a traditional academic post such as a lecturer in a faculty. Due to the nature of the *FD tantōsha* position, junior academics had to spend a great amount of time on *jissen* (practice). Carrying out both *jissen* and *kenkyū* (research) was the lived experience of their career, but those who consider *jissen* not to be a real part of the academic profession accused them of being caught in between. Other academics in the faculties saw them as inferior and they were there to carry out *gyōmu*. As a result, they too questioned whether they were proper academics or not. Even if they built a good research profile, there were not many academic posts available in the faculty because of the nature of the field of HE studies or educational technology that many of these junior academics had majored in. On top of that, their position as *FD tantōsha* was created as a result of policy changes. Therefore, they were aware of the possible end of '*FD baburu* (bubble)', which make them reluctant to follow the idea of *FDer* because there

might not be any real career path.

In such uncertainties, '*shigarami*' seemed to help them to feel that they were within a community. Although it restricted their decision-making, they could at least feel that there was someone in power who knew about their existence and cared about them. As long as they were connected with the person in power, at least they had a community to belong to. However, at the same time, they were aware that it was a fragile bond and therefore it was understandable they tried to keep their options as open as possible. Not making decisions was a key decision they made to survive and the notion of *FD tantōsha*, which could mean anything, helped them to do that.

In the end, Makino felt an outsider. Today, she still continues her research in physics, works for a private university as the IT literacy curriculum coordinator, and continues her research and practice with *FD*. If asked, she would call herself a *FD tantōsha* but she remains uncertain about her future.

Chapter Seven: From FD practitioner to '*FD tantōsha*'

Introduction

This chapter brings together the themes of the preceding chapters and discusses how they contribute to addressing my main research question, "How do faculty development practitioners make sense of the concept of 'faculty development' as a lived experience and a professional identity in Japan?" In this chapter I make three arguments. First, the multivocality of the term '*tantōsha*' allows *FD* practitioners to keep their position within institutions vague, to leave responsibilities related to the role unfixed, and the choices of one's professional identity open. The characteristics of '*tantōsha*' as a role overlap with those of professionals working in a third space between professional and academic staff, which Whitchurch (2008) calls 'blended professionals'. However, are they the same? I argue that while Whitchurch suggests those who are engaging with blended activities are developing blended identities, those who act as '*tantōsha*' have an existing disciplinary paradigm within which to establish themselves. Blended professionals treat their role as a new type of work within HE. On the other hand, '*tantōsha*' suggests the role is an additional task for an academic. Hence, the discussion about professional identity in Japan is not as public as in countries where the position of faculty development practitioner is much more

established such as in the USA and the UK. Rather the question about identity in Japan has more to do with career prospects, especially for junior academics who act as *FD* practitioners, and they discuss their concerns informally in various gatherings.

Second, *FD* in Japan is treated as a mere activity and the implications of the concept of *FD* that might trigger transformation of the status quo is largely ignored. As I discussed in Chapter Two, discussions about *FD* have not been linked with discussions about other topics related to HE, such as academic professionalism, teaching and learning in HE, and the role of the university in Japan. The concept of *FD* in Japan is considered a fixed one, meaning that once faculty members and administrative members have an idea of what *FD* activities are it can be difficult to change their perceptions. This seems to be different in English-speaking Western countries. Various terms emerged after the concept of faculty development was introduced, such as 'educational development', 'organizational development', 'instructional development', and 'academic development'. Those terms indicate how the understanding of faculty development expanded and the focus of the 'development' changed over time. Through the discussions of faculty development, faculty development practitioners introduced various fundamental changes in HE[25]. I argue that

[25] A separate investigation examining the impact of faculty development on the paradigm shift in HE in Australia, the USA, and the UK is necessary.

those differences arose from the fact that '*FD*' is in a foreign language and because the institutional mechanisms prevent a new initiative bringing transformative changes to the university.

Third, communities for faculty development practitioners in Japan express their collective voice much less than those in English-speaking Western countries. Individual experiences as faculty development practitioners, expression of concerns and confidence about their role, practices, and identity are similar regardless of the countries, as I discussed in Chapter Two and Chapter Three. However, as a community, groups in the USA and UK such as POD and SEDA express the advancement of the field, knowledge, and the community, while in Japan there is a lack of such a collective voice. Japanese *FD* practitioners who are also academics seem to see a community for practitioners as a place to get information and they do not think about making contributions to it in order to advance it like they would do for their disciplinary community. I argue that this is an implication of the term '*tantōsha*', which allows the person to see the role as a temporary one, and also the way such communities were formed with a group of higher education researchers as core members.

In this chapter, I summarize the findings from preceding chapters first. I then go on to

explain the three points mentioned above.

7.1 *Overview of Preceding Chapters*

In Chapter One, I discussed how the focus of faculty development and the role of faculty development practitioners in the USA and the UK evolved as universities went through major changes after the 1960s. I did this using Socinelli et al.'s periodization of five ages as a framework. Rapid changes of the focus and role of faculty development led practitioners to discuss their professional identity. To a certain extent, practitioners expressed their confidence in the new role of 'faculty developer' and the field of faculty development, through their self-representation in journals. The formation of networks for faculty developers such as the POD Network, SEDA, and ICED, as well as the existence of academic journals focused on faculty development and teaching and learning in HE such as 'IJAD', 'Higher Education Research and Development', 'International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education', 'Teaching in Higher Education', and 'To Improve the Academy', is significant. It means that faculty development practitioners are communicating across borders regardless of contextual differences and language. In other word, these interactions are contributing to the formation of common ground to discuss faculty development and the international community, although those who are active in such a

community are predominantly from English-speaking Western countries. Therefore, in the landscape of HE faculty development practitioners are beginning to see the territory of knowledge and the tribe they belong to. Becher's (1989) framework of academic tribes and territories is useful to understand the importance and formation process of a community.

In Chapter Two, I discussed the historical background of *FD*, how the concept was introduced and with what purpose, and what kind of people became involved with *FD* practices. Those faculty members involved with *ippan kyōiku* (general education) were the main players introducing, investigating and promoting the concept of *FD*. However, they had their own issues with the concept of *ippan kyōiku* and as faculty members who teach *ippan kyōiku*. In the process of dealing with institutional *FD*, issues related with *FD* became tangled up with other issues, which makes Japanese *FD* complicated to understand. I also described the absence of university education reform after the students' protest and during the massification of university in the 1970s and 80s. In the USA and the UK, institutions responded to similar issues by introducing various reforms, including faculty development. In the case of Japan, the government's decision to strongly recommend the institutionalization of *FD* along with other structures to assure the quality of university education in the 1990s suddenly made universities introduce *FD* activities, thus creating the

role of *FD* practitioner, a move which faculty members resisted. What this means is that *FD* in Japan did not take gradual steps to evolve. Instead, *FD* practitioners had to borrow various forms of 'good practice' from countries including the USA and the UK to meet the pressure to implement institutional *FD*. This resulted in confusion over the concept of *FD*.

Chapters Four and Five offered stories of practitioners in institutional communities. Chapter Four introduced the setting and the working conditions of the Centre at Sakura University. It showed the peripheral position of the Centre within Sakura University and how the working conditions made some of its project members feel outsiders. Having limited access to internal information and being excluded from personal networks in the university made it difficult for the members to develop *FD* practices to meet the needs of faculty and non-faculty members at Sakura University and to promote it. Members had little opportunity to meet other faculty members because not all of them had teaching obligations or could attend *kyōjukai* (faculty meetings) due to their junior positions. Not being part of the institutional community left members reliant on their values and judgements based on their past experiences, own motivations and work ethic, which I explored in Chapter Five. Instead of thinking about the implementation of *FD* practices institutionally, these members focused on activities that would bring a sense of personal achievement and satisfaction, such as

running workshops and presenting at seminars. They tended to design *FD* practices to meet the immediate needs of faculty members. However, at the same time, they understand that in many cases their endeavour is far from having any impact on overall university education because they are not doing anything fundamental to change institutional strategies on university education.

The individual's perception about the culture of faculty members and the university, as well as issues with the quality of education, affected the design and delivery of *FD* activities. The time framework and expected outcomes stated in the proposal for the government funding created pressure on members and led to a sense of losing ones' own initiative. The objective of working became to complete the project as planned, with little chance to reflect on the practices to better fit the actual demands. Lastly, the possibility of the project being discontinued once government funding ended, and the temporary nature of their positions, made members wonder about their endeavour and affected their sense of commitment. Thus, these two chapters showed how keenly people recognize the importance of being in the institutional community (even if they are hired for a project) because of the nature of institutional *FD*. They also describe the importance of personal experiences, values, and ethics in the continuation of work when the work is unbounded.

In Chapter Six, I identified the existence of three different labels '*FD tantōsha*', '*FD senmonka*', and '*FDer*'. Those labels indicate different reactions to the issue of identity. In the case of Japan, the question about identity seems to be more critical for junior academics. Senior academics acting as *FD* practitioners complain about this additional role but they do not seem to question their identity. One of the reasons why identity becomes an issue for junior academics is because they are yet to establish their professional identity and their everyday practice does not necessarily contribute to building their academic profile. Second, junior academics find it more difficult to have a sense of agency as a *FD* practitioner than senior academics due to the complex settings they are in. The fact they need to promote institutional *FD* sometimes forces them to do things that are beyond their abilities and status as a junior faculty or an academic on contract. Third, difficulties also arise because of their efforts to live in different communities and to meet different expectations simultaneously in order to keep career options open. Those communities include their institutional community, a disciplinary community, and a practitioner community. *FD* practitioners have different experiences in each community, which have an impact on their understandings and dealings with *FD*, their role, and identity.

Above all, career prospects are an influential factor for *FD* practitioners in thinking about

professional identity, especially for junior academics. None of the communities that I mentioned seem to offer a secure or defined career path. It is inevitable that current *FD* practitioners seek to meet the expectations that come with pursuing an academic career path, such as producing a certain amount of research and getting involved with teaching. As a result, I argue that Japanese practitioners, consciously or unconsciously, choose to remain ambiguous about their practices and identity. This is different from blended professionals (Whitchurch 2009) who need to sustain multilayered identities in order to succeed in a project. The complexities of their lived experiences and uncertainties regarding their career perspectives as *FD* practitioners seems to make it difficult for *FD* practitioners either to integrate their role as *FD* practitioners into the academic profession or to establish '*FD* practitioner' as a separate professional identity. Therefore, it is a natural reaction of Japanese *FD* practitioners to use the title '*FD tantōsha*' to create an ambiguity around their professional identity and thus around the concept of *FD*.

7.2 *Choosing to Stay a 'Tantōsha'*

7.2.1 Importance of Institutional Communities and *'Tantōsha'*

A sense of belonging to an institution gives a strong incentive or motivation to *FD* practitioners because of the nature of their role. The ultimate goal of institutional *FD* is to

improve the quality of education at the university practitioners are working for. Therefore, *FD* practitioners need to get involved with members of the university to understand their needs, to build trust and to work with administrators and people in power. As the case of Sakura University shows, there are several levels of membership in an institution from outsider to core member. How do individuals identify their position within the institutional community and feel a sense of belonging? The degree of one's membership is defined not only by the formal structure of the organization but also by one's informal network. The structure of a university is traditionally divided into two parts: faculties and administrations. All other divisions such as the Centre at Sakura University exist outside of the traditional structure. As a result, members of such divisions become outsiders within the university (with the exception of those who also hold a faculty position).

Another indication of being in an inner circle of the institutional community is how much administrative work one is doing for the university. Based on the ethnography of a Japanese private university, Poole (2010) explains that professors express loyalty to the institution by joining committees and working hard on administration tasks, which he refers to as "the power of participation (p. 143)". He argues that getting involved with administration tasks for individuals is not voluntary. Being called upon to be on a committee or to get involved

with administrative tasks infers the individual's membership in the inner circle. At Sakura University, the members of the Centre (especially those on contracts) are left out of the inner circle implicitly. As I described in Chapter Five and Chapter Six, members come to know this by not having informal negotiation powers such as *nemawashi*. As a result, some members expressed difficulties in committing to the university because they were not included.

I also argue that administrators often play a critical role in bonding the institutional community together, especially at private universities[26]. At a private university like Sakura University, it is common to see a big number of academics on part-time contracts. Often those part-time lecturers come to the university only when they have classes to teach and they are not involved with any administration. Although they are an integral part of the teaching staff, they learn about the university only through administrators and the students they teach. Another important point is that the term of the president, vice-president, head of the department and faculty, and other managerial posts is for two to four years unless the university is owned by the president. Several interviewees talked about the impact of people in management posts changing on the direction of *FD* and other policies. Under such a

[26] Before the corporatization of national and public universities, administrators were national and local government employees. Therefore, administrators moved around different national or public universities. As a result, they have a different culture from administrators from private universities.

situation, administrators play an important role in sustaining the institutional culture. The administrator's network strongly affects any organizational changes taking place, as I described in Chapter Five.

This also explains why Wada at Hinoki University was able to make the decision to promote the idea of the *FDer*. By the time he became a well-known *FD* practitioner, he had spent more than five years at Hinoki University. During those years, he was able to build trust and become a member of the family. This means *FD* became an integral part of the university as well as the role an *FD* practitioner plays. The sense of professional responsibility to Hinoki University and the university's recognition of his work supported him in his quest to promote the professionalization of *FD* practitioners. In other words, he has real life experience as an *FDer*. He can explain what the work of *FDer* is like using his own experiences. Perhaps that is why his language is convincing to other practitioners who struggle and also people in a similar position, such as practitioners overseas.

Wada's story also enhances Poole's (2010) discussion about *uchimuki* (inwardly-oriented) capital. He states that those professors who are considered to be 'good professors' tend to take administration work seriously, which results in establishing *uchimuki* capital (Poole,

2010). Poole (2010) further argues that such an attitude is taken as loyalty to the institution and thus such professors – regardless of age, title, and longevity of service – achieve the status of 'good professor'. The problem with this form of capital is that it does not translate beyond the institution (Poole, 2010). In Wada's case, he has a tenured position and therefore he does not need to be too concerned about building a profile that translates well outside, such as through publishing research. However, if one has a contract position, there is a limit on the individual in terms of the investment in building *uchimuki* capital, which institutional *FD* requires. Understanding this dilemma, Makino said, "One of the important competencies an *FD* practitioner needs to have is hospitality." Her expression indicates how she deals with her role at a personal level. Based on her personal values, she was making efforts to support faculty members, demonstrating how having hospitality to her was critical as a *FD* practitioner. The effect of having a contract is well described in Makino's quote:

> "My contract ends at the end of this academic year so even if I see things I can do (as *FD*), I can't plan for the future. *FD* is about dealing with people at the university. … If I want to do a meaningful job, I need to build trust with them. But I can't do that in a year!"

What this means is that *FD* practitioners on fixed-term contracts are unable to have a long-term outlook in promoting and designing *FD*. This is the characteristic of the position of '*FD tantōsha*'. The term '*tantōsha*' indicates the temporariness of the position. By applying this term, it is possible for *FD* practitioners to accept the dilemma of understanding

the given role but not being able to play it well, which I described in Chapter Five and Chapter Six.

7.2.2 Discipline and Identity

There is an idea that academics have a firm disciplinary identity that informs their ways of thinking and acting as an academic.

> "Discipline provides a physical structure and a set of accredited, collective functions, through which academics consolidate and refine their disciplinary identities (Henkel, 2000, p. 19)"

Traditionally, an individual develops their disciplinary identity and become a member of a disciplinary community by going through undergraduate and postgraduate education, through to appointment as a faculty member (Henkel, 2000). An individual becomes a full member of a disciplinary community by acquiring 'the ability to define the situation correctly and to use the type of discourse required by that very situation (Becher and Trowler 2001, p. 50)'.

Chapter One discussed how faculty development practitioners in English-speaking Western countries discuss the disciplinization of the field of faculty development. They emphasize the importance of being an academic themselves in order to successfully work with other faculty members. Bath and Smith (2004) compare the activities of discipline-based academics and

faculty developers and claim that both are the same in nature. They argue that HE is a discipline in its own right and that academic developers have their own 'academic tribe' (Bath and Smith, 2004).

Meanwhile, there is no discussion about the disciplinarization of *FD* in Japan. Instead, *FD* practitioners discuss disciplinary identity because of their concerns about their disciplinary field, such as HE studies and educational technology.

Most of the *FD* practitioners that I met were in academic posts. This means they have had an academic training in a discipline and will therefore naturally feel the gap between being a discipline-based academic and a *FD* practitioner, and question if the *FD* practitioner's role is academic. Makino's case revealed that simply claiming that HE is a discipline does not convince those from other more established academic tribes. In Chapter 6, I used Makino's perception of discipline as a lens through which to examine the uncertainties surrounding the disciplinary identity of many junior academics acting as *FD* practitioners, especially those with a background in HE studies and educational technologies. In search of a new disciplinary community to belong to, Makino visited various gatherings to find out about knowledge structures and required discourses, which reflected her understanding of an

academic discipline. Although she found people with fascinating research topics, she was not able to identify the overall structure of HE studies and educational technologies as a discipline. She questioned:

"If I were to study HE, how do I study? Where do I start? What is the basic reading?"

It is possible to say that her reaction was triggered from disciplinary differences between her original disciplinary background of physics and educational studies. But what is interesting is that junior academics in those fields question their field as well.

The sense of uncertainty surrounding their disciplinary identity among junior academics acting as FD practitioners seems to come from several different directions. First, the challenge posed against them from what is considered an established discipline triggers uneasy feelings among those who are in a less traditional field such as HE studies. Chapter Two explained the newness of HE studies as a field. The first generation of higher education researchers had disciplinary backgrounds such as in the sociology of education, history, and comparative educational studies. Today, there are several degree programmes up to doctorate level in HE studies that are considered interdisciplinary. As a result, the newer generation of HE researchers do not necessarily have a disciplinary backbone, which senior academics and others from traditional disciplines criticize. This is an issue commonly experienced by individuals in a newer discipline and interdisciplinary fields. Nevertheless, Brew (2008)

critically questions the idea that academics have firm and fixed disciplinary identity. She argues:

> "The subject that the researcher studied for their first degree, for their masters and PhD, the associations they belonged to and the discussions about the nature of the discipline that are taking place in conferences of these associations combine with the actual research and writing projects that are the current focus of attention to create a complex picture of disciplines as shifting and changing over time (Brew, 2008, p.432)."

Based on her empirical studies she argues that contemporary understandings of disciplinary and interdisciplinary identity need more fluid metaphors and models.

Second, a lack of physical organization in a university in regard to their discipline leads to uncertainties about their construction of disciplinary identity and academic career path:

> "Faculty members refer to their department as their "academic home." Home is a secure place. … For university faculty members, academic justice starts within the department and is shaped by the rules of the discipline (Poole, 2009, p. 50)"

As the above quotes show, a discipline offers a physical structure such as the department in a university and a role in the wider academic society. As I discussed in Chapter Two, the field of HE studies is very new in Japan. Having been established in 1997, JAHER has a growing number of members but very few universities have degree programmes in HE studies. Hence, there is a lack of physical structures to embody the structure of knowledge, academic culture and values of the field of HE studies. It is a similar story for the field of educational technologies.

Third, their research methods are at risk. The academic community serves as a place for *FD* practitioners to gather and discuss their practices in the language of discipline. This follows a 'traditional' idea of how academic discussion should take place. However, it soon became apparent that there is a gap between scholarly discussions and discussions about practices. The manner of carrying out academic discussions at a conference and grumbling about *FD* practices during the drinking party that follows gives an example of dealing with the gap. Some established scholars both criticized and worried about the impact of *jissen* (practice) on junior academics, suggesting they would end up not doing academically sound research anymore. Thus, a concern about the lack of methods to carry out academically sound practice-based research in the field of *FD* began to surface. Although *FD* practitioners were able to build a research profile through the academic community, it was hinted that their academic credibility was at risk. Junior academics do recognize these issues, but there have not been active discussions to promote the conceptualization of their field. As an associate professor in educational technology points out:

> "If we do not talk about what our field of study is, no one will. But unfortunately, I have not seen such discussions carried out at our society."

In addition, their experiences as *FD* practitioners do not offer any structured way of understanding their role but rather create further confusion. Often, *FD* practitioners are involved with various types of work, which do not necessarily contribute to identifying a

framework of specialist knowledge. *FD* is about *jissen* or doing something. There are discussions about the definition and methods of *FD* but no one talks about *FD* as a new discipline or field of studies in Japan. Therefore, the question about the professional identity of those *FD* practitioners whose disciplinary background is in one of established disciplines may bring out other types of issues.

It should also be noted that the conventional image of the academic profession remains unchanged among Japanese faculty members, being characterized by a strong commitment to a disciplinary community rather than to the institution and an emphasis on research more than teaching. In other words, it seems those junior academics are tied to a fixed image of 'discipline' and the 'academic profession' and do not attempt to see emerging new forms in the academic profession. Thus they feel they are "not a proper academic".

The story of the *FD tantōsha* is similar to that of other positions added to the university in recent years. For example, Davis (1961) examined the foreign student advisor to see if it would be a new profession and Findlow (2012) investigated the experiences of faculty members engaged with nursing education, which then was a new addition to the higher education arena in the UK. Collinson (2000) looked at contract researchers in the social

sciences, again a new position, to understand the impact of their experiences on their career perspective. Those posts among others came into being as a result of changes in higher education. What is common in such literature is the expression of those in newly created positions feeling inferior to those in established faculties and departments, although they work hard every day. It reflects the hidden boundary between core and peripheral members of a university and the hierarchy among academics. In the case of Japan, the expression of '*sentā kyōin* (faculty members located at a centre and responsible for general or liberal education)' as 'not proper academics' shows inequality in terms of status in a university. They are considered as spending too much time in teaching and rarely spending time on research. In thinking about the status of lecturers in professional education settings such as nursing, Findlow (2012) suggests that:

> "…only a conceptual shift from 'academic' (with emphasis on research) to 'learning' as the core business of higher education provides a comfortable fit in this supposed community."

In reality, the role of the academic profession has diversified and there are various positions such as teaching-only or research-only academic posts and academic manager posts. The impact of such new types of academic posts on the concept of the academic profession needs investigation, especially in the Japanese context.

Thus, a junior academic acting as a *FD* practitioner needs to deal with two identities – an

academic identity and a *FD* practitioner's identity – and the gap between these two leads on to a question about their professional identity. In fact, *FD* practitioners who are in administrative positions did not express concerns about their professional identity as they seem to be able to treat *FD* as part of their work. The term '*FD tantōsha*' allows for a duality in their identities.

7.3 *Concept of FD*

The use of *FD* without a Japanese translation allows the definition of *FD* to be left open so that practitioners, policy makers, and researchers of HE can all make claims and maintain a vague consensus without denying anyone in particular. As discussed in Chapter Two, there was an attempt to translate faculty development among researchers in HE studies when it was first introduced to Japan and in recent years with an attempt to dispel misunderstandings about *FD* that stemmed from government policy. However, researchers were not able to come up with an appropriate Japanese term because, in order to reach a consensus about the term, researchers would have to inquire into each term closely. For example, there is no term that describes the concept of 'faculty' in Japanese. Currently it is translated as '*kyōjudan*', which means a group of '*kyōju*' or professors. However, Taguchi (2011) questions whether the plural form of 'professor' properly captures the concept of 'faculty'. The function of

'faculty' includes educational management such as deciding entrance requirements, diploma policy and curriculum policy. The Japanese term '*kyōjudan*' does not necessarily embed such a function (Taguchi, 2011). It is not just about giving a Japanese translation of the term 'faculty development' but rather about understanding how these concepts are understood in a Japanese context. In consequence, faculty members and *FD* practitioners developed an understanding of FD by seeing concrete example of practices at other institutions. In other words, *FD* became mere activities. Considering *FD* as an intrusive method to improve teaching skills, and as time consuming without much benefit, faculty members thus developed a negative image of *FD* in general.

Attempts were made by several researchers to replace *FD* with 'educational development, *ED*' and 'professional development, *PD*', claiming that 'faculty development' keeps individual faculty members as the subject of 'development', whilst the improvement of university education will not happen unless the university treats it as an educational management issue (Hata 2009). However, it is only HE researchers who understand such claims. To general faculty members, *ED* and *PD* are just as foreign as *FD*. Thus, the gap in understanding of *FD* between HE researchers and general faculty members began to emerge, which higher education researchers are not necessarily aware of. All in all, *FD* means

anything and nothing to Japanese faculty members and practitioners.

The definition of *FD* given in Clause 25-3 of the Standards became widespread among general university members. In an attempt to explain why the government does not set detailed requirements for the practice of *FD*, which in part is the source of confusion about *FD*, Suzuki (2007) from the MEXT expresses his personal view that the government is trying to balance respect for universities' autonomy and pushing universities to be accountable. The contradiction is that external quality assurance bodies such as the National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation and JUAA include '*FD*' as part of the evaluation guidelines, although it should be noted that an assessment method examining the effects of *FD* is yet to be established. The government's approach to *FD*, the existence of external quality assurance bodies, and the absence of guidelines to check the outcomes of *FD* leave *FD* practitioners in the dark. The discussion about the government's expectation in regard to *FD* activities between the officer of MEXT and a *FD* practitioner that I described in Chapter Four illustrates the situation of an *FD* practitioner. Although it is up to the university to decide how to interpret and practice institutional *FD*, the fact that *FD* is mandated sends out the message that MEXT sees *FD* as significant enough to include in the Standards. Universities have to offer '*FD*', which is related to the improvement of the

teaching abilities of faculty members.

I argue that the government's intention was to encourage universities to have a deep conversation among members on the nature of education, but many universities reacted to the policy by creating *FD tantōsha*. Therefore, '*FD*' became 'activities' instead of a 'concept'. Once *FD* is treated as a set of activities, inquiry into the definition and concept of *FD* became no longer important. A similar situation occurred when the government encouraged IT implementation in universities in the late 1990s. Bachnik et al. (2003) investigated the implementation of IT in Japanese HE and asked why the transformation of education through IT was not successful. They argued that although there were good intentions and initiatives to support the IT implementation at the government, university, and individual level, the institutional mechanism as well as a lack of pedagogical assistance in utilizing IT and little IT support prevented successful transformation (Bachnik 2003). As a result, IT remained a "neutral skill" (*Ibid.* 2003, 332). The stories of IT implementation and institutional *FD* are similar. The aspect of *FD* that promotes the transformation of the status quo is largely ignored in Japan and FD remains a symbolic term.

One possibility for creating transformative movement is to accumulate individual practices

into a collective voice. The individual practitioner builds everyday understandings of *FD* through lived experience, which is presented and shared within the practitioner's community. Certain methods of *FD* have been associated with individuals who started or became known in the community. The '*Hashimoto mesoddo* (Hashimoto method)' is one example. Masaru Hashimoto from Okayama University introduced the idea of involving students in *FD*, which was a new idea in 2007. He quickly became famous and his method gradually became recognized as the Hashimoto method. There are other examples too. In 2007 and 2008, when I carried out the fieldwork, it was easy to identify which individual was leading what kind of *FD*. However, attempts have not been made to analyse and construct the concept of *FD* based on an accumulation of everyday understanding, which links to the characteristics of the practitioners' community in Japan that I am going to discuss in the next section.

7.4 *Role of the Practitioners' Community*

There are a number of *FD* networks in Japan such as *FD* Network Tsubasa (established in 2009), Nagoya Consortium for Faculty and Staff Development (established in 2008), Shikoku Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (established in2008), Kansai Faculty Development Association (established in 2008), Q-Links (Kyushu Learning Improvement Network for Staff Members in Higher Education,

established in 2009), and Japan *FD* Network (established in 2008). The purpose of these networks is to share information about *FD* practices because not all universities have sufficient human and financial resources to carry out institutional *FD*. Each network organizes gatherings to present and share *FD* practices. Participants have various backgrounds institutionally and professionally and therefore their approaches to *FD*, methods of practice and evaluation, and the way they present are all varied. What brings them together is their interest in or a sense of the necessity of promoting *FD* and lived experiences.

At a typical network gathering, there would be one or two talks on a chosen theme, followed by parallel sessions to introduce the practices at various universities. Usually there would be a social gathering or a reception after the formal sessions where participants can exchange information in a more informal manner. As I mentioned in Chapter Seven, *FD* practitioners seem to adopt a different manner of speaking at such gatherings. During the official sessions, *FD* practitioners employ scholarly discourse to discuss their practices. They use data to support the design of *FD* activity and present its outcome. On the other hand, they talk very informally about daily experiences with *FD* at the social gathering or drinking party. They complain about the difficulties they face, about their boss and other faculty members who

criticize them, criticize the government, and worry about their career. Being more or less in a similar situation, they seem to be able to share and understand each other well, regardless of differences in their institutional or professional background. *FD* practitioners start to have a consensus about the importance and difficulties of *FD* through such social gatherings. At POD and SEDA, I also observed a similar phenomenon. The difference is that members of the POD or SEDA conference were mostly full time *FD* practitioners while most Japanese *FD* practitioners are full-time academics, meaning they still teach courses in their major and carry out research in their field. As I have pointed out, they have multiple communities to belong to and have choices of identities. They may be *FD tantōsha* at the time they attended such gatherings but a year later they may not be. At a POD or SEDA conference, I observed a sense of promoting the concept of *FD* and position of *FD* practitioners as an established and recognized new profession while at Japanese gatherings this was not necessarily the case. Most *FD* practitioners knew the role as *FD tantōsha* would be over in a year or two.

This does not mean Japanese *FD* practitioners are not serious about their given tasks. Rather, many of them expressed their sense of responsibility as *FD tantōsha* and, judging from my observations at Sakura University and interviews, it would be genuinely true that those practitioners are the ones who put effort into teaching and grapple with any other

non-academic affairs as part of their responsibilities, which is why they are chosen to play the role. A leader of a *FD* unit at a private university who was a professor at the faculty of engineering told me:

> "I don't know why but the president thinks I am a devoted teacher, which was why he picked me to be responsible for this unit."

In addition, as I mentioned before, there seems to be a consensus that *FD* is an important concept in the improvement of university education. What is not right is the way *FD* is implemented and practiced. This consensus is formed partly because of the ambiguity or multivocality of the concept of *FD* in Japanese.

Through these gatherings some universities became better known for advanced *FD* practices, such as Kanazawa Institute of Technology, Kansai University of International Studies, Ehime University, Rikkyo University and Okayama University. Furthermore, some people began to be known as *senmonka* (experts). This meant that, during the year I conducted my fieldwork, I kept seeing the same names as a guest speaker at various different gatherings. What these phenomena indicate is that some people became a provider of information for those who seek for a model. This is partly enhanced by the position of *FD* practitioners. As I mentioned before, many *FD* practitioners are appointed to act as *FD tantōsha* for a fixed term. Therefore, there is always someone new to the *FD* practitioners' community every year

who needs to learn from practices at other institutions. The ones who tend to be providers of information or the core members leading the gathering and networks are the ones working in a centre for university education and the like (Natsume, 2011), such as the Centre for the Studies of Higher Education at Nagoya University or the Institute for Higher Education Research and Practice at Osaka University. By being treated like and acting as core members, those *FD* practitioners enhance their expertise as a practitioner. Some choose to pursue this kind of expertise in order to become better leaders of *FD* practitioners (i.e. an *FDer*) and some choose to remain facilitators of gatherings and networks, as seen in the example of JFDN Jr.

The issue of this type of community is that an increasing number of newcomers dilute the characteristics of the community of practitioners because they are not necessarily committed to creating a vibrant community (Tanaka, 2011). Rather, they express their eagerness to get quick bites of *FD*. This may sound somewhat contradictory. However, my understanding is that many but not all *FD* practitioners who are temporarily playing the role of *FD tantōsha* are serious about their role but may not be as serious about contributing to the formation of a community. It is one thing to make a contribution to their own institution and quite another to put energy into the community of practitioners. Inevitably, those who are in the core

institutions of such a community thus become responsible for thinking about and sustaining a vibrant community.

Conclusion

So, what is '*FD tantōsha*'? What does it tell us about *FD* in Japan? As a term for *FD* practitioners, it puts the question of the concept of *FD* and professional identity on hold. *FD* practitioners do not need to choose between the academic profession and *FD* practitioner as a new profession. By keeping an academic identity, they are able to sustain collegiality with other faculty members. By being a *FD* practitioner they are able to cross the boundaries of faculties and departments. '*FD tantōsha*' is a term that therefore allows *FD* practitioners not to take too much responsibility and helps *FD* practitioners to make sense of complex lived experiences. The temporariness of the position '*FD tantōsha*' indicates that the individual does not need to commit to the role for good. It depends on the individual to decide to what extent he/she commits. It takes a load off the shoulders of the individual. Ironically, though, it prevents continuity and maturity of discussion about *FD*.

As a reflection of the Japanese reaction to *FD*, it shows how *FD* had been dealt with personally and how questions about career paths and the academic profession overtook

questions about the concept of *FD*. In English-speaking countries, the discussion about faculty development contributed to shape "the ways those in the sector (higher education) think about teaching (Clegg 2009, 403)". Clegg argues (2009, 408):

> The reshaping of higher education has come from actors inside the field, not from those outside it, and academic developers in particular have been immensely influential in transforming the discourse around teaching and teaching quality."

I am not trying to say that faculty development in English-speaking Western countries is successful without doubt in introducing the discourse of teaching and learning or contributing to the transformation of HE. However, what I would like to point out here is that the introduction of the faculty development concept stirred up various discussions among faculty members, university administrators, and policy makers, which took different directions to develop or sometimes disappeared and gradually came to form a discourse of several different categories, including teaching and learning. Japanese *FD*, in comparison, remained in the hands of those who are involved. Indeed, this is what the term '*tantō*' literally means. The case of *FD* practitioners gives a picture of how a university controls the changes led by higher education policies. The university reform such as curriculum reform and organizational reform is treated as a central issue for the president and other executives, while *FD* is assigned to *FD tantōsha*. In this way, changes take place on the surface of the university, while the core – the faculty or more specifically established faculties – remains unchanged.

Conclusion

Late in 2009, having returned from Japan, I felt somewhat at a loss and pessimistic about the future of institutional *FD* in Japan. I felt that I had gained a deep understanding from my fieldwork but was still not sure if I understood what *FD* meant for Japanese practitioners. I then attended two conferences. The first was the 34th POD Network Conference in Houston, Texas, entitled 'Welcoming Change: Generations and Regenerations'. The second was in Birmingham and was the 14th SEDA Annual Conference for Staff and Educational Developers, entitled 'Changing Educational Development: New Ideas, New Approaches, New Contexts'. I found the use of the term 'change' in both conferences in two different countries interesting. At both conferences, the members discussed their work and identity. At the US POD Network, there were three whiteboards set in front of the registration table with the titles "POD Network in 5 years' time", "How would you describe what you do as a faculty developer?", and "Please express your image of faculty development in a drawing'. There were pens and sticky paper for the members to express their opinions. One of the keynote speakers asked members to think about where they had been, where they were, and where they were heading. At the SEDA conference, one of the facilitators of the seminar asked: "Do you see yourself as educational developer? Is it a career? How much confidence

and credibility does an educational developer have?" In another session, the facilitator asked participants to use a metaphor to describe what they do as an educational developer. My experiences at both conferences made me wonder about the nature of faculty development practitioners' work that created so many questions about their role and professional identity even in countries with a more established and defined concept of faculty development. If I had no knowledge about faculty development and listened to participants at those conferences talk, I would not have recognized differences between what they discussed about their day-to-day experiences and concerns and what Japanese *FD* practitioners discussed. I thus began to wonder if I was caught up in searching for a distinctly Japanese understanding of *FD* too much and did not realize what I had observed and experienced was in fact an experience shared by many of those working within *FD*, both in Japan and internationally.

This thesis has investigated the lived experience of faculty development practitioners in Japan, the formation of their professional identity, and the construction of the concept of *FD* as a result of their experiences. I conclude by summarizing my arguments and applying them so as to understand some of the new developments, reflecting on my research strategy, and addressing the implications for future investigations.

Current situation

The introduction of institutional *FD* has encouraged universities to pay attention to the training of faculty members and to improve the quality of teaching. Various approaches have appeared, including the technocratic approach that mainly follows the PDCA (plan-do-check-act) cycle and the *sōgo kenshū*[27] approach that encourages peer learning in everyday settings (Natsume, 2011). Involving students in *FD* is another trend these days. Seminars and workshops that used to be offered to faculty members in general are now offered according to career stage and discipline. Several research-intensive universities began offering faculty development opportunities to graduate students as a preparation for an academic career (e.g. Nagoya University, Kyoto University, and Hokkaido University). People no longer make the joke that "*FD* is not a floppy disk, it is faculty development". In fact, the younger generation is no longer familiar with what a 'floppy disk' is. Time has passed. But what changes has institutional *FD* made? I made three arguments based on my review of the literature and analysis of ethnographic fieldwork. They are:

- The multivocality of the term '*tantōsha*' allows *FD* practitioners to sustain unfixed roles and fluid professional identities;
- *FD* in Japan is treated as a noun and so does not embed the possibilities of

[27] The term '*sōgo*' means 'mutual' and 'reciprocal'.

evolution, unlike the English term ‘faculty development’; and

- *FD* practitioners are able to share their day-to-day experiences regardless of the contextual differences, and their networks bring them together as a community. However, temporariness of the position prevents practitioners to engage with the advancement of the community by creating the language and knowledge base to share.

I now turn to more recent developments in Japanese HE to see how relevant my arguments are for an understanding of these new developments.

A quick look at the titles of presentations at the 34th Annual Conference of LGES and the 15th Annual Conference of JAHER that will be held in 2012 reveals that the new buzzword in the field of higher education in Japan is ‘*IR*’ or institutional research. This is about conducting institutional research to collect data to support better management of the university. Various cases of using IR in the USA and Australia are being introduced. When I attended those conferences in 2008 and 2009, the term ‘*FD*’ was everywhere. The *FD* bubble, in a way, has burst. But considering how the concept of faculty development evolved in the USA and the UK to create various new terms such as ‘educational development’ and ‘organizational development’, and how gradually the use of ‘faculty development’

disappeared, maybe this is simply the Japanese version of the evolution of *FD*. This is just speculation but perhaps the current framework of *FD* reached its limit and practitioners needed a new framework to overcome the restrictions of *FD*. By introducing a new concept or framework, practitioners are able to overcome the restrictions they face. In this kind of changeable condition, it is wiser to remain a *tantōsha* even if the role requires professional knowledge and skills. Those who have been *FD tantōsha* can thus easily become *IR tantōsha*.

The issue remains that new conceptualisations almost always have to be introduced from abroad. As a result, the existing discussions and the newly introduced debates tend to have little connection. The discontinuation of the discussions about the improvement of education that took place in the 1970s and 80s and the discussions of *FD* in the 1990s, which are basically all about the improvement of education, offer a good example. That would seem to be the consequence of borrowing ideas and concepts from other countries and not creating one's own language. Another implication of borrowing foreign term is that once the term is introduced, people begin to try to gain proper understanding of the term and start making judgment about others' understanding. Then it is no longer about 'borrowing' a term to 'do' or 'discuss' something. Understanding the term becomes the purpose. They are caught by the

term. However, what is it that makes it difficult for researchers of HE and *FD* practitioners in Japan to create their own language to describe what they are involved in? This needs further investigation.

Reflections on Research Strategy

Doing ethnography was not easy. Before I left for the field, I was not exactly sure how best to do ethnographic fieldwork well. Once in the field, I tried different ways of writing field notes but kept wondering if I was making progress. My choice of participatory observation was a great way to expose myself to the field of *FD* but I was constantly aware of the impact I might be having on the field as a participant. This sometimes put me in a difficult situation where I needed to express myself as *FD senmonka*, as the Project members perceived. But later I realized that the ethnographic approach allows me to express those concerns. I believe that this is one of the beauties of this research strategy. I was allowed to use five senses to explore the field and to express it as well. It is a rare research strategy indeed that allows the researcher to talk about emotions and subjectivity. Having said that, I tried my best to reflect on my own understandings and judgements by carrying out interviews, document analysis, and sometimes checking my hypotheses with Project members in conversations. The biggest dilemma that I faced was dealing with ethnographic data. Once I was back in Oxford and

began reading my field notes, I suddenly felt the weight of the data. I had stories of people's lives in those notes, stories of junior academics who were still struggling with their career development. I worried that revealing some of the stories could put them in a difficult situation in the field of higher education. This fear stopped me from looking at the data for a while. Then I attended the POD Network and SEDA conference. The experience of seeing and talking to practitioners that I tried to understand through the review of IJAD and other literature encouraged me to write. I realized, as I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, that by writing about what I observed I might be able to give a shape to *FD* that already exists in Japan but was not well recognized. Ethics in ethnography is not something a researcher should think about during fieldwork but rather a focus during the data analysis, writing, and when one thinks about publishing the outcomes.

Implications for Future Investigations

I end with several questions that have emerged as a result of this study, and that I still hope to pursue:

- Although there are contextual differences, the literature written in English about faculty development tends to be read as generic. This study has shown the similarities and differences in the discussion around professional identity in

Japan and in the English-language literature. What are the differences between the discussion about the professionalization of faculty development in the USA and the recognition of academic developers as an 'academic tribe' in the UK? It seems that the discussion around professional identity in relation to discipline-based academics is taking place primarily in the UK and Australia. In the USA, the role and position of faculty developer seems to be established more firmly as a profession, and therefore their concern is about the professional development of faculty developers as a new profession.

- Why do Japanese faculty development practitioners not create their own language to better fit their reality? In other words, why do higher education researchers in Japan need to borrow ideas and concepts from other countries? Is it simply that they intentionally pick concepts that serve to express what they want to say?
- How does this community become imagined through the interactions of ideas and concerns expressed by faculty development practitioners in various countries? In other words, what kind of body of knowledge is being accumulated?

Beyond the discussions in the literature, there are real people putting time and energy into

this act of faculty development. I keep the lives of these people in mind and hope to continue my journey of investigation.

Appendix 1: Consent letter

Unpacking Faculty Development in Japan

- an ethnographic faculty developers

This research study aims at understanding and identifying the role of faculty developers in Japanese universities education reform. This is a study undertaken by Machi Sato, DPhil student at the Department of Education, Oxford University.

I have read and understood the information on this study and have had the opportunity to ask questions and get satisfactory answers about this study. I understand that I can withdraw from the study without any consequences at anytime simply by informing the researcher of my decision.

I understand who will have access to identifying information provided and what will happen to the data at the end of this research.

I understand that this research has been reviewed by, and received ethics clearance through, the University of Oxford Central University Research Ethics Committee.

I agree to participate in this study.

Name:

Date:

Signature:

Name of researcher:

Date:

Signature:

Appendix 2: Part of the research proposal

Title: Development of *FD* program for the promotion of teaching with ICT

This study examines how to promote the use of ICT in their teaching. Based on the result of the study, I intend to develop FD contents for the promotion of teaching with ICT.

In the UK, one of the effective methods for the teacher's (of any levels) to change his/her conception of teaching is through action research. Action research is a method of research. In action research, a teacher is the one to teach and to research. The teacher has to collect data that shows what he/she teaches and pedagogies used, analyze those collected data, evaluate, and improve his/her own teaching. The strength of this method is it encourages the teacher to reflect on his/her own teaching more because he/she is the one who evaluate objectively. Considering the fact that university academics tend to be possessive and protective about their own lecturers, action research might be a suitable method to introduce. Making e-learning contents would involve looking over again about his/her own lecture. It is my intention to develop a way to integrate the idea from action research in to programs to teach how to make e-learning contents.

Appendix 3: Sample of substantive field note

Field note

01/04/08

Today was the first day of my work and research. The administrator told me to bring my bank account information and *hanko* (a stamp with my sir name) and come at 10:00. I checked the train time table and figured it would take me one hour to get there so I left home at around 8:30. I wore dark blue trouser, white sweater and dark blue jacket.

At 9:30, I arrived at the university. This university is in the middle of one of the major shopping districts in Tokyo, which is very popular among teenagers and young couples. Once I walked in from the main gate, I first saw a cafeteria on my right and a huge statue of a foreign priest on my left. This university is a Christian university. In front of the main gate was a pathway straight ahead. There were two buildings on each side. At the end of the pathway, there was an old building which is registered as a historical heritage. The office was located in the building which was on the left side of this old building. There is a chapel underneath the building. This building was built most recently but about 10 years ago. It is 13 stories and the office is located on the 13th floor. Up to 5th floor, there are classrooms for lectures but above 6th floor only catered offices for faculty members expect our centre. Next to the elevator, there was a directory board which showed names of professors next to the room number, however, there was nothing written on the rooms for the centre and there was no visible information about the centre anywhere.

I checked the location of the centre and decided to explore the campus a bit more as I had 30 minutes before the appointment time. I realized I forgot to bring diary so I walked to the university shop on campus. The shop was located next to the cafeteria. They had books, magazines, stationary, computer related stuff, university goods, and snacks. The shop was empty. I checked the university goods first. They sold T-shirt, sweater, white shirt with the university logo, bags, pens, clear case, note book, and key holders, chocolate and cookies. Then I looked around the book section. The first shelf had books and magazines that describe 'how to' find a job, to sit for a job interview, to prepare a CV, etc. The second shelf had novels and essays for pleasure readings. Then there were 6 shelves for academic books. I bought a simple diary and left the shop.

On the way to the office, I saw children wearing school uniform walking with the mothers. Then I realize on the same campus, they have a kinder garden, a primary school, junior and senior high school, and female junior college.

I got off the elevator on 13th floor. The elevator was located on one end of the building. There was no directory on the floor but there was only one corridor with rooms on both sides. I looked at name plates on each door to find the office. The office was located almost at the end of the other side of the corridor. It didn't have the name of the centre but the room number was what I was given. The corridor was very quiet. It felt as if no one was in those offices. I knocked on the door and entered the room.

The office room was small. There were six desks facing each other with partitions, three book shelves on one side of the wall, two printers and one locker. There was also a small counter table with pamphlets and papers and pens. From the entrance, it was hard to see if there were people on the other side of the partitions. The lady who was sitting on the left desk turned around and looked at me. I introduced myself. She nodded and said, "Please follow me. You will have a meeting in another room." She took me to the room next to the office. It had a heavy wooden door, different from other doors, and it was a room for special meeting. There were a huge round table with big black chairs, 12 of them, and a big screen. The lady said to me, "Saito san has not arrived yet. He called and said that the train was stopped for a while so he would be late. Please wait here."

There was a young man sitting already in the room. I greeted him and sat next to him. I introduced myself, "My name is Sato. This is my first day at this Center. Are you also a new member here?" He said, "Yes. But I am only here for two days a week. I am a PhD student." I said, "Oh, I am here only four days a week and I am also a postgraduate student." He asked "Where do you study? What is your major?" "I am actually doing my postgraduate degree at Oxford and my major is higher education studies. How about yourself?" "My major is educational technology. I am doing my PhD at Tokyo Tech."

Then we fell silent. He was touching his mobile phone which happened to be the same one was one. So I said, "Oh, you have the same phone. Great. I don't know how to use this mobile phone.

Can you show me?" "Okay." We played with the mobile phone until Saito san arrived.

Saito san entered the room at 10:15. He said, "I am sorry. The train stopped. And I have another meeting at 11:00. So I will just briefly talk with you and leave you for a while. I will come back at 13:30." "Welcome to the center. Watanabe kun, you know well about this place so you would have no problem. Sato san, we needed a FD specialist and we are happy that you are here." At that time, I realize the other person has already some connection with the staff of this center. He gave us a piece of paper. General rules were written such as hours of work a day, instruction about the key, the building, library card, computer, and so on. Nothing about the project was written. Each one of us was given the computer and was asked to think about the email address and password so that he could create while he is in the next meeting. By the time he finished explaining about those general stuff, it was already time. So we were again left in the room with a brand new computer.

We started to set up the computer. Watanabe kun asked, "Do you know how to set up the internet?" So I said, "No. Do you? Can you do that for me?" He grinned and started to set up my computer. He said, "You are not a technology person, aren't you." So I said, "I am not."

At 12:00, the lady at the desk came to the room and asked if we wanted to go out for lunch together with others. She explained that usually the members go out for lunch at 12:00 together. I met other members for the first time. There were three other male staff. One was slightly older than others in his early 40s but the other guy was in his late 20s and another one in his early 30s. We quickly introduced to each other and started to walk to the restaurant. I walked with the administrator. We went to a Japanese restaurant and sat at the counter. As I was sitting at the end of the counter, I was only able to talk with the administrator. We just chatted about her previous job as the coordinator of interpreters. We spent about 30 min. at lunch. I was the last one to finish.

When we came back to the room, we were informed that the meeting at 13:30 was postponed to 16:00. We were told to do whatever we want. There was nothing we could do so we decided to walk around the campus. While we walked around, I asked him about his PhD topic. He is working on mobile learning. He is examining how students learn with mobile technology and how lecturers can design materials for mobile learning. It was totally a new topic for me so I

asked many questions about mobile learning.

At 16:00, the meeting started. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the members of the center to us and confirm what kind of projects they are currently involved and to check the timelines. Nine people attended including three administrators and Watanabe and myself. Three administrators were female and others were all male. Three of male staff brought their computers and continued to type during the meeting. Saito san explained that there are more members in the center but those people are the ones who share the office together. Saito san said, "I am involved with all the projects. So basically I can't spend too much time on each project. Suzuki is working mostly with Prof. Suzuki. Matsuda is in ICT-FD project and he also runs mentoring program. We work closely together. Hiza is in ICT-FD project and he manages students who work as part time at this center. Takamiya is a part time staff. She helps mentoring program. Hosaka is a part time administrative staff and Nakagawa is the full time administrative staff. If you have any questions about this center you should ask Nakagawa. There is another part time staff, Ishii, but today is not her working day so she is not here. She is the legal expert." I introduced myself and Watanabe followed me. Then Saito said, "As I said, there are different projects running at the same time. You can read the report or the website about each project." He then started to check everyone's schedule. They reported the week schedule one by one. Matsuda seems to have the tightest schedule. Saito chatted for a while about the meeting that he attended in the morning. "It was a meeting for the new staff members of the university. I became full time staff from this year although I have been working for this university for number of years. In the meeting, there was a talk by the chaplain about the mission of the university. I am not Christian but I enjoyed listening to his talk." He went on talking about the meeting for a while. The meeting lasted until 17:30. There was no specific information about each project.

It was the end of the day. I left the university after the meeting.

Appendix 4: Sample of analytic field note

01/04/08

So this was the first day of my work and ethnography. My first impression of the office and people are as follows.

- Maybe the center does not have much power in the university. The location of the office is kind of strange and it is hard to know that it exists there. Also, having no name on the directory also shows the weak publicity of the center. I was surprised to know that most of the members are part time and young as well.
- My role…? I was surprised that there was no introduction about my work. Maybe they were busy today but I didn't feel I was given enough information about what I supposed to expect from tomorrow. Perhaps I need to wait for a week to figure out my position and my time table.
- FD specialist…? Saito called me a specialist of faculty development. What does he expect? What does he mean by FD specialist? Is it different from being a practitioner of FD? What made him say that I am a FD specialist?
- Are they reserved? Even at the lunch time, they just talked among themselves and didn't really ask me any questions. It seems lunch time is the good time to communicate with others so I should join them as well.
- Team work…? At the meeting, everyone seems to be doing their own work although we were sitting in the same room. Also Saito spent long time just chatting about his day. How does meeting work in this office? Is this a place to discuss something or is it just for the formality?
- Tomorrow…? No one told me what to do tomorrow. I guess I just have to find out tomorrow.

Appendix 5: List of interviewees

First Group

No	Name	Affiliation	Position	Date of interview
1	Ogawa	Ayame University, national, multi disciplines, top 20, located in the major city	Associate Professor, Social Science	01/10/2008
2	Mori	Hagi University, private, multi disciplines, top 20, located in the major city	Professor, Social Science	10/06/2009
3	Ikeda	Fuji University, private, multi disciplines, top 20, located in the major city	Associate Professor, Social Science	16/06/2009
4	Aoki	Fuji University, private, multi disciplines, top 20, located in the major city	Professor, Science	25/06/2009
5	Kaneko	Momo University, national, multi disciplines, top 20, located in the major city	Lecturer, Social Science	04/12/2008
6	Wada	Momo University, national, specialized field, top 20, located in the major city	Professor, Science	12/01/2009
7	Tamura	Keyaki University, national, specialized field, top 20, located in the major city in the east	Professor, Science	09/01/2009
8	Nakano	Keyaki University, national, specialized field, top 20, located in the major city in the east	Professor, Science	11/11/2008
9	Hara	Keyaki University, national, specialized field, top 20, located in the major city in the east	Professor, Science	12/11/2008

Second Group

No	Name	Affiliation	Position	Date of interview
10	Suzuki	Ayame University, national, multi disciplines, top 20, located in the major city in the east	Associate Professor, Educational Technology	17/09/2009
11	Tanaka	Sugi University, national, multi disciplines, top 20, located in the major city in the west	Assistant Professor, Higher Education, *FD tantōsha*	15/09/2009
12	Yamamoto	Take University, national, multi disciplines, top 20, located in the major city in the west	Associate Professor, Educational Technology, *FD tantōsha*	14/09/2009
13	Watanabe	Take University, national, multi disciplines, top 20, located in the major city in the west	Postgraduate student, Higher Education	14/09/2009
14	Takahashi	Nazuna University, private, multi disciplines, top 50, located in the major city in the central	Administrator, *FD tantōsha*	23/07/2009
15	Kobayashi	Hasu University, private, specialized field, top 50, located outside the major city in the east	Lecturer, Educational Sociology, *FD tantōsha*	11/09/2009
16	Nakamura	Beni University, private, limited disciplines, top 200, located outside the major city in the east	Administrator, *FD tantōsha*	10/09/2009
17	Ito	Mizuna University, national, multi disciplines, top 20, located in the major city in the north	Postgraduate student, Educational Technology	09/09/2009
18	Saito	Mizuna University, national, multi disciplines, top 20, located in the major city in the north	Professpr, Higher Education, *FD tantōsha*	09/09/2009

19	Kato	Murasaki University, national, multidisciplines, top 50, located in the small city in the south	Associate Professor, Educational Psychology, *FD tantōsha*	06/09/2009
20	Yamada	Research institute		02/09/2009
21	Yoshida	Yanagi University, private, limited disciplines, top 200, located in the major city in the north	Professor, Law, *FD tantōsha*	31/08/2009
22	Sasaki	Yuzu University, national, multidisciplines, top 20, located in the small city in the north	Associate Professor, Higher Education, *FD tantōsha*	08/08/2009
23	Kimura	Yomogi University, private, specialized field, top 200, located in the major city in the west	Associate Professor, Educational Technology, *FD tantōsha*	15/07/2009
24	Hayashi	Kaede University, private, limited disciplines, top 200, located in the major city in the west	Professor, Higher Education	15/09/2009
25	Imai	Hinoki University, national, multi disciplines, top 50, located in the small city in the west	Associate Professor, Educational Management, *FD tantōsha*	18/11/2009

Selected Bibliography

Akahori, K. (1997) *Daigaku jūgyō no gihō* (Methods of university teaching). Tokyo: Yūikaku.

Amano, I. (1991). *Nihonteki daigakuzō wo motomete* (In search of Japanese university). Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.

Amano, I. (2003). *Nihon no kōtō kyouiku shisutemu* (System of Japanese higher education). Tokyo: Tokyo University Press.

Amano, I. (2006). *Daigaku kaikaku no syakaigaku* (Sociology of University Reform). Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.

Amano, I. (2008). *Kokuritsu Daigaku Hōjinka no yukue* (Corporization of national universities). Tokyo: Toshindo.

Amano, I., Arai, I. (1971). Kōtōkyōiku ni kansuru bunken kaidai (Review of literature on higher education), *Kyōiku Shakaigaku Kenkyū*, 26, 122-136.

Anderson, B. (1998). *Imagined Communities.* (A. Shiraishi & T. Shiraishi, Trans.) Tokyo: NTT Publisher.

Andrews, R. (2003). *Research Questions*. London: Continuum.

Arimoto, A., ed. (2004a) *Study of the Institutionalization of Faculty Development Part 1: Report of the Nationwide Survey on University Presidents in 2003.* Hiroshima, Japan: Research Institute for Higher Education Hiroshima University.

Arimoto, A., ed. (2004b). *Study of the Institutionalization of Faculty Development Part 2: Report of the Nationwide Survey on University Faculty in 2003.* Hiroshima, Japan: Research Institute for Higher Education Hiroshima University.

Arimoto, A. (2005). *Daigaku kyōjushoku to FD* (Academic Profession and Faculty Development in U.S.A. and Japan). Tokyo: Toshindo.

Arimoto, A. (2009). Changing Academic Profession in the World from 1992 to 2007. Conference paper. The Changing Academic Profession Over 1992-2007: International, Comparative, and Quantitative Perspectives. 13 and 14 January, 2009.

Arimoto, A., ed. (2007). *Construction and Quality Assurance of 21st Century Higher Education System - Report from the Group on FD, SD, and Education.* Hiroshima, Japan: Research Institute for Higher Education Hiroshima University.

Arimoto, A., ed. (2008). *Study of the Institutionalization of Faculty Development Part 3: Report of the Nationwide Survey on University Faculty in 2003.* Hiroshima, Japan: Research Institute for Higher Education Hiroshima University.

Austin, A. E., Wulff, D. H. (2004). The Challenge to Prepare the Next Generation of Faculty. In D. H. Wulff et al., *Paths to the Professoriate: Strategies for Enriching the Preparation of Future Faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 3-16.

Asmar, C. (1999). Scholarship, experience, or both? A developer's approach to cross-cultural teaching. *The Internaitonal Journal for Academic Development,* 4 (1), 18-27.

Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., Delamont, S., Lofland, J., Lofland, L. (2001) *Handbook of Ethnography.* London: Sage.

Bachnik, J. M. (2003) *Roadblocks on the information highway: the IT revolution in Japanese education*. Oxford: Lexington Books.

Barnett, R. (1997). Beyond Competence. In F. Coffield & B. Williamson, eds., *Repositioning Higher Education.* Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press, 27-44.

Barnett, R. (2000). *Realizing the university in an age of supercomplexity.* Buckingham: SRHE

& Open University Press.

Barnett, R., ed. (2006) *Reshaping the University - New Relationships between Research, Scholarship and Teaching.* Maidenhead: SRHE & Open University Press.

Bath, D., & Smith, C. (2004). Academic developers: an academic tribe claiming their territory in higher education. *International Journal for Academic Development , 9* (1), 9-27.

Baume, D. (2002). Scholarship, academic development and the future. *International Journal for Academic Development,* 7 (2), 109-111.

Baume, D. (2006). Towards the End of the Last Non-Professions? *International Journal for Academic Development,* 11 (1), 57-60.

Beaty, L. (2006). Towards professional teaching in higher education: the role of accreditation. In P. Ashwin, ed. *Changing Higher Education - The development of learning and teaching.* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 99-112.

Becher, T. (1989). *Academic Tribes and Territories – Intellectual enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Milton Keyness: SRHE and Open University Press.

Becher, T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). *Academic Tribes and Territories - Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines* (second edition). Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.

BERA (2004). *Revised Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research.* Southwell: British Educational Research Association.

Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University: what the student does.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Blackmore, P. (2009). Conceptions of development in higher education institutions. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34 (6), 663-676.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brew, A. (2008). Disciplinary and interdisciplinary affiliations of experienced researhers. *Higher Education , 56*, 423-438.

Brew, A. (2003). The Future of Research and Scholarship in Academic Development. In H. Eggins & R. Macdonald, eds., *The Scholarship of Academic Development*. Buchkingham: SRHE & Open University Press, 165-181.

Brew, A. (2009). Academic development in a global context. *International Journal for Academic Development,* 14 (2), 95-97.

Brewer, J. D. (2000). *Ethnography.* Berkshire: Open University Press.

Bryman, A. (2001). *Social Research Methods.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burgess, R.G. (1989). Grey Areas: Ethical Dilemmas in Educational Ethnography. In R.G. Burgess, ed., *The Ethics of Educational Research.*New York; Philadelphia; London: The Falmer Press, 60-76.

Camblin JR, L.D. and Steger, J.A. (2000). Rethinking Faculty Development. *Higher Education,* 39 (1), 1-18.

Candy, (1991). *Ivory Tower to Concrete Jungle: The Difficult Transition from the Academy to the Workplace as Learning Environments.* Ohio State University Press.

Candy, P. (1996). Promoting lifelong learning: Academic developers and the university as a learning organization. *Internaitonal Journal for Academic Development,* 1 (1), 7-18.

Carew, A.L., Lefoe, G., Bell, M., Armour, L. (2008). Elastic Practice in Academic Developers. *International Journal for Academic Development,* 13 (1), 51-66.

Center for the Advancement of Higher Education Tohoku University (2009) *fakaruthī diberoppumento wo koete* (Beyond faculty development). Sendai, Japan: Tohoku University Press.

Central Council (2008) *Gakushi katei kyōiku no kōchiku ni mukete.* MEXT. http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo0/toushin/1217067.htm

Chism, N.V.N. (2006) Teaching Awards: What Do They Award? *Journal of Higher Education,* 77 (4), 589-617.

Clark, S. M., Corcoran, M., & Lewis, D. R. (1986). The Case for an Institutional Perspective on Faculty Development. *Journal of Higher Education , 57* (2), 176-195.

Clegg, S. (2003) Problematising Ourselves: Continuing Professional Development in Higher Education. *International Journal for Academic Development,* 8 (1/2), 37-50.

Clegg, S. (2009). Forms of knowing and academic development practice. *Studies in Higher Education , 34* (4), 403-416.

Coffield, F. and Williamson, B. (1997) *Repositioning Higher Education.* Bristol: SRHE & Open University Press.

Collinson, J. A. (2000). Social Science Contract Researchers in Higher Education: Perceptions of Craft Knowledge. *Work, Employment & Society , 14* (1), 159-171.

Cummings, W. K., Amano, I. (1977). The changing role of the Japanese professor. *Higher Education*, 6 (2), 209-234.

Davis, J. M. (1961). Foreign Student Adviser: A New Profession? *American Academy of Political and Social Science ,* 335, 91-98.

D'Andrea, V., Gosling, D. (2005). *Improving Teaching and Learning - A Whole Institution Approach.* Milton Keynes: SRHE & Open University Press.

Dawson, D., Britnell, J., Hitchcock, A. (2010). Developing Competency Models of Faculty Developers - using World Cafe to foster dialogue. *To Improve the Academy,* 28, 3-24.

de Vaus, D. A. (2001). *Research Design in Social Research.* London, Thousand Oaks, and New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Deem, R., Brehony, K. J. (2005). Management as ideology: the case of 'new managerialism' in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education , 31* (2), 217-235.

DiLorenzo, T. M., Heppner, P. P. (1994). The Role of Academic Department in Promoting Faculty Development: Recognizing Diversity and Leading to Excellence. *Journal of Counseling & Development , 72*, 485-491.

Donald, J. G. (2009). The Commons - Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Encounters. In C. Kreber, ed, *The University and its Disciplines - Teaching and Learning Within and Beyond Disciplinary Boundaries*. New York: Routledge, 35-49.

Eggins, H., Macdonald, R., eds. (2003). *The Scholarship of Academic Development.* Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.

Findlow, S. (2012). Higher education change and professional-academic identity in newly 'academic' disciplines: the case of nurse education. *Higher Education , 63*, 117-133.

Frase, K. (1999). Australasian academic developers: Entry into the profession and our own professional development. *International Journal for Academic Development , 4*, 89-101.

Gaff, J.G. (1975). *Towards Faculty Renewal.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gaff, J. and Simpson, R. (1994). Faculty development in the United States. *Innovative Higher Education,* 18, 167-176.

Geertz, C. (1973). *Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Gibbs, G. (2003). Improving university teaching and learning through instituion-wide strategies.

Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: New Trends and Innovations, 1-15.

Gibbs, G. (1996). Supporting educational development within departments. *International Journal for Academic Development,* 1 (1), 27-37.

Gillespie, K.H., Hilsen, L.R.,Wadsworth, E.C., eds. (2002). *A guide to faculty development - practical advice, examples, and resources.* San Francisco: Anker Pulishing Company, Inc.

Goodman, R. (2005). W(h)ither the Japanese University? An Introduction to the 2004 Higher Education Reforms in Japan. In J.S. Eades, R. Goodman, Y. Hada, eds., *The 'Big Bang' in Japanese Higher Education - The 2004 Reforms and the Dynamics of Change.* Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press, 1-31.

Gosling, D. (2001). Educational development units in the UK: What are they doing five years on? *International Journal for Academic Development,* 6 (1), 74-90.

Gosling, D., McDonald, J. and Stockley, D. (2007). We did it our way! Narratives of pathways to the profession of educational development. *Educational Developments,* 8 (4), 1-5.

Gosling, D. (2008). *Educational Development in the UK - Report for the Heads of Educational Development Group.* www.hedg.ac.uk/documents/HEDG_Report_final.pdf

Gosling, D. (2009). Educational development in the UK: a complex and contradictory reality. *International Journal for Academic Development,* 14 (1), 5-18.

Gordon, R., Holland, J., Lahelma, E. (2001). Ethnographic Research in Educational Settings. In P. Atkinson, *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: SAGE Publications, 188-243.

Hamersley, M., Atkinson, P. (1995). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice.* London: Routledge.

Hammersley, M., Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice.* Third edition ed. New York: Routledge.

Hamano, K. (1987). FD ankēto chōsa jisshi no keika nit tsuite (Mid-report of FD survey). *Ippan kyōiku gakkaishi*, 9 (1): 52-72.

Hashimoto, K. (2007). A Decade of Activities of the Japanese Association of Higher Education Research: Focusing on its Organisation and Knowledge. *Japanese Journal of Higher Education Research*, 10, 7-29.

Hata, T. (2009). Daigaku kyōiku kaikaku to Faculty Development (University education reform and Faculty Development). In the Center for Advancement of Higher Education Tohoku University, ed. *Fakaruthī diberoppumento wo koete* (Beyond Faculty Development). Sendai: Tohoku University Press, 3-22.

Hara, K. (1995). FD katsudō no sogai yōin to sono kokuhuku saku. *Journal of the Liberal and General Education Society of Japan,* 17 (1), 21-24.

Harland, T. and Staniforth, D. (2008). A family of strangers: The fragmented nature of academic development. *Teaching in Higher Education,* 13 (6), 669-678.

Harland, T. and Staniforth, D. (2003). Academic Development as Academic Work. *International Journal for Academic Development,* 8 (1/2), 25-35.

Henkel, M. (2010). Introduction: Change and Continuity in Academic and Professional Identities. In G. Gordon & C. Whitchurch, eds. *Academic and Professional Identities in Higher Education: The Challenges of a Diversifying Workforce*. New York, Abingdon (UK): Routledge.

Henkel, M. (2000). *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education.* London, Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Hicks, O. (1999). Integration of central and departmental development - reflections from Australian universities. *Internaitonal Journal for Academic Development,* 4 (1), 43-51.

Horta, H., Sato, M.,and Yonezawa, A. (2011). Academic inbreeding: exploring its

characteristics and rationale in Japanese universities using a qualitative perspective. *Asia Pacific Education Review , 12* (1), 35-44.

Inoshita, O. (2008a). Trends of Research Reports Presented at the Annual Kyoto Conference on Educational Reforms in Higher Education in Japan, 2002-2008: Focusing on Papers Related to Instructional and Faculty Development . *Kyoto University Researches in Higher Education , 14*, 87-104.

Inoshita, O. (2008b). FD no tagisei to katsudō no kadai (multiplicity of FD and issues with practices). *IDE gendai no kōtō kyōiku*, 10-16.

Inter University House, ed. (1989). *Daigaku ha kawaru* (University will change). Tokyo: Kokusai shoin.

Ito, A. (2006). Kindai nihon no kōtō kyōiku no rekishi kenkyū no tenkai (Trend of higher education research in Japan today). *Daigaku Ronshū*, 36, 149-168.

Ito, H., Otsuka, Y. (1999). *Gaido bukku daigaku jugyō no kaizen* (Guide book improving university teaching). Tokyo: Yūikaku.

Iwami, K. (2004). Henbōsuru gakusei. In M. Kinukawa and A. Tachi, eds. *Gakushi kateikyōiku no kaikaku* (Reform of Undergraduate education in Japan). Tokyo: Toshindo, 107-125.

Kahn, P., Baume, D. eds (2003). *A guide to staff and educational development.* London; Sterling, USA: Kogan Page Limited.

Kandlbinder, P. (2012). Recognition and influence: the evolution of higher education research and development. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 31 (1) 5-13.

Kinukawa, M. (1995). *Daigaku kyōiku no honshitsu.* Tokyo: U-LEAG Book.

Kinukawa, M. (2006). *Daigaku kyouiku no shisou - gakushi katei kyouiku no dezain-.* Tokyo: Toshindo.

Kinukawa, M., Tachi, A. (2004). *Gakushi kateikyōiku no kaikaku* (Reform of Undergraduate education in Japan). Tokyo: Toshindo.

Kitamura, K. (1989). Daigaku kenkyū no imi (Meaning of doing research on university). *Daigaku Ronshū*, 1-22.

Kōtō kyōiku kenkyūkai, ed. (2002). Daigaku shingikai zen 28 tōshin hōkokusho (28 papers of University Council) Tokyo: Gyōsei.

Knapper, C. (2010). Plus Ça Change …Educational Development Past and Future. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning , 122*, 1-5.

Kogan, M., Hanney, S. (2000). Reforming higher education. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers Ltd.

Kyoto Daigaku kōtō kyōiku kenkyū (2009). The 14th Kyoto University in Higher Education Symposium (http://www.highedu.kyoto-u.ac.jp/index_publication.html)

Kreber, C., Cranton, P. A. (2000). Exploring the Scholarship of Teaching. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(4), 476-495.

Kreber, C, ed, (2009). *The University and its Disciplines - Teaching and Learning Within and Beyond Disciplinary Boundaries*. New York: Routledge, 35-49.

Kuroha, R. (2001). *Sengo daigaku seisaku no tenkai* (Transformation of higher education policy after the World War II). Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.

Kuzukami, H. (1998). Jugyō kaikaku wo samatagete irumono (Elements that stop reform of teaching). In. H. Shimizu, ed., *Kyōiku no esunogurafī* (Ethnography in Education). Kyoto: Sagamino shoin, 195-222.

Land, R. (2004). *Educational Development: Discourse, Identity and Practice.* Berkshire,

England: SRHE & Open University Press.

LeCompte, M.D., Goetz, J.P. (1982). Problems of Reliability and Validity in Ethnographic Research. *Review of Educational Research,* 52 (1), 31-60.

Lee, A. and McWilliam, E. (2008). What game are we in? Living with academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development,* 13 (1), 67-77.

Liberal and General Education Society of Japan, ed. (1987). Faculty Development ni kansuru ankēto chōsa hōkoku (Report of Faculty Development Survey). *Ippan kyōiku gakkaishi*, 9 (2), 64-122.

Liberal and General Education Society of Japan, ed. (2004). *Towards a New Liberal Education : 25 years of Liberal and General Education Society of Japan*. Tokyo: Toshindo.

Liberal and General Education Society of Japan, ed. (2010). *University Education 30 Years of Study and Reform – From the viewpoint of the Liberal and General Education Society of Japan.* Tokyo: Toshindo.

Maanen, J. V. (1988). *Tales of the Field.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Macdonald, R. (2003). Developing a Scholarship of Academic Development. In H. Eggins, & R. Macdonald, *The Scholarship of Academic Development*. Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press, 1-10.

Macdonald, R., Wisdom, J. (2002). *Academic and Educational Development: Research, Evaluation and Changing Practice in Higher Education*. London: Kogan Page.

Manathunga, C. (2007). "Unhomely" Academic Developer Identities: More post-colonial explorations. *International Journal for Academic Development , 12* (1), 25-34.

May, T. (2001). *Social research: issues, methods and process.* Buckingham: Open University

Press.

McAlpine, (2004). *Designing Learning as Well as Teaching: A Research-Based Model for Instruction that Emphasizes Learner Practice.* London: Sage Publications.

McAlpine, (2006). *How Do Instructors Explain their Thinking When Planning and Teaching?* Amsterdam: Springer.

Marton, F., Dall'Alba, G., & Beaty, E. (1993). Conceptions of learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 19, 277–300.

Massey, W. E. (1997). Uncertainties in the Changing Academic Profession. *Daedalus , 126* (4), 67-94.

Matsushita, K. ed. (2011). *Daigaku kyōiku no nettowāku wo tsukuru (Creating network for university education).* Tokyo: Toushindo.

McDonald, J., Stockley, D. (2008). Pathways to the profession of educational development: An international perspective. *International Journal for Academic Development,* 13 (3), 213-218.

Ministry of Education (1980) *Japan's Modern Educational System - A History of Education-*. http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/hakusho/html/hpbz198103/hpbz198103_2_169.html.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2004). *Daigaku ni okeru kyōiku naiyō no kaikaku jyōkyō ni tsuite* (Current status of university education reform). http://warp.da.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/286184/www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/18/06/06060504.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2005). *Daigaku ni okeru kyōiku naiyō no kaikaku jyōkyō ni tsuite* (Current status of university education reform). http://warp.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/286794/www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/18/06/06060504.htm

Millis, B.J. (1994) Faculty Development in the 1990s: What It Is and Why We Can't Wait. *Journal of Counceling & Development,* Vol.72, 454-464.

Mills, D., Harris, M., eds (2004) *Teaching Rites and Wrongs: Universities and the making of Anthropologists.* Birmingham: C-SAP Monographs.

Mio, T., Yoshida, A. (2002). *FD ga daigaku kyōiku wo kaeru* (FD changes university teaching). Tokyo: Bunyosha.

Moses, I. (1987) Educational development units: A cross-cultural perspective. *Higher Education,* 16, pp. 449-479.

Natsume, T. (2011). Daigaku kyoiku no shitsuhosho hosaku to shiteno FD no kanosei. *Nagoya Journal of Higher Education ,* 11, 133-152.

Natsume, T. (2011). FD moderu to shinteno sōgōkenshugata/dōryō moderu. In K. Matsushita, & ed., *Daigaku kyōikuno netto wāku wo tsukuru (Creating network for university education)*. Tokyo: Toshindo. 193-205.

Neyland, D. (2008). *Organizational Ethnography.* London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, and Singapore: SAGE Publications.

Ogasawara, M. (2004). 1990 nendai no daigaku oyobi daigakuin kaikaku. In M. Kinukawa & A. Tachi, eds. *Gakushi katei kyōiku no kaikaku* (Reforming of Baccalaureate Education in Japan). Tokyo: Toshindo, 71-104.

Ogose, T. (1968). *Tōdai – daigaku hunsō no genten* (University of Tokyo: the origin of students' protest). Tokyo: Sanichi Shobo.

Osaki, J. (2008). FD wo kangaeru gimuka to kongo no kadai (Mandatory FD and future prospects). Arukadia gakuhō, Association of Private Universities of Japan. http://www.shidaikyo.or.jp/riihe/research/arcadia/0335.html

Peseta, T. (2007). Troubling our Desires for Research and Writing within the Academic Development Project. *International Journal for Academic Development,* 12 (1), pp. 15-23.

Poole, G. (2009). Academic Disciplines: Homes or Barricades? In C. Kreber, ed., *The University and its Disciplines - Teaching and Learning Within and Beyond Disciplinary Boundaries*. New York: Routledge, 55-57.

Poole, G. S. (2010). *The Japanese Professor : An Ethnography of a University Faculty.* Rotterdam, Boston, and Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Prosser, M. and Trigwell, K. (1999). *Understanding Learning and Teaching.* Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Prosser, M., Walker, P., Millar, R. (1995). "Differences in students' perceptions of learning physics. *Physics Education, 31,* 43–48.

Punch, K. F. (2005). *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches.* London: SAGE Publications.

Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning and teaching in higher education.* Oxon: Routledge Falmer.

Riegle, R. P. (1987). Conceptions of Faculty Development. *Educational Theory*, 37 (1), 53-59.

Riesman, D. (1980). *On Higher Education: the Academic Enterprise in an Era of Rising Student Consumerism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Research Institute of Higher Education, ed. (1982) Kōgakukei daigaku / gakubu no kyōiku kaikakuni kansuru jirei kenkyu (Case study of educational reform at engineering universities and faculties). *Daigaku kenkyu nōto*, 53.
(http://rihe.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/pl_default_2.php?bid=49316)

Research Institute of Higher Education, ed. (1985). Nihon no daigaku kyōiku no genjō, kadai, tenbō – karikyuramu to tīchingu wo chushinni (Status quo, issues, and future of Japanese higher

education – curriculum and teaching). *Daigaku kenkyu nōto*, 62.

Robson, C. (2002). *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers* (Second Edition). Malden, MA, Oxford, and Carlton, Victoria : Blackwell Publishing.

Rowland, S. (2002). Overcoming Fragmentation in Professional Life: The Challenge for Academic Development. *Higher Education Quarterly,* 56 (1), 52-64.

Rowland, S. (2007). Academic development: A practical or theoretical business? In H. Eggins & R. Macdonald (eds.), *The scholarship of academic development*. Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press, 13-22.

Sakai, A. (1998). Tabō mondai wo meguru kyōshi bunka no konnichiteki yōsō (Culture of teachers that creates sense of business today). In H. Shimizu, ed., *Kyōiku no esunografī* (Ethnography of Education). Kyoto: Sagaminos shoin, 223-248.

Sato, M. (2007). *Faculty Development in Higher Education - An investigate of rationales and challenges in the Japanese context.* University of Oxford, Department of Education. unpublished.

Sato, N.E. (2004). *Inside Japanese Classrooms - the heart of education.* New York, London: Routledge Falmer.

Schwartzman, H.B. (1993). *Ethnography in Organizations.* Newbury Parck (California), London: SAGE Publications.

Seki, M. (1989). A Consideration on the Methods for Higher Education Reform in Japan. *Daigaku Ronshu,* 18 (March), pp. 1-28.

Seki, M. (1990). Daigaku kyōiku kaikaku ni kansuru kenkyū: Faculty development no kanten kara (Methods of university reform: with reference to faculty development) Hiroshima: RIHE.

Seki, M. (1995). *Nihon no daigaku kyouiku kaikaku.* 3rd ed. Tokyo: Tamagawa University

Press.

Shimbori, M. (1956). Daigaku shingaku no mondai gaikan (overview of issues related with university entrance process). *Kyōiku shakaigaku kenkyū*, 10, 6-16.

Shimbori, M. (1981). The Japanese Academic Profession. *Higher Education ,* 10 (1), 75-87.

Stefani, L. (1999). On becoming an academic developer: A personal journey. *The Internaitonal Journal for Academic Development,* 4 (2), pp. 102-110.

Stets, J. E., Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63, 224-237.

Sorcinelli, M.D., Austin, A.E., Eddy, P.L.and Beach, A.L. (eds) (2006). *Creating the Future of Faculty Development – Learning From the Past, Understanding the Present* -.Bolton: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Suehiro, A. 2000. *kyacchi appugata kyōgyōka ron* (Catch-up model of industrialization). Nagoya: Nagoya University Press.

Sugie, S., et al. (2004) *Daigaku jugyō wo kasseika suru hōhō* (Tips to create active lecture). Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.

Suzuki, T. (2007). Recent Reform in Undergraduate Education and Some Issues on FD System. *Kyoto University Researches in Higher Education* , 13, 53-62.

Sword, H. (2008). The longitudinal archive. *International Journal for Academic Development,* 13 (2), pp. 87-96.

Taguchi, K. (1987). *Gendaigakusei kishitsu* (Characteristics of students' today). Kobe: Kobe Newspaper Publisher.

Taguchi, M. (2011). Dare ga donoyōni FD wo suishin surunoka (Who promote FD and how?). In K. Matsushita, ed., *Daigaku kyōikuno netto wāku wo tsukuru (Creating network for*

university education). Tokyo: Toshindo, 128-142.

Tanaka, M. (2009). Wagakuni ni okeru kōtōkyōiku sentā no tokushoku (Centres for Higher Education Research and Development: the varying nature of their tasks and the ambiguity of their existence). *Daigaku ronshū*, RIHE, 40: 313-325.

Tanaka, T. (2003). Daigaku kyōiku gaku toha nanika (What is the study of university education?). In Center for the Promotion of Excellence in Higher Education, Kyoto University, ed., *Daigaku kyōiku gaku*. Tokyo:Baifukan, 1-21.

Tanaka, T. (2011). *Daigaku kyōiku no rinshōteki kenkyū (Clinical Research in University Education)*. Tokyo: Toshindo.

Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the Self - The Making of the Modern Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Teichler, W. (2007). Soto kara mita nihon no kōtō kyōiku kenkyū (Characteristics of higher education research in Japan from outsider's viewpoint). *Japanese Journal of Higher Education Research*, 10, 165-177.

Terasaki, M. (1999). *Daigakukyōiku no sōzō (University Reform: History/System/Curriculum.)* Tokyo: Toshido.
Terasaki, M. (2006). *Daigaku ha rekishi no shiō de kawaru (University Reform; A Historical Perspective FD/Evaluation/Private Universities*. Tokyo: Toshido.

Terasaki, M. (2007). Daigaku jishutekina soiwo. 19 March, *Nikkei Newspaper*.

Tsuchimochi, G. H. (2006). *Sengo nihon no kōtōkyōiku kaikaku seisaku* (Higher education policy reform in post war Japan). Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.

University Council (1998). *A Vision for the University of the 21st Century and Future Reform Measures: To be Distinctive Universities in a Competitive Environment*. MEXT. (http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/12/daigaku/toushin/981002.htm)

University Council (2000) *Higher Education in the Age of Globalization.* http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/12/daigaku/toushin/001101.htm: MEXT.

University of London Teaching Methods Unit, Kitamura, K., Umakoshi, T. and Higashi, Y. (1985) *Daigaku kyoujyuhou nyumon, Improving Teaching in Higher Education.* 3rd ed. Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.

Ushiogi, M. (1989). New Direction to the Research on the Higher Education System – Cooperation between the Historical and Sociological Approach -. *Kyōiku syakaigaku kenkyū,*45, 5-19.

Ushiogi, M. (2008). *Funboruto rinen no shūen?* (The end of Humboldt model?) Tokyo: Toshindo.

Ushiogi, M. (2009). *Shokugō to shiteno daigaku kyōju* (University Professor as a Profession). Tokyo: Chūōgensho.

Walford, G., ed.(2001). *Ethnography and Education Policy.* Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.

Walford, G., ed. (2008). *How to do Educational Ethnography.* London: the Tufnell Press.

Walker, M. (2006). *Higher Education Pedagogies.* Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Walker, M. ed. (2001). *Reconstructing Professionalism in University Teaching.* Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.

Webb, G. (1996). *Understanding Staff Development.* Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.

Whitchurch, C. (2009). The rise of the *blended professional* in higher education: A comparison between the UK, Australia and the United States. *Higher Education*, 58 (3), 407-418.

Whitchurch, C. (2008a). Professional managers in UK higher education: Preparing for complex

futures. Final report. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. http://www.lfhe.ac.uk/publications/research.html/ (accessed 1 September 2012).

Whitchurch, C. (2008b). Shifting identities and blurring boundaries: The emergence of *third space* professionals in UK higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62 (4), 377-396.

Yamanoi, A. (2007). *Academic Market Place in Japan*. Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.

Yoshida, A. (2006). The Divergence of Liberal Arts or General Education: Undergraduate Curriculum Reform since the 1990s. *Journal of Higher Education and Lifelong Learning*, 15, 21-28.

Yomiuri shinbun kyōiku shuzaihan, ed. Kyōiku runessansu Daigaku no jitsuryoku (Education renaissance University's ability). Tokyo: Chūōkōron shinsha.

Website

Annual report on progress of university education reform, MEXT
http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/koutou/daigaku/04052801/005.htm

Consortium of Universities in Kyoto
http://www.consortium.or.jp/

International Christian University
http://www.icu.ac.jp/index_e.html

Japan University Accreditation Association
http://www.juaa.or.jp/en/index.html

UK Professional Standards Framework, Higher Education Academy
http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/ukpsf