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Abstract

Japan’s ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) in 1985 heralded improvements in gender equality, yet Japan still has one of the lowest rates of women in management (108th out of 135 countries), fewer than 10% women in all management levels, and one of the lowest percentages (11.9%) of female academics. CEDAW has been the basis for promoting gender equality in Japan in top-down implementation of policies and through bottom-up, civil society initiatives. However, CEDAW’s application in the institutions where gender employment discrimination occurs has been under-utilised. This thesis employs CEDAW’s directives of broad education, equality of opportunity/outcome, and positive action to interrogate women’s low numerical representation in Japanese universities. A feminist institutionalist analytic of the gender regimes was used to explicate change and continuity. This case study, involving women and men, explored all levels of the hierarchy in a Japanese university and found that Japanese-specific practices—consensus decision-making and the emphasis on harmony in the workplace—that might intuitively suggest a tempering of discrimination, reinforced gendered normativity, hindering change. Change occurred in university praxis, in the form of layering and conversion, which had promise regarding improvements in gender equality. However, ‘logics of gender appropriateness’ were recursively enforced through normative and cultural-cognitive institutions, mitigating the potential for change. Despite some discursive attention to the egalitarian ideals that CEDAW promotes, egalitarian norms had not substantively diffused and the corporate culture precluded challenges to gender discrimination. The entrenched power nexus found around the world within male-dominated academia was found to be overt in the Japanese context, which embraced a gender ideology of difference that explicitly ‘Othered’ women and underemphasised gender commonalities. This thesis makes a contribution through a unique utilisation of CEDAW and institutionalist analytics, contributing to the expanding regional research on employment inequalities.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1 Introduction

This thesis investigates institutional dynamics of change and constraint in Japanese universities. Through an examination of the gender regimes the overriding point of inquiry is why there are so few women in faculty positions. Legislative changes have been adopted that guarantee women’s formal equality with men in Japan. Furthermore, international norms have not only shaped change in civil society, but civil society has used human rights instruments such as the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) to push for improvements in equality (Chan-Tiberghien 2004a; Pekkanen 2006; Shinohara 2008; Working Women’s Network 2008). However, change toward equality continues to be slow. The argument of this thesis is that examining micro-level interactions at the meso-levels of society—specifically in the institution of the university—can shed light on the diffusion of egalitarian norms and the institutional mechanisms that constrain or encourage improvements in gender inequality. Elucidating the institutional processes that contribute to gender inequality can potentially explicate the ways in which the target institution is or is not complying with the directly applicable laws of CEDAW that mandate women’s employment equality.

There has been minimal improvement in gender equality in employment worldwide, despite international treaties such as CEDAW. For example, the
International Labour Organization (ILO) found only a small increase in working-age women’s labour-force participation since the 1980s—from 50.2 to 51.7% (ILO 2010: 19-20). The employment situation as reflected in economic indicators shows that Japan continues to fall behind. The Japanese gender pay gap is pronounced, with Japan 97th out of 135 countries at 60 yen for women to men’s 100, and one of the lowest rates of women’s representation in management, ranking 108th out of 135 countries (WEF 2012). According to the World Economic Forum’s (WEF) latest corporate report, this stands at less than 10% for all levels of management, with 74% of companies having no women on their corporate boards (WEF 2010: 64). Corbett and Hill (2002) found in the UK context that, for university graduates, ceteris paribus, the gap is due to discrimination. Osawa (2006) attributes the trends toward precarious employment as demand-side (employer) driven (178) and gender inequalities in employment have been partially attributed to discrimination (Tachibanaki 2010).

Regarding women’s education, Japan also ranks low on global indices. It is 100th out of 135 countries in tertiary attainment according to the WEF’s Global Gender Gap Report (2012: 216). A low ranking in this category is particularly problematic since educational attainment is the pipeline to faculty and senior management positions in academia. The percentage of female university faculty is one of the lowest in the world at 11.9%, and only 10.6% of these women are full professors while the majority of women are in part-time and contract positions as assistant professors and lecturers (Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications 2006). Almost twice as many men as women enter graduate school and segregation by majors shows similar contours to other countries (Osawa 2007), which accounts for some occupational segregation. These statistics indicate that the entrenched power nexus that is found around the world within the male-dominated institution of academia is at an extreme level in Japan. Tachi
(2004) and Ueno (1999) stated that women academics in Japan have not been afforded the same respect as men, have been judged more severely, and that since expertise is defined in male terms it tends to exclude women. Women are ‘Othered’—positioned as secondary citizens within the male dominated society (Tsujimura 2004).

There is a dearth of information on the discrimination that occurs in Japanese organisations such as universities. Very little research has been done in Japan to identify the mechanisms of discrimination within institutions that reproduce male-centred workplaces (Yuasa 2005). Recently, Nemoto (2013a, 2013b) found that male norms positioned women as men’s assistants, and the ‘misogynistic perceptions of female managers’ (2013a: 163) marked women as deviant. The lack of objective assessment and general bias in Japanese organisations disadvantages women (Benson, Yuasa and Debroux 2007) and women managers either have to conform to male standards or opt out (Nemoto 2013a). A feminist pluralist institutionalist approach that utilizes interactionism, as well as a constructivist conception of gender, can provide the detailed information that is currently lacking. This pluralist analysis also addresses the lacuna of processes (Heugens and Lander 2009) and mechanisms (Campbell 2004) of change.

Given the levels of gender inequality, it may be surprising to some to learn that Japan was one of the earliest adopters of laws that guaranteed the equality of the sexes through the 1947 Japanese Constitution, as well as through ratification of CEDAW in 1985. Some Asian states have rejected international human rights on the grounds that they are not compatible with Asian values, as outlined in the 1993 Bangkok Declaration. This Declaration stressed ‘community over individuals, social harmony, individual duties and respect of hierarchy’ (Bloise 2010: 4). Since international norms guarantee individual rights, women would be guaranteed rights as independent
individuals; however, women’s roles as family members are emphasised in the Asian values declaration. Bloise argued that it was, therefore, not possible for Japan to take part in the Declaration since Japanese legislation unambiguously included human individual rights, both civil and political (2010: 22). Notably, unlike other countries such as the United States that require domestic processes to be fulfilled before transnational treaties become law, these treaties in Japan have the force of law upon ratification and thus CEDAW became immediately applicable as domestic law overriding any domestic laws (Iwasawa 1998), and was ratified with no reservations.

Japan has strong legislative protections that nonetheless co-exist with extreme gender inequality, and is, therefore, a richly complex and informative context within which to explore mechanisms of change regarding inequality. This thesis, in exploring institutional change through micro-interactions at the meso-level of society, uncovers the gaps between the strong legislative institutions that guarantee gender equality and the persistent inequalities in the labour market. Uncovering the institutional processes that result in gender inequality could partially explain why the goals of the domestic and international laws are not being met.

A case study of an institution, examining all levels of the institutional hierarchy through women’s and men’s meaning-making, can elucidate the mechanisms of change and constraint. Shakai Daigaku¹ is an established and well-respected private university in the Kansai region that is generally viewed as a leader in education in the region. It might be useful at this point to distinguish between the ‘idea’ of the university and the specific university, Shakai Daigaku. In conceptualizing the university as an institution, as is similarly done with the ‘family as an institution’, it will be useful to draw on discursive institutionalism where institutions are internal (versus external) to the

¹ Shakai Daigaku is a pseudonym. In Japanese, shakai means society and daigaku means university.
individual, and consist of ideas and discourse (Schmidt 2010; 2011). Therefore, to distinguish the ‘idea’ of universities from the target institution of the case study, the former will be referred to in general terms of the university, universities, or universities in Japan. The latter will be specifically named as Shakai Daigaku, while only in the empirical analysis will it be referred to as the university.

The first part of this chapter, Section 2, discusses CEDAW and theories on diffusion of international norms of sexual non-discrimination. It is important to understand the specifics of the background of CEDAW’s ratification as well as particulars of domestic equality laws in order to appreciate the context in which women’s employment within the existing structures and practices occurs. Therefore, these will be discussed in Sections 3 and 4 after a short explanation of changes in the Japanese labour market. Also, how equality is defined through such legislation is explored, illuminating the dilemmas of domestic policy approaches that emphasize sameness or difference, which permeate gender-equality debates. Since distinct gender roles continue in Japan and are reinforced by state policies, it is important to explore conceptions of sex/gender difference. Structures related to women’s employment will subsequently be discussed in Sections 5 and 6. Japanese activists and feminists have been divided on the weighting of embodiment in policies, and, therefore, a short summary of feminist controversies related to embodiment in employment will also be covered.

CEDAW’s value-added utility will be discussed next. While CEDAW’s efficacy has been explored in policy development and legal challenges, I suggest that the lacuna of empirical work that explores compliance or non-compliance to the ‘spirit’ of the international law can be accomplished through an institutional analysis—a robust diagnostic for explicating change and stasis. I explore CEDAW’s potential as a rubric,
focusing on aspects pertinent to the target institution. I argue for its utility for assessing changes in the gender regimes within institutions, since this is where much discrimination is recursively produced. Making a direct link between CEDAW’s legislative purview and institutional principles and processes to illuminate change and stasis regarding sexual non-discrimination provides a way to identify these mechanisms. This can problematise assumptions that constraint is due to women’s proclivities or that policy implementation will automatically and adequately result in change. Since there are assumptions that the Japanese government’s lack of commitment to change is responsible for the continuing inequality in employment (Ochiai and Joshita 2014), it is imperative that institutions are analysed to highlight exactly how they are implicated in order to identify what needs to be addressed. Finally, the significance of this research and some general findings conclude this chapter.

2 Contours of change in the labour market

The uniqueness of the Japanese labour market has been theorised to rest on the pillars of lifetime employment, seniority wages and rank hierarchy, as well as enterprise unions (Keizer 2010; Mouer and Kawanishi 2005). The core labour market developed through firm-specific training that led to lifetime employment, while the peripheral labour market provided the necessary flexibility to address economic fluctuations (Keizer 2010: 37; Thelen 2007). Entry into the core depended on uninterrupted, age-normative criteria (Charles and Grusky 2004). The labor market, while maintaining its overall contours of these elements, is continually changing. La Croix and Kawaura
wrote that Japan does have a tradition of change—slow change—as witnessed by market adjustments since WWII (2006: 31).

There have been fundamental changes in employment patterns. The varieties-of-capitalism (VOC) perspective suggests that change is more constrained in coordinated market economies (CMEs) such as Japan. Witt (2006) argued that complementarities, or interlocking industries, combined with Japanese consensus decision-making, slow change processes. Vogel (2005) found that Japan’s labour market has remained fairly intact, though he argued that while maintaining coordination through interlocking industries, conversion has occurred in the balance between core and peripheral employment, with increases in part-time employment. However, others have found some substantive changes in the Japanese labour market. Milhaupt found normative changes in seniority-based employment, which has traditionally received widespread support, toward more flexible labour practices (2006). Keizer found little change in support for the three key labour-market pillars yet argued that there had been some conversion replacing lifetime employment with precarious employment (2010: 173–7). Jackson and Miyajima found slight diffusion towards performance-based pay and fast-track promotion (2008: 25). Internationalisation has also been instrumental in institutional change. For example, Witt’s (2006) multi-organisational research and Breaden’s (2013) research on internationalisation that specifically examined Japanese universities, suggested that labour market changes have occurred due to kokusaika (the influence of internationalisation).

While much of the literature on VOC that presupposes divergence to either a liberal market economy (LME) or towards two VOCs, the LME or the coordinated market economy (CME), Gottfried categorised Japan as a hybrid since it has been suggested to have its own unique combination of elements of both (2013: 122).
2.1 Gendered contours of the labour market

While the above conceptions of the labour market put at its centre the elite core employees—predominantly male—they represent only a small and decreasing minority of the labour market. The majority are precarious workers in non-standard employment who are not only marginalised in organisations but are also on the periphery of the state-supported welfare system—a system that does not provide safety nets such as employment protection and pensions except to the elite minority (Gottfried 2008). Women are the majority of non-standard employees and precarious employment has been increasing. In 2002, women were 70% of non-standard employees and, since the 1990s, despite continued increases in labour-market participation, standard, full-time employment for women has decreased due to changes in labour-market trends toward part-time and contract work (Kimoto 2003). Precarious employment makes up the actual core (majority) of the Japanese labour market, most of whom are women, and this is not a new development. Gottfried and Hayashi-Kato (1998) showed that the economic miracle of Japan’s post-war development rested on women’s poorly paid, exploited labour. More recently, Gottfried (2008: 180) argued that non-standard employment was already growing before the 1990s economic downturn, thus precluding this as a causal exogenous shock. She attributed the rising precariousness of women’s employment to the male breadwinner welfare model, which is underpinned by corporate-centred embedded male bias. She argued that the state continues to evade responsibility for providing protection and cushions, especially financial support, to help women return to work. Families, *ipso facto* women, are generally required to shoulder the burden of care work. Ochiai and Joshita (2014) argue that the slow rate of change in Japanese gender regimes is the result of the mistaken assumption that
‘culture’ undergirded Japan’s early economic success, and the solidifying of the Japanese family into laws and policies has left a legacy that is resistant to change.

2.2 Contours of the Japanese university labour market

Japanese university labour markets are interconnected to other universities through the networks formed by alumni; they are also connected to industries as mutual pipelines to employment (Brinton and Kariya 1998). The broader context in which the university is embedded—the ‘field’ (DiMaggio and Powell 1983)—and universities are thus co-constituted. While there is equal educational opportunity for primary and secondary school, in 2008, 43% of girls compared to 55% of boys continued to 4-year colleges (Mombukagakusho 2009 cited in Hara and Fujimura-Fanselow 2011: 85). This is lower than most highly developed countries. Women are 40% of university enrollment but their entry into graduate school is half that of males (8% versus 16%), resulting in around 30% of graduate school enrollment being women. Similar to other regions, women are concentrated in traditional female fields, such as humanities, education, domestic science, and art, yet they are only 25% in science and 10% in engineering. Priority is given to sons for families with financial restrictions; however, these gendered differences do not account for the extreme underrepresentation of women as university faculty (Hara and Fujimura-Fanselow 2011: 85).
3 CEDAW: norm diffusion of women’s rights as human rights

One objective of this research is to illuminate the interplay of sexual non-discrimination norms throughout the university in relation to change and constraint in women’s employment in faculty positions. Research has connected norm diffusion with change; however, norms are not necessarily diffused through the ratification of international treaties such as CEDAW (Keck and Sikkink 1998). There has been only scattered success of norm diffusion of women’s rights (Zwingel 2012). However, even when norms have been diffused, their impact—for example on employment equality—has not been guaranteed, as in the case of the Scandinavian countries that show strongly egalitarian views yet continue to exhibit occupational and vertical segregation. There is some evidence of CEDAW’s diffusion internationally and Gray, Kittilson and Sandholtz (2006), in their analysis of 180 countries, found that its ratification correlated with improvements in women’s situation. In the Japanese context some diffusion of international norms has also been found (Chan-Tiberghien 2004a; Liu and Boyle 2001). Previous research on norm diffusion in Japan has connected international norms to improvements in equality (Gurowitz 1999).

Norm diffusion occurs or is constrained by various interacting mechanisms and principles. The feminist international legal critique shows that the limited impact of these international norms is well documented and is attributed, in part, to the conception of women’s human rights as cultural or individual and therefore beyond the purview of international law. State resistance is often premised on religion and national identity (Hellum and Aasan 2013a: 629).

International relations analytics rooted in traditions such as neoliberalism, liberal intergovernmentalism, sociological institutionalism, constructivism, as well as critical
realism, are all unable to sufficiently explain the diffusion of international norms. Weaknesses include the inability to explain: diffusion that occurs independently of state and individual utility maximization (neoliberalism and liberal intergovernmentalism); persistent heterogeneity (sociological institutionalism); and the overestimation by constructionists of the impact on state practices (Savery 2007: 3). Feminist international legal critiques view the CEDAW regime as somewhat inconsequential due to the lack of enforcement mechanisms, which has been the case in Japan (Luera 2004: 615). However, this points to the need for concrete explanations of why differences exist across states and this empirical research aims to concretely explain mechanisms that constrain the diffusion of CEDAW’s mandate (Savery 2007: 2).

Understanding the various ways norms travel (Scott 2014; Seabrooke 2006) is critical in understanding Japan’s continued sexual discrimination. Seabrooke (2006), in interrogating top-down, top-to-top, and bottom-up norm diffusion, found that bottom-up processes had an impact on change. Meyer, Boli, Thomas and Ramirez’s (1997) constructivist ‘world culture’ idea of ‘epistemic communities’ theorises the importance of transnational processes through the agency of a constellation of actors at the international, national and local levels. Organisational sociologists such as Scott conceptualised ‘carriers’ of ideas such as symbolic systems, relational systems, activities and artifacts (2014: 96). Finnemore and Sikkink (1998), taking a constructivist approach, referred to a ‘norm cascade’—the tipping point where states adopt international norms that have become indicators of appropriateness. The adoption of international values by some states exerts further influence on other states that aspire to international legitimacy.

Zwingel (2005) argues transnational instruments such as CEDAW are triggers for change in nation-states and that the state is central to domestic norm diffusion with
bottom-up, civil-society actions also prompting change. In this conceptualisation, the enforcement and promotion of norms are emphasised and ratification with discursive compliance without substantive fulfillment is viewed as indicating the weakness of the human-rights regime. States, in ratifying treaties like CEDAW, are viewed as using these instruments to capitalise on international legitimacy without expending the resources that are required for their substantive implementation (Zwingel 2012: 116–17). DiMaggio and Powell (1991) termed this ‘decoupling’—for example, when the incompatibility of global norms does not resonate with local standards—resulting in nothing more than discursive compliance.

Savery (2007: 185), taking a critical realist approach, found that Japan resists international norms of non-discrimination, even though there is domestic and international pressure, and that numerous governmental and corporate tactics are employed to avoid legal changes. In Japan, the government was reluctant to ratify CEDAW as it was apparent ‘wide-ranging legal changes were necessary’ (Zwingel 2005b: 231). Savery (2007) argues there have been ‘virtually no changes to state behaviour’ (185). She attributes this mainly to the ‘profoundly patrilineal corporate identity’. She outlines how legislative and policy changes have been counteracted by neutralizing state policies that reinforce the gender order despite sustained pressure from domestic and international sources. This results in a failure ‘to generate substantial state behavioural change in accordance with international norms of sexual non-discrimination’ (Savery 2007: 185).

There are some ambiguities in CEDAW’s requirement for formal equality that still require examination: the lack of challenge (and expectation of conformity) to male-normative social structures; the focus on merit ignores women’s different horizons, especially interrupted work patterns; and it ignores the relativity of the concept of
equality (Fredman 2013: 223-224). Feminists, amongst others, have also criticised CEDAW on the grounds that its human-rights narrative is predicated on Western values (Steans 2013). Strategies for norm diffusion by agents promoting gender equality have included a conflating of some specific norms—such as women’s rights as human rights— with universal norms (Walby 2011). Due to this formulation, there are tensions regarding different but equal conceptions of gender, such as in the Asian region’s Bangkok Declaration, that are not consistent with CEDAW but are, nonetheless, widely supported. The sameness stance emphasizes equal treatment between men and women, whereas the difference stance emphasizes distinctions due to one’s sex. Walby, though, posited that transnational human-rights instruments, such as the UN conventions, have evolved beyond a Western-based perspective to a ‘hybrid’ viewpoint that includes a diversity of perspectives, such as the inclusion of ‘Soviet Union’ (sic) and Asian views on gender equality (2011: 132–134).

CEDAW has further been criticised on the basis that women’s experiences are largely outside the scope of legal protection since the public/private divide that disadvantages women is the underlying ideology of discrimination (Steans 2013). Charles and Bradley argued that the prevalence of different but equal versions of gender egalitarianism—in other words, the outcome of fundamentally gendered, but autonomous free choice—‘resonates strongly with citizens of even the most ideologically progressive societies’ (2009: 961). However, they acknowledged that, in reality, separate conceptions of equality do not necessarily result in equality, due to power differentials. MacKinnon concurred that both these approaches are problematic, since women are defined against the male norm (1992: 417). However, the Committee does aim to balance ‘respect for diverse conditions of life…and effective human rights protection’ (Hellum and Aasen 2013a: 628). Nonetheless, the tensions between
state/national sovereignty and codifying women’s human rights in international legislation characterise the development of international human rights treaties generally.

A goal of this research was to elucidate the contextual specificities of international sexual non-discrimination norms within the university. A key concern during my research was the configuration of change or stasis in which mechanisms of norm dispersal that occurred, either through bottom-up processes within the institution or through trickle-down processes from legislative institutions, consequently had an impact on the formal and informal processes within the university. This was of particular interest in my research, since it would seem likely that the formal and informal rules that produce inequalities would be overt in the Japanese context since difference underpins Japanese welfare institutions (Peng 2001, 2012) and is widely embraced. For those women who aspire to high-level positions, conflicts between the gender-normative regimes of institutions and women’s career aspirations would seem to be inevitable. Even if egalitarianism is embraced, the widespread, acceptance of difference would contribute to segregation. This thesis set out to explicate whether difference was pertinent regarding changes in sexual non-discrimination norms in relation to university principles and praxis.

3.1 Specifics of CEDAW related to Japan

CEDAW is legislatively embedded and supersedes domestic laws, and this section discusses pertinent aspects of CEDAW relevant to gender and labour markets.
CEDAW’s Article 5(a) is of particular significance, since it deals with cultural relativism.

As a starting point, CEDAW’s definition of discrimination is broad, and specifically mandates economic, cultural, political and social equality. CEDAW’s definition is used in this thesis. With the goal of promoting substantive equality and eradicating all discrimination against women:

> Any distinction, exclusion or restriction made on the basis of sex which has the effect or purpose of impairing or nullifying the recognition, enjoyment or exercise by women (irrespective of their marital status), on the basis of equality of men and women, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field. (Sepper 2008: 599)

CEDAW requires equality of outcome, not just equality of opportunity, and it requires the state, through initiatives such as affirmative action, benchmarks, targets, and incentives to reach actual equality sooner rather than later. Article 5(a)\(^3\) of CEDAW is unique in obliging states to remove social, cultural and traditional patterns that perpetuate gender-role stereotypes so as to promote the realisation of women’s full rights—even if the said patterns are considered to be convenient, ‘reasonable’ or culturally justified. CEDAW’s strength is that it addresses cultural relativist rationales that perpetuate women’s subordination and challenges rationales of maintaining cultural practices and traditions that perpetuate inequality and discrimination.

\(^3\) ‘States’ Parties shall take all appropriate measures … to modify the social and cultural patterns of conduct of men and women, with a view to achieving the elimination of prejudices and customary and all other practices which are based on the idea of the inferiority or the superiority of either of the sexes or on stereotyped roles for men and women’ (Luera 2004: 634).
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3.1.1 Legalities of CEDAW relevant to the university

According to CEDAW, and to Japan’s ratification of it, Japan is obliged to use temporary measures such as quotas, benchmarks, targets and incentives to increase the number of women in management (and academia and politics) to reflect the full diversity of the population. Numerical goals and timetables through using positive action are mandated. Arguments against positive action that block change—such as those based on Japanese cultural practices—contravene Article 5(a). For example, consensus decision-making has been viewed as problematic since it stymies change. The CEDAW Committee has ‘expressed its frustration that Japan values social consensus “too much” and noted that people’s attitudes are “not an excuse” for Japan’s non-compliance with international law’ (Shinohara 2008: 461). If consensus decision-making cannot be reconciled with substantive improvements, it is argued the practice would need to be modified (Luera 2004). Media and educational initiatives, including systematic public awareness and informational campaigns to change stereotypical attitudes, are the very minimum requirement of states. This is particularly relevant to this thesis since education is a raison d’être of universities, and therefore the university is well placed to contribute in the dispersal of information on Japan’s remit to CEDAW. One goal of this thesis is to illuminate contexts or circumstances where obligations toward the education of corporate citizens regarding sexual non-discrimination are enacted in the university.
3.1.2 Neutralising CEDAW: implementation of domestic laws

The implementation of domestic employment laws such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Law (EEOL) have been shown to neutralize the potential improvements that CEDAW’s ratification propounds. Gurowitz (1999: 422) has argued that Japan’s weak links with international society are relevant regarding the minimal concern for its international standing. Savery (2007) argues the corporatist state has been the driving impediment in Japan’s reluctance to honour women’s human rights. The systems of taxation, employment policy, pensions and social security have been undergirded by the patrilineal ie seido (household system) that formalizes male domination, which remains despite domestic pressures (Savery 2007: 156). Stalling has been the government strategy employed to avoid compliance. Arguing that the government needed to study how international conventions could ‘give consideration to the harmony between domestic law and the convention’ resulted in thirty years without conclusions (Savery 2007: 155). The state’s refusal to make substantive changes has been attributed to the over-emphasis on economic development that is dependent on a state welfare system undergirded by the family’s responsibility for child- and elder- care (Ochiai and Joshita 2014; Peng 2001, 2012). This is premised on women’s role in the home that is dependent on the economic advantages gained by corporations through women’s economic contributions as a cheap, flexible labour force. In fact, Gelb (2003) argued that the EEOL actually has been instrumental in the deterioration of women’s employment (53).

Since CEDAW immediately became (and superseded) domestic law (Iwasawa 1998), some key points have been outlined in this section to highlight the strong legality of gender equality in Japan, juxtaposed against the normative practices that reproduce
women’s disadvantage. This next section describes the impediments to the enforcement of CEDAW, due not only to the non-litigious nature of the Japanese legal system, but also to the impact of domestic legislation that neutralizes the sexual non-discrimination intentions of CEDAW.

4 Implementing domestic equality laws

The passage of the employment laws dealing with equal opportunity were met with severe resistance and the Minister of Labor (sic) stated that it was extremely rare for laws to meet such resistance in the Diet (Beauchamp 1998: 620-621). Once passed, enforcement has been weak to non-existent. Legal enforcement of the gender equality laws principally depends on mediation; however, the first case of mediation only occurred in 1995, a decade after the EEOL was enacted (Savery 2007). In order to justify inaction, the government controversially argued that CEDAW required that the elimination of discrimination against women be achieved over an unspecified amount of time (182). The judiciary argued that, while the Japanese constitution prohibited women’s exclusion from managerial positions, the fact that this was normal business practice at the time meant the company ‘did not disturb the order’, and did not ‘offend public standard(s) of decency’ and therefore, no redress was required for practices before 1985 and the state was not held liable (Working Women’s Network 2000; Yoneda 2000: 72 cited in Savery 2007: 183). The plaintiffs lost their case.

In the revised EEOL (1997), enforcement continued to be a problem. The requirement that all parties agree to mediation, including the employer, remained
(Hanami 2000 cited in Savery 2007: 182-183). If employers do not comply with the Mediation Commission’s requests to adhere to agreements, then the:

penalty is for the Minister of Health, Labour and Welfare to publicly “name and shame” guilty employers…[however], since the public announcement sanction was introduced over 10 years ago, not a single EEOL public announcement has been made’, and by 2008, according to the Ministry, there had yet to be any sanctions. (Courmadias et al. 2010: 110)

They also suggested that at issue is that the judiciary (and public officials, corporations) needs equality training (115).

4.1 EEOL anti-harassment provisions

Japan’s ‘Basic Law for a Gender-Equal Society’ (1999) guaranteed gender non-discrimination. It stated, ‘Care should be taken so that social systems and practices have as neutral an impact as possible on the selection of social activities by women and men’ (Osawa 2007: 93). For the first time, the laws included legal protection against sexual harassment as a form of discrimination (Miller 2003: 205). The revised EEOL (1999) provided protection against harassment—a much-needed addition since harassment had been highly problematic in the workplace in Japan (Uggen and Shinohara 2009).

This legal protection is particularly relevant to university professors. Career mobility is highly restricted for those in core employment and they would be particularly vulnerable having to work in an environment near their harassers. The
complainant may even be obliged to resign from their position. Uggen and Shinohara (2009: 224) argued that the early EEOL laws encouraged women to enter malldominated fields. This was where more harassment was likely to occur but the laws gave a sense of protection. Research in non-Japanese contexts also has found that gender transgressions in labour norms have been subject to social sanctions, and this has had two consequences relevant to this research project. The first is that social sanctions can result in women avoiding male-dominated fields and self-selecting gender-appropriate careers, thereby potentially contributing to segregation (West and Zimmerman 1987). The second is that social sanctions in the form of harassment might result in women choosing to withdraw to the periphery or opting out. While cases are dealt with through mediation aiming for consensus, those individual women who press for litigation are likely to be socially sanctioned, which acts as a deterrent.

According to the Ministry of Education, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), by 2004, 77.1% of private universities had both established a section for consultation on harassment and implemented a system to investigate and take action on incidents (MEXT 2004 cited in Hata 2007). The EEOL reform of 2007 included strengthened sexual harassment regulations, prevention measures and fines (Shinohara 2008: 462). Munakata (2001) wrote how harassment led to emotional problems, and to women’s loss of confidence and motivation. Furthermore, she found women used strategies such as silence, attempts to ignore the situation or resignation from their employment. Yamada further argued that women were told to maintain harmony at work, as this was a sign of maturity, whereas confronting harassment was a sign of immaturity (2002: 160–1). Since it was expected that formal procedures on harassment had been implemented in the university, one question of relevance for this research was whether...
procedures provided substantive protection for faculty and contributed to improvements in women’s working conditions.

5 Structures

This section will discuss the structures that undergird women’s employment that are pertinent to this research context.

5.1 Welfare breadwinner typologies

States provide welfare, based on a sense of fairness, to varying degrees in order to mediate societal inequalities. Not only do states have an impact on a person’s quality of life, but they also shape gender relations, and affect the balance of power in relationships (Orloff 1993: 320). Esping-Anderson’s (1990) three welfare capitalisms categorised countries with little redistribution through welfare and social investment such as the US and the UK, as liberal market-based economies. The social-democratic countries have an equality ideology tending toward universal benefits. Social-conservative countries provide services based primarily on contributions, but liberal-market countries, with an ideology toward a work ethic, provide the least support. Esping-Andersen (1997)4 viewed Japan as a hybrid since it combined both conservative welfare and liberal regimes. Japan has social policies that provide social insurance for those in paid employment (generally men), while there is strong dependence on the

4 Esping-Andersen’s model has been criticised as overlooking the gendered nature of capitalist institutions (Daly and Lewis 2000; Gottfried 2013: 123; Gottfried and O’Reilly 2002: 31).
family (women) for providing much of the social welfare, with little state support for women wishing to return to employment.

Taking a more nuanced approach than Esping-Anderson (1990), Rantalaiho’s (1997) typology of national gender systems includes: the market-liberal model, which provides minimal state-funded parenting funding; the conservative marriage/family model, such as in Japan, where publically funded support is provided to wives and mothers though not to women as individuals; and the Nordic model that provides substantial public funding for parenting to women and men through a social-democratic welfare system (Rantalaiho 1997 cited in Martin 2011: 215). All systems result in extensive gender inequality (223).

Gottfried and O’Reilly (2002) combined insights from the VOC approach, Esping-Anderson’s (1990) comparative state-welfare approaches, and the gender contract—the balance of paid and unpaid work—to create a topography of gendered employment in Japan. They posited that, in countries with a strong breadwinner model such as Japan, power in gender relations rests on traditional male authority with care work done by women within the family. Low maternal employment rates, such as Japan’s, characterise this model. Women’s labour power is not freely exchanged in the way men’s is, due to competing demands on their time.

In Japan, difference imbues state welfare policies, labour-market policies and family norms (Gottfried and O’Reilly 2002). For example, Osawa (2000) argued that Japan’s emphasis on maternalist policies that focus on work/life balance makes it similar to Scandinavia. However, other differences, such as weak state financial welfare support and the lack of enforcement mechanisms for gender equality employment laws make Japan substantially different from Scandinavia. Esping-Andersen (1997) viewed the comparison to Scandinavia as ‘superficial’.
Gender contracts vary in terms of weak, modified or strong institutional organisation of the breadwinner model. While Japan has been a strong male-breadwinner model, it has been argued that compressed modernity (Ochiai 2010, with push and pull of care work (housewifisation) and paid employment especially since the war, has seen a shift towards a modified breadwinner model, where a family unit (ie) consists of a husband (generally) as full-time breadwinner and the wife in non-standard employment. Japanese laws have been based on the male-breadwinner model, with the assumption of the male head of the family enshrined in the family registration system (koseki seido). Strong male-breadwinner countries, such as Japan, have state incentives for mothers and married women, channelling women into non-standard employment as a way to balance work and family, and segregating women and men into private and public spheres, respectively. However, Peng argued that the law assumes a male breadwinner, despite women’s increasing human-capital investments, and labour regulations continue to support core (generally male) workers, with most women outside the system of state support. Like Peng (2012), Gottfried and O’Reilly (2002) posited that the state focus on the family continues to disadvantage women. They wrote that conservative state ideologies shape policies. Their research:

---

5 The ‘reproductive bargain’ (Pearson 2007) has been presented as an alternative to the gender contract, since the term ‘contracts’ invokes legalese where terms and conditions are clearly set out and enforceable. Arrangements of the family, however, are unenforceable in the way contracts are. In the ‘reproductive bargain’, though, agency is enacted within interconnected institutions, ideologies and identities regarding the provision of care work.

6 Kamo (1994 cited in Fuwa 2004: 752) found, comparing 22 industrialised countries, that Japanese men contribute the least to households—contributing only 13 percent: ‘Husbands in Japan share housework the least, and husbands in the United States and Norway share housework the most’.
tracked the conservative impulse behind the design of policies, including the tax transfer system, family allowances, and limited support of child care for young children. This array of policies contained disincentives to women’s labor force participation in full-time employment and created incentives for mothers to work part time while taking care of children and elderly parents. As a consequence, women have tended to derive social benefits and rights as dependents of male breadwinners. (2002: 47)

Mackie (2003: 20) explained how the educational and bureaucratic complicity in women’s oppression was constructed through the family registration system (koseki seido). This was crucial to the imperial state and continues to maintain the patriarchal (and ethnic) hierarchy of discrimination, since it is based on gender and bloodline and is required for eligibility for any government welfare benefits.\(^7\)

Compared to ‘the West and other places’, sociologists like Sechiyama have argued that for Japan there are differences in the evolution of family elements of submission, loyalty, devotion, and love. The subjectivity of these elements suggests potential problems of this comparative historical approach that included uniqueness regarding: Japanese women’s higher dedication to childrearing; their great(er) love of children; the strong power women have in the household; the relatively high status of housewives; as well as women’s proclivities and career choices. Sechiyama argued that in Japan, the gender divide between public/private blurs the gendered power inequalities, since mothering in Japan is a ‘service of love’ (297). However, describing Japanese women’s (high status) roles as housewives (Sechiyama 2013) needs to be interpreted with caution in light of *nihonjinron* (Japan’s uniqueness) and because this

---

\(^7\) This includes passports, education and any income assistance (Shigematsu 2012: 198).
contention has been highly and widely contested. Lebra (1985) outlined the vulnerabilities of women’s economic dependence, and women’s contingent power in the household, as in other countries, is generally limited in decision making for larger considerations (Sugimoto 1997: 164).

The importance of women in the household, in contrast to men’s role as breadwinners, has been reflected in the ideology of *ryosai kenbo’s* (good wife and wise mother), which has been structurally sedimented through societal norms and laws. Ono posited that rigid gender roles ‘throughout much of the twentieth century’ were reinforced through *ryosai kenbo* (2006: 223 cited in Quah 2009: 105-106). Since the *ie* was the basis of the social security system, the family, rather than the state, was envisioned as being responsible for shouldering caring for children and elderly, and this fell almost exclusively to women (Savery 2007: 153). Furthermore, social security accrued to the *ie*, generally positioning women as dependent on male members of the family, thereby precluding women from independent state support of social security, health insurance or pensions (Osawa 1993).

Women’s role as wife and mother has historically underpinned and continues to undergird societies and labor markets worldwide, and is argued to have evolved in Japan from a combination of Western housewife ideals along with a nationalist desire to create something Eastern and uniquely Japanese (Ochiai and Joshita 2014). Variations of *ryosai kenbo* have been found in East Asia patriarchies (Sechiyama 2013), but parallels are also found across many regions, since motherhood and caring have generally been considered to be women’s responsibility. However, the sedimentation into law and cultural norms has, as elsewhere, its own particular configuration. Confucianism’s legacy permeated, though unevenly, much of the Asian region including Japan, and its focus was primarily men and promulgated male domination.
(Quah 2009: 106-107). Sechiyama argued that eliding Confucianism with sexual inequality in Japan does not stand up to analytic scrutiny (2013: 3) and that using ‘Confucianism as [an explanatory] variable in a study of gender issues simply doesn’t work’ (284). Ochiai and Joshita (2014) concur, arguing that women’s historical involvement in employment and the education of children are not consistent with Confucian tenets and that it has had little influence on policy. Japanese ‘traditions’, they found, are ‘mostly the products of modernity’ (177).

Women’s lack of economic independence—their vulnerability in being dependent on a particular man (or men)—has been a concern for those working on gender justice (Jaggar 2014; Lebra 1985; Okin 1989). Young (2011), in the development paradigm, like many feminist economists, argues that the gendered division of labour that positions women in the home, recursively produces ‘vulnerability to domination and exploitation in wage employment’ and firms and state policies reproduce gendered vulnerability (230 cited in Jaggar 2014: 25-26). The public/private divide results in women’s relation to the labor market being generally different to men’s to varying degrees as women do not sell their labor in the same, unrestricted way men do (Bloomberg 2009). Japanese policy reforms are argued to have resulted in social security that provides no safety nets (Ochiai and Joshita 2014: 173).

The industrial development of Japan has resulted in some changes in the labour market that parallel many other regions, particularly East Asia (Aoki 2012: 20), showing similar changing work horizons for women. For example, research has found women now place a greater emphasis on work, and there are declining birthrates and changing marriage rates occurring in Japan (Tachibanaki 2010) that are also occurring elsewhere. Tendencies for women to stay at home for childcare exist to varying degrees

---

8 Sechiyama (2013), describing the Japanese form of patriarchy, defined it as a ‘comprehensive set of relationships and norms characterised by a gender-based allocation of set roles and a distribution of power that places men in a superior position’ (19).
in all developed countries. While men’s contributions in the household are exceedingly low in Japan, focusing on increasing their contributions may be following a losing strategy, at least in the short term, since it is likely the strongly gendered nature of housework and childcare that ensures men’s resistance to contribute (Nolan 2005). This resistance would seem particularly likely to continue in this region since, with the strong emphasis on difference, masculinity is premised on the rejection of participating in activities related to women’s role in the home (Lebra 1985).

5.3 *Ie, social support, pensions and taxes*

The 1960s saw the implementation of tax laws that promoted temporary full-time work for single women, while for married women part-time work was encouraged in order to maintain the family system of women’s role in the home (Buckley 1997: 367; Uno 1993). The tax system that provides spousal tax exemptions has ‘reinforced married women’s marginal employment’ (Gottfried and O’Reilly 2002: 48) and the state has been complicit in serving the ‘needs, interests and authority of men’ (35). Change is therefore constrained by the continuing segregation of men in core employment and women in precarious work, which is undergirded by emphasising gender differences. Tax breaks encourage women to limit their incomes and provide spousal deductions to minimize women’s earnings, resulting in a low-waged, flexible workforce of married women. State benefits for employment security are accrued to those in standard (secure, well-paid) employment, resulting in the exclusion of the majority of women. The national pension was also automatically available, without premiums, for married women with low incomes if their husbands joined Employee’s Pension Plans or Public
Servant’s Pension Plans, resulting in keeping married women’s earnings to a minimum (Ochiai and Joshita 2014: 162).

Highly educated women in Japan, as in other regions, are likely to be partnered with high-earning men, given the general tendency of people to marry within their socio-economic levels (Tachibanaki 2010: 103). Some women married to high-earning partners in many countries do remain outside the paid workforce. The tax scheme in Japan, where a husband’s taxes are reduced if a wife earns below a certain amount, is not likely to be hugely determinant for high-earning women. The small tax savings a high-earning spouse would be eligible for would be minimal compared to the salary a highly-educated women would receive. Professors’ salaries are relatively high in Japan, eclipsed only by medical doctors and newspaper journalists (Shima 2012: 191). This renders the tax scheme a minor consideration for potentially high-earning women.

5.4 Highly educated women and the gendered labour market

Highly educated Japanese women pursue careers and want to work on equal terms with men (Miller 2003; Tachibanaki 2010). Naturally, as in many other regions, in Japan some also aspire to being full-time in the home. Highly educated women tend to remain employed during the childbirth/childcare phase relative to those less educated but are also the least likely to return to work if they do actually quit at that time, in part because they tend to have husbands in stable employment. Thus, there is an inverse relationship between a partner’s income and a woman’s choice to work in the home (Sechiyama 2013: 129-131). Having trouble balancing work and children results in some women opting out of marriage, or delaying and not having children (Miller 2003). Sechiyama’s
findings confirm that falling birthrates cannot be solely explained by the lack of changes in either men’s attitudes or work environments but rather economic insecurity is instrumental (2013: 249-250). Ensuring economic independence and attaining well-paid, satisfying work commensurate with their abilities would likely result in more highly-educated women working.

5.5 **Dual-track employment system**

One specific mechanism of segregation that emerged in opposition to the gender equality laws was the development of the dual-track employment system (Broadbent 2005). Women were supposed to be able to decide whether they wanted to follow the *shogoshoku* (career track) or the *ippanshoku* (office-worker track) though most companies directed women to the office-worker track and only 18% of companies offered women an option (JIWE 2005). The dual-track employment system diffused across the corporate sector obscuring the previously overt discriminatory practice that advantaged men. Around half of the large corporations implemented it (MHLW 2003 cited in Rebick 2011: 84-85). Women consisted of less than 4% of *shogoshoku*, and even less (2%) in the larger, better paying corporations, while almost all men were funneled into for *shogoshoku* (JIWE 2000 cited in Rebick 2011: 84). Long hours and the requirement of mobility for transfers became rationales for the dual tracks (Sugeno 1992: 132). Rationales could then be used for the differential treatment upon recruitment, while continuing the practice of gender disparate treatment.

Kimoto (2005) found that the tediousness of *ippanshoku* resulted in women’s disillusionment and lack of commitment, eventually resulting in resignation, creating a
vicious circle of assumptions that women should be viewed as peripheral workers because of their lack of commitment to careers (191). Keizer (2010: 150) contended that the dual-track system has been decreasing. Hybrid career tracks such as chiki gentei shogoshoku (region-based management) and jun shogoshoku (quasi-management) are emerging in some corporations, which allow for career advancement without some of the strict demands, such as transfers abroad, and these have potential to allow for greater work/life balance (Tachibanaki 2010: 196). Rebick has noted an overall change, especially in the lessening of the requirement for mobility to be transferred anywhere, which would be one method of accommodating women’s careers (Rebick 2011: 84-85).

Ogasawara’s (1998) and Kondo’s (1990) fine-grained empirical work highlights the strong gendering of employment. This continues to exclude women from the career track, while illuminating how women exercise agency within highly bounded contexts and how, in some instances, that reinforces stereotypical gendered expectations (Ogasawara 1998: 162-163). Agency is always bounded and the extent of it is an empirical question that has characterised sociological explorations. Within women’s inevitably bounded contexts, in which men continue to benefit from accumulated micro-advantages, women’s strong need to feel that they are exercising agency potentially may result in women’s overstatement of control over their choices. Teasing out structural factors as well as separating the normative and mimetic forces from the exercise of agency can illuminate institutional mechanisms of isomorphism, which I incorporate in my empirical analysis.
5.6 Male-dominated institutional contexts

Martin (2011) argued that inequalities in male-dominated organisations, of which Shakai Daigaku is one, have been well documented. Accumulative, small advantages favour men that result in large disadvantages for women over the long run (Andersson 2005: 179; Krefting 2003: 267). Valian (2005) concurred and argued that the lack of improvement in women’s representation in high-level positions, despite women’s increasing human capital acquisitions, pointed to the need to re-define expertise and competence. Women are disadvantaged regarding potential gains that come from building human capital through informal networks (Diezmann and Grieshaber 2009; Jones, Reilly, Krisjanous and Vasquez 2012; Prichard 2010). Martin’s (1996: 204) research on academics documented how masculinity is done through a variety of self-aggrandizing behaviour. Peetz, Strachan and Troup (2014) found that funneling, the reduction of women as you go up to higher academic levels, occurs due to women’s exclusion in early career stages owing to social expectations. Women’s entry positions also tend to be at lower levels of the hierarchy.

Kloot (2004) found the adversarial leadership style problematic for women and that ‘boys’ clubs’ advantage men, as did Bagihole and Goode (2001), who also documented how self-promotion was both a necessary part of academia and gendered to advantage men. Organizational cultures have been found to create barriers to women (Ozkali and White 2008; Peetz, Strachan and Troup 2014), including the micropolitics of university operations (Morley 2006). The homosocial nature of tsukiai, the mandatory after-work socializing for those in shogoshoku, reinforces men’s role as separate from housework and childcare. And since it often occurs in sexually charged environments with its focus on male bonding, it excludes women.
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Castilla and Benard (2010) posited when organizational culture gives the appearance of non-bias, this discourages reflection on discrimination. Kelan (2009) found that egalitarianism and discrimination co-existed side-by-side through attributing biases to women’s choices instead of discrimination. Researching high-level female managers, Sealy (2010) found that increases in women’s work experiences (acquisition of higher levels of human capital) correlated with less belief that meritocracy was being utilised. In the Australian context, Thornton (2013) found the social construction of the professoriate was male normative, and that as more women entered academia, the ideal academic, as well as conceptions of meritocracy, have become more masculinized (138). However, Van den Brink, Brouns and Waslander (2006) in researching Dutch academic grants, found gender equality in particular fields of research, though not all. Evidence of academia’s lack of gender neutrality seems to be firmly established, but the shape this takes in the Japanese context and the process of change that are occurring have not been sufficiently researched and therefore this research will contribute to addressing this empirical gap.

Standard employment for Japanese academics is comparable to tenure in other countries (Shima, 2012). Mun’s (2010) research confirmed that demand-side factors in the form of exclusion from being considered for standard employment had a negative impact on women. Ishiguro (2000) found in the Japanese university context that most women were employed in the lowest rung on the hierarchy, in part-time and contract employment, and this was also where most gender specialists were found. Women’s studies or gender studies departments are almost non-existent in Japan (Mori 2000). Uchiumizaki also stated that feminism and women’s studies were viewed as problematic because they were supposedly underpinned by a dangerous ideology (the supposed links to fascism are explained in Chapter 2).
The gender segregation of fields of expertise into subfields would seem to be a factor to emerge in hiring committee decision making. Charles and Bradley (2009) found gender segregation in advanced industrialized countries is more pronounced and as gross domestic product (GDP) increased in developing countries there was a tendency toward more segregation (959). Math is one example of the gendering of academic fields. Even with the shrinking gap in mathematical achievements, girls still expressed doubts about their competence, possibly indicating the strong role of gender-essentialist beliefs (962). On the other hand, their article, titled ‘Indulging our Gendered Selves’, indicates the role of choice in segregation processes. Their research adds to other research that has found different but equal conceptions of egalitarianism ‘that advances a multidimensional conceptualization’ of gender equality (961). Barone (2011) also found strong segregation within curricular choices that exhibited a care/technical divide.\(^9\) In non-Japanese contexts it has been found that, ceteris paribus, women ‘graduate to pay gaps’ (Corbett and Hill 2012: 1). Since choice of majors, as elsewhere, is gender segregated, a question in this research is how factors beyond choice, such as institutional processes, are implicated in segregation.

---

\(^9\) Regarding gender segregation in higher education, Barone (2011), found in eight countries over three decades, that the humanities/science divide accounted for 49.6% of segregation in higher education, while the care/technical divide accounted for 91.3% of segregation. He stated ‘Female students develop a preference for humanistic disciplines and for fields of study that display direct or indirect connections with care jobs, whereas male students are more inclined toward scientific subjects and tend to avoid care-oriented fields in favor of technical fields’ (166). However, his categorisation of the fields may have been gender biased in themselves and the research is Euro-centric. For example, there is a current trend for women from India and China to major in engineering. It is noteworthy that women used to be thought of as ideal for computer programming based on the requirement of repetitive, detailed work that was traditionally viewed as feminine. Men now dominate as computer programmers, which has become a masculinised, lucrative field.
6 Ideas of equality

6.1 Japanese equality and shifts in attitudes

The term ‘equality’ has not been without its opponents in Japan. Osawa argued that in domestic gender laws, the term *danjo byodo*[^10] (gender equality) was rejected because of its association with Western ideas of feminism and equality of *outcome* (2000: 6). Instead, the terms *danjo kyodosankaku* (male/female joint participation) and *danjo kyosei* (harmonious co-existence) were used and thus the Basic Equality Laws were adopted into legislation. Ueno and Osawa, using the terms ‘conspiracy’ and ‘allergy’ to describe government attitudes to gender equality, saw this as a political manœuvre (2001: 46) that attempted to redefine equality in domestic laws in order to bring in Japanese-specific values, along the lines of Asian values, by emphasising separate but equal roles for women and men. However, conservative politicians in power hold anti-feminist sentiments and disparaging views of women (Ochiai and Joshita 2014). Those who have said that gang rape is more natural than remaining single (Takao 2007: 155) and that women’s role is merely to supply progeny (‘Mori Takes Turn,’ 2003) view women as primarily serving the state’s and men’s needs. While Mori’s utterances were met with public complaints, they nonetheless raised questions about the commitment to equality of the men in political power in Japan (Takao 2007: 155). Furthermore, the state’s continued focus on Japan’s economic might, evidenced in welfare policies that perpetuate women’s caring roles (Peng 2001, 2012) and labour laws that perpetuate women’s precarious employment (Gottfried and O’Reilly 2002), also strongly challenges the view that gender equality, or indeed, women’s wellbeing, is a state goal.

[^10]: The term ‘equality’ was used in the Japanese constitution, which is a higher law than domestic laws such as the EEOL and Basic Laws.
since it is caring roles and precarious employment that leaves women dependent and vulnerable.

It is important to emphasise two points: the majority of the population does not support the strict division of gender roles and, in Japan, international treaties such as CEDAW supersede domestic laws. According to government Cabinet Office surveys, the majority of the population, until the millennium, supported a strictly gendered division of labour, with women in the home and men at work. However, by 2004, this had dropped to 45% (Takao 2007: 157) and the majority of the population no longer supported the idea. While it could be argued that economic factors, such as the burst of the bubble in the 1990s and the recent financial crises have been forcing women into employment, women have worked since WWII. Yet this earlier societal shift into employment did not substantively dislodge ideologies on gender roles. Therefore, the more recent impetus for change in gender relations and amelioration of women’s situation may be due to isomorphism toward international norms, as has been argued by some (for example, Shinohara 2008).

The particular configuration of inequality in Japan is characterised by contradictions between legislative institutions and institutional practices. Forced job retirement upon marriage and/or pregnancy, for example, while unlawful since the 1960s and 1970s, continues unofficially through organisational practices. Women have generally been viewed as temporary workers (koshikake—empty seat) where employment was designed to give them the opportunity to experience life (shakai kengaku—social observation/study), until they took on their appropriate lifetime role in the home (eikyuu shuushoku—eternal service to the family) (Iwao 1993).

---

11 For example, during the Sumitomo court cases, the Tokyo Chisai (District Court) determined that forced retirement at marriage was illegal and over the next 15 years, forced retirement due to childbirth or earlier for women than men were declared illegal (Beauchamp 1998: 151).
Given Japan’s history of colonising in Asia and the sexual exploitation of women of the region, the country’s legitimacy would be strengthened by the ratification of human-rights instruments, particularly those that show a commitment to improvements in the situation of women. Takao suggested that changes in the laws have not been due to national leaders embracing non-sexist attitudes; instead they have been seen as a way to get women to increase the birthrate and join the labour market in order to ‘sustain Japan’s healthy economy’ (2007: 154-155), positioning women as tools of the state.

6.2 Feminism: East and West

How equality is conceptualised in each state and how each state aims to achieve equality varies, with sameness and difference conceptions underpinning the debates on gender inequality. The sameness stance suggests equal treatment between men and women while difference focuses on the distinctions due to one’s sex. As Liff and Wajcman stated, ‘Feminists have long argued about the extent to which women are the same as, or different from, men, and about the political consequences of adopting these positions’ (1996: 79). In suggesting the concept of ‘complex inequality’, Walby posited that it is important to consider what is inequality and what is ‘valued difference’ (2009: 21).

Mackie (2003) argued that at the turn of the century in Japan, differences in women’s embodiment was not denied, but rather some feminists bravely brought the ‘reproductive body into the public sphere’ and considered ways social policies could be formulated for women’s full participation in citizenship (233). The focus on social
policies has, therefore, been on the ‘two categories of people—men and women, with embodiment being solely a women’s problem’ (234).

Shigematsu (2012) argued that Japanese *uman ribu* (women’s liberation) and *feminizumu* (feminism) have had their own unique development. However, they both also incorporated ideas that were being developed internationally (Mackie 2003; Shigematsu 2012). Japanese feminism drew from ‘the West’ while also including intellectually sophisticated home-grown elements. *Uman ribu* departed from the huge mainstream women’s groups that were the *tatemae* (facade or mask) of the Japanese authoritarian state. Despite the post-war legal reforms, these latter were based on a continued support of societal expectations of women’s place in the home that underpinned the gendered ideologies of segregated employment (Shigematsu 2012: 8-9). *Uman ribu* challenged the state-supported *ryosai kenbo* that undergirded the ‘interlocking relationship between the Japanese family and state capitalism’ (Shigematsu 2012: 9-10), which marked women, whose proper place was in the private sphere, as different from men, who occupied the public space.

6.3 Reverse Orientalism and feminism

Ueno (1997) outlined how reverse Orientalism, propounded by Japanese philosophers such as Karatani, has been used to marginalise feminism by negatively positioning it as a non-Japanese, Western influence. In this conceptualization, feminism has been

---

12 Shigematsu argues that Japanese *uman ribu* and *feminizumu* denote different views and different movements on women’s issues and are not interchangeable (2012: 171). The two have merged into various mutations of Japanese feminisms resulting in, as elsewhere, a non-monolithic feminism.

13 Yoda and Harootunian (2006) contended that the term ‘Asia’ was used by Europeans to racially differentiate the West, that implied homogeneity across diverse Asian regions and exoticised the political-economic region through an Oriental gaze as ‘Other’.
aligned with fascism by connecting it to the Emperor system they mistakenly argued to be matrilineal. Using Asian values and internalising the paradigm of Orientalism to constitute national identity resulted in anti-feminist sentiments that operated to describe Japan as indigenously feminised (as opposed to a masculinised West), and therefore not in need of feminism. Feminism was viewed as alien, unnecessary, and consistent with anti-Western sentiments that ‘Othered’ Japan, so a reverse Orientalism was espoused that produced ‘a highly masculinist and antifeminist argument’ (Kano 2005: 527-528).

Feminists have expressed frustration at the credibility given to this ahistorical, intellectually flawed account (Molony and Uno 2005). Women, reverse Orientalism argues, have always been powerful, not oppressed. This convoluted argument leads to maintenance of the gender status quo obscuring the masculinist culture as well as Japan’s Othering relationship with the rest of Asia (cited in Kano 2005: 546), obfuscating its colonising past. Ueno argues that an essentialist Japan arising from reverse colonialism (Orientalism) is undergirded by an essentialist theory of women (Kano 2005: 548). Ueno (1989) wrote:

> Whenever one raises the question of gender, one is inevitably trapped into this mode of reverse Orientalism…“Women have always been strong so they don’t need to become any stronger”…This stupefying intellectual climate is extremely irritating. Why everyone keeps falling into such an obvious trap is beyond me.’ (cited in Kano 2005: 546)
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7 Feminist activism and labour legislation

Feminists and other activists have been at the centre of changes in labor-market policies. The challenges of ameliorating women’s situation have resulted in the ubiquitous dilemma faced in many regions—of policies that emphasize sameness or difference, with feminists in Japan ‘divided into pro-equality and pro-protection groups’ (Ochiai and Joshita 2014: 164). Disagreements in the 1970s amongst feminists and other activists evolved around whether to abolish protectionist legislation or to focus on equality, which contributed to a stalling by the government regarding the recommendations of the Labour Standards Law Committee. The government’s initial refusal in 1980 to sign CEDAW, criticisms of Japan’s first CEDAW report of 1988, and the lack of input from NGOs and independent experts, were criticized by Japanese feminists and activists (Savery 2007: 161-170). The EEOL’s (1986) absence of enforcement and penalties dismayed feminists who viewed this as a lack of commitment to gender equality, as well as a ploy to sabotage their efforts for protective legislation. They fought the dual track labor system, though the government defended it as non-discriminatory and not a violation of the EEOL. Feminists exposed the conflicts between the EEOL and the social security changes that reinforced women’s place in the home (Mackie 2003; Savery 2007: 167-170).

Ratifying international gender conventions required no actual action nor further legislation yet gave the appearance of being committed to the international community. International pressure played a large part in defining sexual harassment in Japan, and the eventual inclusion in labor legislation through the amended EEOL of June 1997. Japanese feminists drew on what was happening internationally, particularly in Japanese subsidiaries abroad, such as in the US (Doi and Gordon 1996; Pharr 1987;
Savery 2007: 178-179). Japanese feminists, including the Working Women’s International Network (WWIN) went to the ILO and CEDAW Committee in order to expose what was happening in Japan, attempting to embarrass the Japanese government (Hicks 1997). The lawsuits against the Sumitomo group, the first case where the Japanese judiciary were required to interpret CEDAW, garnered domestic and international attention, and created pressure to revise the 1985 EEOL, which resulted in the revised 1997 EEOL, that became effective April 1, 1999 (Mackie 2003).

8 CEDAW as a rubric: assessment of enactment

CEDAW mandates the end goal of equality of outcome and also outlines the steps to be taken by each state. In relation to these, there are three elements of CEDAW relevant to this research project:

1. The mandate of the broad education of equality, which would be evidenced in egalitarian norm diffusion and the adoption of egalitarian values. CEDAW requires this as a bare minimum, regardless of the state’s level of development.

2. Equality of opportunity, which would be evidenced in substantive gender-neutral meritocratic recruitment, appointing and promotion.

3. Positive action would be evidenced in policies with a substantive impact.

These three mandates, which have been singled out by the CEDAW Committee’s periodic reports to Japan, are specifically pertinent to the university context. Therefore,
I argue they are useful as a rubric to assess the presence and enactment of international sexual anti-discrimination norms within the institution. CEDAW’s ‘interminable utility’ has yet to be explored fully (Hellum and Aasen, 2013b), its application having generally been limited to legal approaches or as a tool for civil society activism. Assessments of its implementation (or lack of) have focused on policy (Hellum and Aasen, 2013a; Savery 2007) and macro-level indicators such as government reports. With ground-up activism of civil society, such as NGOs, the mechanisms and effectiveness have been assumed (see, for example, Chan-Tiberghien 2004) but not empirically interrogated.

The value-added usefulness of CEDAW, I argue, is its applicability in assessing the ‘spirit of the law’. In doing this the three aforementioned points from CEDAW can be used as a rubric to ascertain elements within the institution such as: the weaknesses of policy enforcement; the (lack of) prevalence of broad understandings of discriminatory forces; the emergence of indicators about broad education; the illumination of mechanisms of compliance and noncompliance directly related to CEDAW; and the points of conflict between competing societal and organizational values. I will explore the utility of this rubric to tease out cultural practices that interfere with women’s human rights within the institution. Some specifics of the three CEDAW mandates that form the rubric are discussed in this section.

The CEDAW Committee, in 1994 and 2003, warned the Japanese government that the population had not been sufficiently educated about women’s rights regarding discrimination and employment (Shinohara 2008: 461). This lack of awareness signals a failing of the Japanese government regarding CEDAW’s most basic requirement for broad education regarding sexual non-discrimination.
A further requirement of CEDAW is a broad understanding of discrimination. For example, in 1994, in response to Japan’s second and third reports, the CEDAW Committee criticized Japan’s failure of compliance to implement measures toward equal opportunity and equal pay for work of equal value (Savery 2007: 180). It further criticized the dual-track employment system as a form of indirect discrimination and emphasized the need to prosecute offenders. Male-normative hiring would also be dealt with under indirect discrimination. Doubting the Japanese government itself understood the concept of indirect discrimination, the CEDAW Committee required the inclusion of indirect discrimination in the 1997 EEOL (Savery 2007: 180-181). However, as in other countries, there is a multiplicity of values, interests, laws and considerations that tend to mediate improvements in gender equality. Even though gender equality has been formally legitimised through Japan’s ratification of CEDAW and the domestic equality laws, norm diffusion has not been very successful in corporations. It seems likely that it is the structures of organisations that continue to constrain substantive change. This requires empirical investigation, which I undertake.

When the Labour Policy Council of the Ministry of Labour considered the introduction of the concept of indirect discrimination, employers expressed strong opposition, stating that the concept is not well recognized yet. Consequently, prohibition of indirect discrimination has generally not been provided for in the amended laws (Shinohara 2008). This approach indicates that the government is interpreting the law in a backwards manner, waiting for understandings to change. CEDAW actually requires a pro-active approach to change people’s attitudes. Furthermore, the progressive approach to implementation directly contravenes CEDAWs mandate of change being required sooner rather than later.
Equality of *opportunity*, is operationalised in organisations through gender-neutral meritocracy. The *idea* of equality, practiced within organisations in the form of meritocracy, is a liberal value that resonates widely in Japan. However, in terms of recruitment and appointment, networks of alumni, social contacts and intra-industry connections have traditionally been the source of recruitment. Adopting meritocratic praxis is therefore a relatively new development. Nonetheless, meritocratic practices are required by Japanese domestic laws since these laws require equality of *opportunity*, which is underpinned by gender neutral meritocratic processes.

In theory, meritocratic processes have been evidenced by increases in *koubou* or open recruitment, though Horta, Sato and Yonezawa (2011) found that practices that interfered with meritocratic appointment, such as the internal labour markets (ILMs), have persisted. This is a factor examined in the empirical work of this thesis. Bias toward particular fields of expertise has been found in Japan (Mori 2000; Tachi 2000; Uchiumizaki 1999), particularly in how expertise is conceptualised in relation to meritocratic practices. In 1994, the CEDAW Committee criticized Japan’s failure of compliance to implement measures toward equal opportunity (and equal pay for work of equal value (Savery 2007: 180). Changes toward *koubou*, formalised in policies and praxis, and the integration of meritocratic practices, would fulfill this requirement.

The implementation of positive action is encouraged by CEDAW and Japanese domestic laws as a temporary measure until equality has been achieved. This could take the form of practices that promote work/life balance such as reductions in work hours, policies to encourage the diversity of academic expertise, or quotas to increase women’s numerical representation.
9 The significance of the research and general findings

Theorising that gendered organisations and professions result in discrimination against women needs to be accompanied by studies that examine the contextual specifics. Little research using institutional theory has explored gender inequalities (Meyerson and Tompkins 2007). Frameworks like those of Acker (1990, 1992b, 1998, 2009) and Connell (1987, 2006a, 2006b), while theoretically utilised, have not been sufficiently tested empirically. Generally, empirical research in the Japanese institutional context has only been employed sporadically (Nemoto 2013a, 2013b). This project, therefore, contributes to this need for empirical analysis. Furthermore, in the Japanese context, little research has been done on the mechanisms internal to institutions and organisations that produce inequality (Yuasa 2005). Also, there have been no interpretivist studies undertaken by non-Japanese academics, to my knowledge, that explore gender inequality through an institutionalist analytic in the Japanese university context.14

While there has been research on norm diffusion regarding women’s human rights as embodied in CEDAW, there is very little qualitative research on changes in organisations, specifically in universities, let alone Japanese universities. Therefore, this current endeavor provides a fine-grained analysis that potentially produces a deep understanding of gendered power relations within the Japanese university institution. This is timely given the changes regarding women’s increasing human-capital acquisition (Osawa 2007) since highly educated women still find themselves in unfulfilling employment incommensurate with their qualifications, suffering severe gender segregation and continued employment discrimination.

14 Non-Japanese academics who have done empirical work within universities have primarily written as educators in language teaching.
Furthermore, this project explores the utility of feminist institutionalism in elucidating gender regimes within the university. Using a pluralist analytic that draws on interactionism and structuration theory in the Japanese (non-Western) context provides a particularly intriguing, yet challenging, endeavor. Additionally, exploring the further value-added utility of CEDAW, through employing it as a rubric, I aim to explore change and stasis from a particular angle that links CEDAW’s mandate directly to the institutional context.

10 Thesis outline

Chapter 2 explains the theoretical underpinnings of the research detailing my choice of a feminist, institutional analytic to explicate the gender regime. This analytic is useful for uncovering change and constraint within the university context related to CEDAW’s mandate. Chapter 3 explains the methodological choices for this empirical research, detailing the interpretivist paradigm. The next three chapters present the empirical data and analysis. Chapter 4, on meritocracy, discusses institutional change in relation to meritocracy and various forms of networking that have been pertinent to university recruitment and appointing. Chapter 5, on segregation, explains the various choices and mechanisms that position women in different roles to men. The last empirical chapter, Chapter 6, explores the coexistence of egalitarianism and discrimination, and the various views that were embraced by faculty. In the final chapter, Chapter 7, the empirical findings are summarised.

This thesis explores the utility of creating a direct linkage between CEDAW and domestic institutions. I argue that making this connection can lead to insights regarding
the mechanisms that trigger change regarding internationally codified norms as examined through contextualized agency. The findings indicate, generally, that while Japan is similar to many other countries regarding constraints on equal opportunity in recruitment, appointment and advancement, the discrimination was extreme and overt. Regarding the gender regimes, bounded agency [or perhaps ‘iron cages’ (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983)], is a seemingly appropriate conceptualization of the unrelenting isomorphism of gender relations. This starkly contrasts with the ongoing incremental changes in institutional principles and processes, including layering and conversion that otherwise marked the university’s fluid, emerging nature.
Chapter 2

THEORY

1 Introduction

Organizational theories not only tend to ignore gender, they also implicitly assume gender neutrality in organizational practices and structures despite the plethora of research to the contrary (Jeanes, Knights, and Martin 2011: xi). Discrimination is, thus, mistakenly explained as resulting from individual choices rather than being caused by organizational ‘rules, routines, norms, or practices’ (xii). Acker (2006) found that ‘organizations are a key mechanism’ in the creation of inequalities of gender, race, and class, which is accomplished through segregation, crowding in gender ghettos and low-level positions (cited in Jeanes, Knights, and Martin, 2011: xii). Since organizations are the site of political, economic, and cultural transactions, examining institutions can shed light on the creation and reproduction of inequality. Rather than cognitive psychological explanations, I take a constructivist, relational approach—the gendering of institutions—where decision making and practices in organisations better explain the persistence of inequality (Calás, Smircich, and Holvino, 2014).

For this thesis, I chose a feminist pluralist analytic, due to its efficacy in illuminating the change and stasis of institutional gender regimes (Krook and Mackay 2011a; Vickers 2011). Utilizing an analytic that integrates feminist theory, institutionalism, and interactionism, attends to the meaning-making of gendered
institutional ‘praxis’. Structures, as they are ‘instantiated’—brought to life—within relations can be illuminated using insights from structuration theory (Giddens 1984). The interactionist approach, due to its contextualized situatedness within institutions, provides for what Merton called middle-range theories (Sica 1998); in other words, it illuminates specificities rather than universal understandings. This chapter explains the theoretical underpinnings of my research in detail.

The conceptual framework of this study synthesizes micro and macro level elements, as much feminist institutionalism does (Krook and Squires 2006). Micro-level interactions are explored within the societal meso-level of the target institution, and elements of the macro-level, which are also crucial to the construction of hierarchies of inequality, emerge within interactions. A constructivist approach to gender takes the stance that gender is a process—that we ‘do gender’. This interpretivist approach to gender overlaps with other social psychology traditions, such as Goffman’s (1977) ‘Dramaturgical Theory’, and Garfinkel’s (1967) ‘Ethnomethodology’. It is analogous to Giddens’ structuration theory in that they are both underpinned by interactionism and integrate structural factors, which are conceptualized to influence, though not necessarily determine, behaviour. Therefore, I use a theoretical formulation that integrates interactionism, drawing on structuration theory, to illuminate the interplay of gender interactions and gendered structures. This approach allows for the exploration of the labour market structures, such as the institutional gender regime as well as the structures that were discussed in the previous chapter, including the dual-track employment system and state welfare support that are underpinned by the ie (household system).

In analysing gender inequalities, institutionalists have used various forms of pluralist analytics to explicate how institutions are gendered (Beyeler and Annesley
2011; Chappell and Waylen 2013; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005; Kenny 2007; Mackay et al. 2010). Krook and Mackay (2011a: 2) contended that early gender theorists neglected the processes and practices in institutions that recursively fortify gender inequalities and instead favoured the focus on macro-level stratification caused by the gender order. Institutional inequalities had been envisioned as the result of societal gender relations, not the cause. Rather than the power and oppression of patriarchy, an alternative conceptualisation argued for a focus on gender regimes of institutions to illuminate how power operated since ‘relations of power operating through institutions are seen as a crucial part of the “structure” of gender’ (2011a: 3). Connell (2002, 2006a, 2006b) submitted that mapping the institutional gender regimes, through a relational approach, would elucidate the specificities of the gender regime. A gender-relational approach opened an analytical space of the historically constructed ‘composition and effects [that] are theoretically open to change’ (Krook and Mackay 2011a: 3). I undertook a mapping of the gender regime, which was conducted in the data generation process.

Institutions, which are comprised of complex systems of formal and informal rules, enable and constrain change. This chapter conceptualizes change at a specific point in time that emerges within relations. Rates of change between various institutions are generally acknowledged to be uneven (Scott 2014). Since the Japanese gender equality laws are in place, the gaps between legislative, normative (non-legal rules) and cognitive-cultural institutions (the ‘moral templates’ or taken-for-grantedness) are a focus of this research. Exploring the institutionalisation of legislation into concrete organisational processes, such as the establishment of gender-fair hiring processes in order to align with legislation, can reveal how normative practices and

---

15 Krook and Mackay (2011a) use the term ‘patriarchy’. Walby (2011: 104) suggested ‘gender regime’ as a substitute for ‘patriarchy’ since the latter is frequently misinterpreted.
cognitive/cultural forces operate. Rather than researching the diffusion of international norms of sexual non-discrimination with a focus on change attributed to civil society or policy implementation, this study assesses or evaluates norm diffusion in terms of their organizational enactment, interpretations and translations by corporate citizens. I will elucidate how these mechanisms are implicated in the processes of change.

In Section 1 of this chapter, institutions are defined. This is followed by an overview of the theories of institutional change utilized in my analysis. Next I explain the utility of a feminist pluralist institutionalism in elucidating change and stasis in gender inequality. Materiality and power are brought into this conceptualisation. Theoretical explanations of institutional mechanisms of change such as bricolage, diffusion, enactment and translation will be discussed next. Finally, I explain the efficacy of a constructivist approach to gender, including some criticisms and shortcomings that are generally based on ontological and epistemological differences, but that can be addressed through attending to materiality and situated analysis.

2 Institutional analytics

With the inclusion of informal alongside formal conventions, new institutionalism is able to provide fine-grained analyses of institutional change and constraint, and pluralist approaches are often the most appropriate for interrogating target institutions (Lowndes and Roberts 2013: 50). Organisations are embedded in a ‘dense matrix’ of institutions (140) that complicates and slows change. However, while narratives, rules, and practices constrain institutions, gaps and contradictions create instability and
provide the possibility for change (134). This section explicates the specific analytics used to tease out institutional change and constraint.

2.1 *Defining institutional analytics*

Institutions embody behaviours, material resources and symbolic systems of norms, rules and cultural-cognitive beliefs that are ‘brought to life’ through human interactions. Structures necessarily include material and human resources and asymmetries of power, since mechanisms for enforcement of rules are dependent on material resources. As Scott conjectured, rules and norms are enforced through ‘sanctioning power, and cultural beliefs, or *schemas*’ that invariably relate to resources (2014: 57-58). I therefore elucidated change and stasis through an analysis of institutional elements in relation to ensuing material resources, focusing on how they are accessed/denied through inclusion/exclusion in employment. The chosen analytic of institutions is robust in terms of exploring the gaps between the legislative/regulative pillar of women’s human rights’ laws (such as CEDAW) in relation to the normative and cultural-cognitive pillars (Scott 2014) of the institution. Aspects of this analytic and its application are summarized below.

Institutions, by definition, are about continuity. Chappell and Waylen (2013) posited institutions—whatever theinstitutionalist tradition being used—as ‘created and maintained through cultural perceptions or path dependencies’ (604). Giddens’ (1984) structuration theory describes institutions as ‘the more enduring features of social life’ (24). Drawing on Scott (2014) I will utilize a definition of institutions as:
regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social life.

(56)

Change, while traditionally theorized to be from ‘exogenous shocks’—outside influences such as ratifying CEDAW or financial crises—has more recently been usefully conceived to occur continuously and endogenously (Mahoney and Thelen 2010). Since institutions are viewed as legacies of events that include embedded formal and informal norms, rules and practices in society, conflicts between these elements potentially drive change.

Heugens and Lander (2009: 76) found that isomorphism—coercive, mimetic and normative mechanisms that sustain institutions—has generally been weak, and concluded that institutions, rather than being ‘iron cages’ (DiMaggio and Powell 1983) should be more accurately characterised as embodying bounded agency. Therefore, isomorphism should not be assumed, but needs to be substantiated or disputed through empirical research.

2.1.1 Defining norms and values

Since institutions are most commonly defined as the ‘rules of the game’, a useful definition of rules is needed. Ostrom defines them as:
prescriptions that define what actions (or outcomes) are required, prohibited or permitted, and the sanctions authorized if the rules are not followed. (1999: 38 cited in Kenny 2013: 36)

Institutions are comprised of complex systems of formal and informal rules. Normative rules are comprised of both values and norms:

*Values* are conceptions of the preferred or the desirable together with the construction of standards to which existing structures or behaviors (sic) can be compared and assessed. *Norms* specify how things should be done; they define legitimate means to pursue valued ends. (Scott 2014: 64)

A shared focus of feminist (new) institutionalist approaches is the centralised position of formal and informal institutions and their interplay (Kenny 2013: 36). Mackay *et al.* (2010: 581) argued gendered patterns of norms and rules need to be examined regarding how formal and informal institutions interact, as they impact on women and men differently. For instance, conceptions of fairness in organisational processes of recruitment, egalitarianism as enshrined in the laws, and the ‘logic of appropriateness’ in gender behaviour and relations may all be in conflict. While legislative institutions formally guarantee equality, other normative (non-legal rules) and cognitive-cultural institutions (the ‘moral templates’ or taken-for-grantedness) persist in perpetuating inequality. Rates of change between the various institutions are generally acknowledged to be uneven (Scott 2014). Teasing out these elements would likely be informative regarding change (or stasis) in gender relations. The introduction of legislation and other formal rules does not necessarily have the desired and intended
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outcomes. Gaps between formal and informal rules are explored and exploited by actors in both top-down and bottom-up processes (Lowndes and Roberts 2013: 118). Rather than agents necessarily adapting to institutions, rules are bent and reinterpreted to fit actors’ interests, highlighting the potential for change. Bringing into focus the gendered nature of rules and practices can improve our understanding of mechanisms that circumvent or hinder the legislative institutions.

3  Contours of change: layering and conversion

Institutions evolve through contingent events and are characterized by ‘path dependency’, which refers to the persistence of institutions over time that results in options being constrained (Campbell 2004: 65). While path dependency is conceptually useful and captures the overall resistance to institutional (and societal) changes to principles and practices, its causal mechanisms are not generally stipulated.

Thelen (2009) proposes a framework of four different types of change—conversion, layering, displacement and drift. The first two were judged to be the most likely to emerge within my target context16 giving my chosen analytical approach. With conversion, institutions are ‘redirected to new goals, functions, or purposes’ (Streeck and Thelen 2005: 26, italics in original). Since rules and regulations would emerge in the micro-level interactions within the university, interpersonal interactions would tend to have elements of rule interpretation that embodied personal interest, as well as compromise. With highly educated women’s labour-market participation increasing,

---

16 In this context, as a broad generalisation, displacement and drift would seem to require a longer time frame than articulated by most interviewees, and they would more probably be exhibited throughout the macro-environment in which the university is embedded.
conversion of ‘norms of appropriateness’ within the male-dominated professoriate would likely occur. The second form—layering—occurs when new rules and regulations are introduced alongside or on top of existing rules (Mahoney and Thelen 2010: 16). Revisions, amendments and additions can maintain stability while producing change. Layering would seem probable, since the complex institutional complementarities that characterise coordinated market economies (CMEs) such as the Japanese labour market (Keizer 2010; Witt 2006), would stymie much displacement.

3.1 Mechanisms of change

Mechanisms are ‘the processes that account for causal relationships among variables…the nuts, bolts, cogs, and wheels that link causes with effects’ (Campbell 2004: 63). Identifying causal processes within institutions allows for the development of middle-range or middle-order theories (Maynard 1995; Sica 1998), since the empirical work and analyses are contextualised within an institution, making no claims to universalism. Empirical research that recognises the fluid nature of institutions and the institutional specificity can be informative, without attempting to uncover universal laws of human behaviour.

Micro-level institutional analysis is robust in specifying causal mechanisms, and in the process of explicating mechanisms, directions of causality or spurious correlations can be avoided (Campbell 2004: 63). Bricolage, diffusion, translation and enactment are some mechanisms utilized by institutionalists (Campbell 2004) and will be useful in my analysis to elucidate stasis and change. Drawing on Campbell (2004: 65-89), each of these mechanisms deserves a short description.
Bricolage emphasizes actors’ agency, and refers to ‘creative processes in which actors make decisions about how to recombine the institutional elements at their disposal’ (Campbell 2004: 71). While substantive bricolage utilizes existing institutional elements and combines them in unique, useful ways, symbolic bricolage frames action through rhetorical devices and culturally held principles—on what is acceptable and legitimate in the surrounding environment—such as rules, norms, and worldviews.

Processes of diffusion through (domestic) institutions, as Campbell (2004: 78) says, tend to remain unspecified. Savery (2007) identified mechanisms that constrained the Japanese adoption of the intentions of CEDAW, which intended to eliminate cultural practices that perpetuate women’s disadvantages. CEDAW’s requirement for the broad diffusion of the norms propounded by CEDAW would be evidenced in the enactment of processes of change in individual institutions, such as those within the university.

Enactment, or putting into practice new institutional practices (Campbell 2004: 79) is one stage where mechanisms for diffusion (or lack of diffusion) can be explored. The process of translation of ideas into practices in organizations is affected by how they are ‘altered as they are translated into local practice’ particularly the modifications that occur through power struggles (Campbell 2004: 83). Zwingel (2012) suggests a more nuanced approach to norm diffusion is required, and proposes various forms of ‘translation’ that have influenced the formation of CEDAW and that occur in domestic contexts. These complicate the enactment of international norms.
3.2 Logics of appropriateness and orthodoxy

Institutions include not just rules and norms but also ‘symbol systems, cognitive scripts, and moral templates’ (Hall and Taylor 1996: 947) that guide behaviour. It has been found, for example, that occupations are ‘symbolically and discursively gendered’ (Britton 2000: 427), and women in masculinist arenas have to somehow do masculinity successfully. While the normative system has a ‘logic of appropriateness’, and normativity has its legitimacy in moral governance, the cultural-cognitive has ‘a logic of orthodoxy’, and mimetic mechanisms have their legitimacy in what is culturally supported, taken-for-granted and comprehensible (Campbell 2004; Scott 2014). Since gender relations are infused with expectations of gender appropriateness based on culturally specific (though varying) practices, as women enter high-level positions such as professorships, gender performances of femininity (Fenstermaker and West 2002b) within the male-dominated institution that typify the professoriate, would likely result in conflict since performing gender would have to be done differently to accommodate one’s occupational role. This has potential for change.

Cognitive scripts not only guide behaviour but also account for agency ‘by specifying what one can imagine oneself doing in a given context’ (Hall and Taylor 1996: 948). Change is not solely constrained by normativity—the ‘logics of appropriateness’—but is also enabled through agency. A feminist institutionalism has change at its core, and discursive institutionalism (the ideational—ideas conveyed through discourse) has been argued to best elucidate change (Schmidt 2010, 2011). Discursive institutionalism takes institutions as ‘internal to sentient agents, serving both as structures (of thinking and acting) that constrain action and as constructs (of thinking and acting) created and changed by those actors’ (Schmidt 2010: 14). Schmidt argued
that it is ideas that have the potential to promote change (13). Lovenduski stated since solutions to problems are determined by how a problem is defined, it is through changes in ideas about gender relations that change is possible (2011: x–xi). Ideas of equality, meritocracy, fairness and ‘gender appropriateness’ are central to my research, so it is, therefore, useful to conceptualize change as occurring through ‘internal processes of interpretations, imitation, and adaptation’ (Mackay, Kenny and Chappell 2010: 578). Schmidt (2011) elaborated that these structures and constructs of thinking and acting are an internal capacity to create and maintain institutions that derives from one’s ‘background ideational ability’. However, it is the ‘foreground discursive abilities’ that enable individuals to think beyond taken-for-grantedness that are a necessary element for change (56). I use this to explore the tensions between the ‘hidden scripts’ such as silences (who is silent and when) and topics absent from discussion (such as the absence of gender issues in normal university functioning) as well as to explore the ideas of change in gender relations.

3.3 Materiality and power: exclusions and gender power differentials

To account for power asymmetries, Giddens and Sewell (Scott 2014: 58) posited social structures as idealist and materialist. Effective rules/norms need be undergirded by ‘sanctioning power and cultural beliefs, or schemas…[which] must relate to and are often embodied in resources’ (Scott 2014: 58). Men’s access to power is reinforced through ‘constantly repeated processes of exclusions’ of women (Lovenduski 2005: 50) and through organizational rules, routines, policies and discourses that have rendered
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17 Schmidt likens ‘foreground ideational ability’ to Habermas’ ‘communicative action’ (Habermas 1996 cited in Schmidt 2010: 56).
'women, along with their needs and interests, invisible' (Acker 1992b: 567). This, in turn, privileges (certain) men who have influence on policymaking and outcomes. Gender power differentials are deep-seated in institutions and they have an impact on access to material resources. Principles held by those who formulate policies at the macro-level of society (i.e. governments), as well as those in upper administrative positions in the university hierarchy, have a greater force than the actions of individuals who operate at the micro-level (Stones 1998: 304), who are, nevertheless, not completely without agency and power (Foucault and Kritzman 1988). Therefore agency, placed in the forefront in interactionist approaches, can illuminate both its bounded nature and the gender regime’s influence on change and constraint.

Those with institutional legitimacy can be catalysts of change. Meyerson and Tompkins (2007) argued these ‘tempered radicals’, with multiple affiliations within and outside the institution (feminist activist connections, for example) gain some success from their legitimacy derived from their embeddedness within the organization. Barley and Tolbert, also drawing on Goffman’s (1983) ‘interaction order’, suggest that the realisation of widespread change would require broad changes in actors’ behaviour in the same direction (1997: 231). Actors exercising agency require access to power and may also require tangible resources. Women’s low representation in upper levels of the university would seem to preclude much influence from ‘tempered radicals’. However, the empirical exploration of this and other forms of agency through making links to materiality and power differentials was a focus of my interrogation.
4 Constructivism: gender as a process

This section explicates the conception of gender used in this research, and describes accountability to norms and power.

4.1 ‘Doing gender’

There were weaknesses in conceiving of gender as an essential attribute or as a role, as these insufficiently explained variations, diversity, and persistence of inequalities. A constructivist approach conceives of gender as a ‘routine, methodical, and recurring accomplishment’ (West and Zimmerman 2002: 4). Conceptualizing gender as a process, as an emergent feature of social (and institutional) contexts, provides a link between the interactional and the institutional since gender is contextually ‘produced’. Interactionist conceptualizations of ‘doing gender’ (Fenstermaker and West 2002b; West and Zimmerman 1987) have been instrumental in sociological examinations of gender inequality. Organisational structures, revealed through a relational approach (Acker 1992a, 1992b; Connell 2006a, 2006b), have been useful in explaining structures, resources and power.

The ‘doing gender’ approach developed from Goffman’s (1977) dramaturgical gender ‘displays’ that, in turn, built on Mead’s symbolic interactionism (Sandstrom, Martin and Fine, 2010). West and Zimmerman (1987) diverged from Goffman’s views of gender as optional, ritualized, scheduled displays that were peripheral to what was socially at hand. Rather, they positioned gender as central and often the business at hand, since establishing status, and therefore maintaining power and access to material resources—the establishment of male entitlement that results in gender inequalities—is
dependent on gender bifurcation. Doing gender involves a ‘complex of socially guided perceptual, interactional, and micropolitical activities that cast particular pursuits as expressions of masculine and feminine “natures”’ (West and Zimmerman 2002: 4) with consequences regarding power and material resources.

4.1.1 Constructing inequality

Since gender is constructed as a social division and given meaning through interpretation, the making of the distinction between the categories of the binary is crucial; the binary does not pre-exist its social construction. Gender is also not the only ‘identity’, since race and class are also omnipresent in social life and these may be ‘stressed or muted’ (West and Fenstermaker, 2002: 75). The habitual everyday processes of interpretation of gender go unnoticed because they are taken-for-granted since gender is taken to be a ‘natural fact’ that is, in actuality, relentlessly reasserted.

West and Zimmerman (1987) posit that in ‘doing gender’ we are accountable to gender expectations, ‘to live up to normative conceptions of femininity or masculinity; it is to engage in behavior at the risk of gender assessment’ (2002: 13 italics in original). They posited that the sex category is relevant in almost all situations, arguing the ‘sex category is used as a fundamental criterion for differentiation. Doing gender is unavoidable because of the social consequences of sex category membership: the allocation of power and resources’ (21). Using accountability, expectations are determined by ‘past outcomes of interactions, which, in turn, have resulted in historical and institutional practices’ that reproduce and affirm supposedly natural inequalities that result in inequality (206-207). According to West and Zimmerman (2002),
regarding institutional arrangements, ‘doing gender furnishes the interactional scaffolding of social structure, along with a built-in mechanism of social control’ (22). This gives legitimacy to social arrangements and establishes the connection between interactions and institutions, which explains and results in equalities. Fenstermaker and West (2002a) emphasize that expectations, or norms, provide the understanding of what will be acceptable behavior and guide compliance or non-compliance (209). Normative expectations impose the structure that ‘ratifies notions of difference, dominance, and entitlement’ (213). Therefore gender (and class and race) is not limited to interactions but, through accountability that has consequences in compliance and non-compliance, the accomplishment of difference is ‘done’ in accordance (or not) with normative expectations. This results in ‘the exercise of power and various manifestations of social inequality’ (213). The ‘doing’ or not ‘doing’ of gender (or race and class), therefore, allows for the possibility of change.

4.1.2 ‘Doing gender’ and structure

Giddens’ (1984, 2013) structuration theory, similarly drawing on Goffman and Garfinkel, is also premised on interactionism. Giddens attempts to bridge the agency/structure divide, where social ‘praxis’, or skillful performance of interaction, is the basis of social life. In this regard, ‘structure’ exists within acts and only emerges at the very time of practices (Giddens). Structuration emphasizes praxis and focuses on the formation and structure of collectives through social praxis (Cohen: 281). This instantiation, though, provides opportunities for innovation since social practices vary across time and space and the consequences of social action cannot be controlled nor
predicted. Groups develop structural features such as ‘moral codes, types of domination and class structures’, which are reproduced through routines and rituals (Cohen 1998: 281-2) that come to constitute social structures.

Taken-for-grantedness, what Giddens terms ontological security (Cohen 1998: 284), refers to patterns that structure social life; however, through the complexities of societies, these are subject to change. This explains how individuals know how to act within the mental hierarchical states of consciousness (283). Scott uses a slightly different typology with normative processes of compliance enforced through social obligation and cultural-cognitive institutions that have taken-for-grantedness and shared understanding as the basis of compliance (2014: 60). Coercive, normative, and mimetic mechanisms generate isomorphism. Giddens’ structuration approach is useful since meanings and understandings of institutional processes are perceived and interpreted within institutional interactions.

4.1.3 Butler’s performativity

There have been long-running debates on ambiguities, similarities and differences between constructivist approaches of ‘doing gender’ and Butler’s (1999) psychoanalytic ‘performativity’, which also conceptualises gender as a process (see Fenstermaker and West 2002b; Moloney and Fenstermaker 2002). Moloney and Fenstermaker draw parallels and explicate differences between ‘doing gender’ and Butler’s performativity. The approaches overlap in that meaning is ‘fluid, flexible and multivalent and neither posit gender and sexuality as objects existing prior to the meanings invested in them’ (Jackson and Scott 2007: 3). Both approaches: reject the mimetic sex/gender connection
and dichotomy; view gender not as an attribute but as a process that is not fully voluntaristic nor deterministic; and see gender as omnipresent, yet potentially challengeable.

Nonetheless, Moloney and Fenstermaker (2002) argue that it is important not to conflate Butler’s ‘performativity’ and the ‘doing gender’ approach due to their foundational differences (202). Butler’s performativity addresses identity development over the long term, with gender norms—discourse written on the body—resulting in stylized performances. Unlike constructivist approaches to gender, performativity’s key insight is that it describes what makes gender intelligible within different contexts, while also addressing the contextualized gender norms (Calás, Smircich and Holvino 2014: 30). Butler emphasises the internalising of gender appropriateness, and since gender is not a fact, the idea of gender is created through the various acts of gender. Potential challenges to gender norms may occur through ‘troubling’ gender. On the other hand, interactionism is characterized by the creation of gender that responds ‘to changing contemporary norms’ (Deutsch 2007: 207), focusing on meaning-making through contextualised intersubjectivity within relations. Moloney and Fenstermaker (2002) caution that the divergences of the theories should be acknowledged. They conclude the ‘accomplishment’ of gender is ‘what lies at the heart of social inequality and what allows us to understand how forms of oppression intersect and overlap’ (208). The emphasis is on ‘communicating difference and complying with (or defying) normative expectations’ (209).
4.1.4 Power, invisibility and silence

The supposed gender-neutrality of institutions renders maleness invisible and unproblematic (Calás, Smircich, and Holvino 2014: 31). Men tend to be oblivious to their own gendered nature, gendered attitudes and prejudices (Whitehead 2014: 449). Male embodiment, or the assumed disembodiment in organisations, results in obscuring the actual gendering of institutions. This contrasts with the visibility of female embodiment in institutions (Calás, Smircich, and Holvino 2014: 31). Heteronormativity, hegemonic masculinity, and male homophily/sexuality are obfuscated through the norm of gender-neutrality. For example, Bloomberg (2009) highlights that it was the changing status of men and not women’s subordination that characterized the gender regime. Women’s irrelevance and exclusion were a byproduct of men’s interest in other men’s status and their place in the organisational hierarchy, which resulted in women’s invisibility. Segregating mechanisms related to masculinist norms would likely emerge in the management track of the university, and was integrated into my research exploration.

Lewis and Simpson (2010a, 2010c) differentiated between surface and deep conceptualisations of visibility and invisibility to explore power relations and I employ this notion, as well, in the empirical analysis. The surface level of visibility generally aligns with liberal feminist inclinations focusing on numerical representation, asymmetrical gendered relations, and gendered subjectivities. Regarding the latter ‘poststructuralist perspective’, mechanisms of power around gender normativity, where the (male) normative position is obscured through the recursive production of the institution as supposedly gender-neutral, provides for the maintenance of power. Power struggles that challenge gender normativity expose how (in)visibility operates and
subsequently men also become ‘marked’, exposing the previously invisible privileges of masculinity that ‘evade scrutiny and problematization (sic)’ (Lewis and Simpson 2010a: 3-4). Women, to minimize being marked ‘in normatively masculine environments, where their gender identity becomes an unrelenting marker of difference, may pursue a chameleon-like “quest for invisibility”’ (Lewis 2006 cited in Tyler and Cohen 2010: 25). Combining this with the difficulty of being a ‘leader’ in male-dominated environments and the persistent antifeminist sentiments, explains women’s reluctance to speak out. For women, becoming visible as a leader ‘often entails trying to be invisible as a women’ and this identity work requires labor (hard work) as ‘an imposter in a male world’ (Binns 2010: 169). In the empirical chapters, I explore these tensions between voice, (in)visibility and ‘logics of gender appropriateness’ (Chappell and Waylen 2013).

4.2 Addressing criticisms: materiality, inequality and change

Criticisms of the ‘doing gender’ approach have centred around epistemological and ontological differences (Hill 2002; Risman 2009; Smith 2002). However, its resilience is reflected in its continuing use and reinterpretation (Jurik and Siemsen 2009: 72). Some of its supposed failings can actually be addressed through emphasising ‘accountability’ (75) and through understanding that material conditions, consisting of resources (such as jobs), as well as symbolic resources (knowledge, language, and information), though outside the instantiation or interaction, ‘can be taken into account by asking how they enable and constrain the actors within it’ (Schwalbe 2000: 780). This is an empirical question that puts materiality at the centre by elucidating which
resources are salient and how they are used to ‘create and sustain patterns of interaction’ (781).

The ‘doing’ of gender problematically evokes conformity (Deutsch 2007), which will also require attention in the empirical analysis. Fenstermaker and West (2002a: 208) concede that criticisms such as Schwalbe’s (2000), that arise from misusing the concept of gender as a variable, are worth consideration if gendered accomplishment is confounded with gender as a thing (Fenstermaker and West 2002a: 208). Schwalbe (2000) argues that it is the relationships sustained by the ‘nets of accountability’ (780) that recursively produce structures. Structures are ‘patterns of joint action that constitute othering and exploitation’ and he argues these coordinated actions, along with material conditions, can be analysed through interactionism (781). Since my intention is a focus on the mechanisms that produce inequality, empirically connecting interactions to material resources while attending to gender ‘performances’ can overcome shortcoming such as these.

Praxis, according to Giddens, is based on the insight that social conduct tends to be strongly routinis ed but also potentially provides for innovation that can lead to the unexpected (Cohen 1998: 281). Rather than envisioning freedom and constraint as polemical, since social structures exist only as patterned social activities—the relations, rules and resources that are reproduced over time (social structures)—they are both medium and outcome in practices that are reproduced recursively (Giddens 1984). Agency is therefore both constrained and enabled through social structures. Giddens distinguishes institutions from social structures as being more strongly embedded across space and time. Structuration, according to Scott (2014), is ‘embraced by most institutionalists [and] enables us to theorize and examine the sources of both social order and social change’ (111). Countering criticism of interactionism’s ahistorical
nature and the lack of integration of structures, such as Hill’s (2002), Fenstermaker and West (2002a) argue that the ‘force of history’—social structures and institutional power—come into being within ‘situated social action’ (210). Ontological and epistemology underpinnings of this approach, though, remain contested (Smith 2002). The force of the argument supporting the interactionist approach, however, is that social change can occur since conduct is not determined, and resistance or subversion can challenge domination systems (211-212).

5 Conclusion

This chapter has elucidated the theoretical underpinnings that will be used in order to explicate the institutional elements of the gender regime. Taking a relational approach to gender, a feminist pluralist institutionalist analytic has been used in this study to interrogate change and continuity in institutional norms and inequality. The three empirical chapters follow.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

1 Introduction

International quantitative indicators such as the World Economic Forum’s *Global Gender Gap Reports* and national research regularly conducted by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW) have established that gender inequality is widespread in Japan, and is the most pronounced in high-level positions such as professorships. However, understanding why this is so would best be explained using qualitative research. An interpretivist paradigm was chosen due to its strength in providing rich, detailed information on the complex interconnectivity that characterized this context, which was necessary to accomplish my primary goal of illuminating change and stasis (Bryman 2004; Mason 2006).

In this chapter, the research process will be described in detail and will include a description, and justification of the constructivist theoretical underpinning of the research methods. Next, the research process will be described, including the researcher’s positionality, the rationale for using case studies, why the particular case was chosen, as well as the limitations of the case studies. This will be followed by a description of the data generation and analysis. Finally, ethical issues will be presented.
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2  Interpretivist paradigm

An interpretivist paradigm was chosen because it was deemed to be appropriate for ‘measuring’ attitudes, experiences, perceptions, actions and meanings of practice of those who are the object of examination, in this case those in the institution. The goal was to uncover the day-to-day processes within the institution that maintained or challenged the gender regime. This appropriately placed my research within the interpretivist framework (Bryman 2004). Since positivism aims for objective causal explanations regarding social phenomena, it excludes subjectivism and interpretation or meaning (Bryman 2004). Subjectivism, though, views social phenomena and their meanings as accomplished continually through interactions of social actors, where individuals are integral and active in the social construction of reality (Bryman 2004: 17). It is this latter interpretivist, constructivist paradigm that was, therefore, adopted.

An underlying factor of importance was the role of agency within the organisation. Since the goal of amelioration of inequalities is served by a critical-theory approach with an eye to change, the role of agents within the organisation was crucial in understanding conditions that contribute to or constrain change. A relational approach of micro-level analysis allowed for an exploration of the contours of discourses related to academic professionalism. Since there is a dearth of empirical research that focuses on how the labour processes within institutions contribute to gender inequality, especially in Japanese institutions, more scholarly attention is needed in this respect. Furthermore, micro-level interpretation was specifically relevant in the Japanese cultural and organisational context, since theories of Japanese society have surmised the importance of the relational and situational aspects of Japanese social structures (Breaden 2013).
The ontological position taken was constructivist. Epistemologically, constructivism—where social properties are the result of interactions—has conceptually allowed the researcher and the participants to share their understandings of meaning in the research process, in order to explore the underlying generative mechanisms that are instantiated through relations within the organisation at a point in time (Giddens 1984 1987). The lack of supposed objectivity is not a limitation, since meaning-making through interpretation is how knowledge construction occurs. Subjectivity is not a failing, since theory is not assumed to be unearthed from data but rather from narratives of experiences, in this case in a specific university, elucidating problems, tensions and challenges to gender regimes. Therefore, because the research focus was on meaning-making, methods that are used to establish quality in quantitative research, such as objectivity, reliability, validity and generalisability (Bryman 2004) were not employed. Instead, quality is ensured through the credibility and transparency of the research process, data generation and analysis. Generalisation was also not the goal. Rather, unearthing the ‘generalising effects’ of social processes was (Holstein and Gubrium 2011: 352).

In summary, this study analysed the social structures, people and their interactions through the interpretivist paradigm. Social reality is created through human relations in the organisation, and an interactionist approach is capable of shedding insight on the generative mechanisms and human agency of the gender regimes. It is within the particular context—Shakai University—that interpretivist research can elucidate the causal mechanisms that are constitutive of the gender regime. Interpretations of the workings of the organisation, through the meanings that were generated during the examination of gender-inequality regimes, therefore, revealed the
understandings and negotiations of individuals in the organisational context as well as the underlying generative mechanisms that created or challenged inequality.

3 The research process

This section describes in detail the development of the research project throughout all its stages. It starts with a discussion of positionality, followed by rationales for the case-study selection. The remainder of this chapter will cover sampling methods, data generation and analysis, as well as relevant ethical issues.

3.1 Positionality

Transparency in qualitative research and reflexive practices contribute to research validity and quality. (Mason 2006: 192–3). This includes making explicit and examining one’s own standpoint, as the researcher ‘is implicated in the construction of knowledge through the stance that he or she assumes’ in relation to the research (Bryman 2004: 500). In the interpretivist paradigm, stating the researcher’s positionality can add to the validity of the research (Bryman 2004; Denzin and Lincoln 2011; Tracy 2010). The researcher functions as both ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ and this section describes that positionality.

I had in-depth local knowledge about Japanese academia, having taught in eight Japanese universities over 15 years. I taught at Shakai University for five years. I continue to work as a sennin (in a full-time permanent position) at a different university in the same region. This employment history has allowed me to experience many aspects of university operations and has brought me into contact with a range of
individuals at all levels of the university hierarchies. I have had many opportunities to be part of high-level decision-making, taking part in committees with senior faculty and staff, which gave me a somewhat unique perspective given the small number of non-Japanese who have lifetime employment and a history of work in multiple universities. Furthermore, I had worked on gender committees, a role which enabled me to develop this project. While I am researching in a culture that is not my birth culture, I have lived in Asia most of my life and am very familiar with Japanese culture, in which I have had considerable work and life experience. This afforded me significant advantages in access, insight and social contacts. My years working in Japanese universities allowed me to forge contacts to carry out research that might otherwise not have been possible by a (non-Japanese) foreigner.

Issues, such as *tatemae* (telling someone what they want to hear) and *senpai/kohai* (senior-/junior-status) relationships were relevant to the research process, and were kept in mind during the data generation and analysis. A general tendency toward *kireigoto* (whitewashing difficulties) is sometimes difficult to detect and, as a researcher, I had to look for visual clues to identify and, at times, navigate, this. I was able to do so precisely because of my ‘insider’ status. On the other hand, I did find some high-level administrators who were somewhat disdainful—particularly of gender issues, unsurprisingly—and, throughout the interview processes, I would sometimes have to rephrase or redirect the conversation in order to get the desired information in other ways. Negotiating these cultural issues was possible because of my experience within the culture.

As a non-Japanese not culturally, ethnically or racially from the dominant culture, I was also positioned as an ‘outsider’. My interpretations of interviewees’ comments had the potential to benefit from this, providing the potential to tease out the taken-for-
grantedness of social relations that those from the dominant culture may not think of interrogating. Another advantage to being an outsider was that, while some Japanese may be reticent to surmise about social issues and their causes, their belief that foreigners like to be straightforward and honest may have encouraged some participants to be more open than they would have been with a Japanese interviewer.

However, my ‘outsider’ status had the potential to be a hindrance in instances where interviewees felt that a person’s nationality—i.e. being Japanese—was a strong indicator of his or her understanding of the Japanese culture. Lie summarised some of the literature on multi-ethnic Japan and argued that Japanese racism has been documented by many writers and that ‘some have come to regard Japanese society as hopelessly and irremediably racist’ (2004: 172), though he did not ascribe to that view himself. He argued, however, that the racism was not necessarily overt but tends to be passive (2004: 175).

Anti-Western sentiment was a potential issue, even with some Japanese feminist participants, who were quite certain that a Westerner would be unable to understand Japan’s unique situation. I was able to counteract these attitudes by establishing that I was knowledgeable of the Japanese situation regarding women’s issues, which proved effective. Some of the most interesting data generated through the interview process was through my use of methods such as probing for meaning and paraphrasing that were usefully employed, for instance, around narratives of nihonjinron.

3.2 The rationale for the case studies

Case studies are useful in providing an intensive examination in a particular setting. The intensive focus of case studies matched the goal of my research, which was to
provide copious details of institutional processes. Therefore the holistic approach
(Mason 2006: 166) of a case study was deemed to be appropriate for generating data
that would elucidate rich detail regarding change and stasis in the institutional gender
regimes.

3.2.1 Choosing the particular case

This research was based on a case-study analysis of one institution—Shakai Daigaku—
a large and respected private university in central Japan. Public or imperial universities
such as those of Kyoto or Tokyo tend to set standards for other universities. In the
region other universities, especially the smaller and less prestigious ones, look to
Shakai Daigaku and follow their lead in organisational practices, making it an ideal
exemplary case. Like universities across Japan, this university, from my preliminary
research, appeared to be implementing gender policies similar to those at public
universities. Furthermore, Shakai Daigaku had a goal of internationalising, which made
gender equality relevant regarding gaining and maintaining international legitimacy.
While other more traditional universities may not be moving in this direction, Shakai
Daigaku appeared to be following closely the public discourse that the government was
putting forth regarding internationalisation.

Gender amelioration goals that had been published on the university WebPage
were consistent with the government’s target of 30% women by 2020, as put forward
by the Gender Equality Bureau Cabinet Office. The university’s stated goals towards
gender equality appeared to put gender on the table, and this was further evidenced by
the formation of departmental gender committees and university-wide long-term plans
for improving working conditions. The topic of gender has been somewhat taboo, partly
due to a rejection of its supposedly Western origins (Fujimura-Fanselow 2011;
Shigematsu 2012), as mentioned previously. However, gender issues had recently been discussed by some university faculty, which led to debates and strategising. My personal contacts with individuals who were high-level administrators in Shakai Daigaku described the university’s gender initiatives as bold and broad. It therefore appeared timely to do a case study at Shakai Daigaku given my research goals.

3.2.2. The limitations of case studies

Case studies have been used to generate and test theories, but there is disagreement on the importance of their validity, reliability and replicability, and inclusion of these is uneven (Bryman 2004: 50–2). Determination of the usefulness of cases, according to Yin (1989), depends on how the case is constructed.

Broad generalising was not the goal of case studies. Stake argued that the case study is limited in its generalisability, but that its purpose ‘is not to represent the world, but to represent the case’ (2008: 142). External validity, or generalisability, has limited purchase; however, he contended that case-study generalisations need to be modified ‘to fit the search for effective particularization (sic)’ (2008: 142), emphasising how the particular aspects of a case can provide insight into theoretical issues of interest, which this project aims to accomplish. Bryman argued that case studies are not normally generalisable, but exemplifying cases, such as this one, ‘provide a suitable context for certain research questions to be answered. As such, they allow the researcher to examine key social processes...The case merely provides an apt context for the working through of these research questions’ (2004: 51).

Bryman emphasised that, for case studies, rather than representing the broad population, their findings ‘are to generalize (sic) to theory rather than to populations. It is “the cogency of the theoretical reasoning” [that leads to] considering the
generalizability (sic)’ (2004: 285). Williams argued that, in an interpretivist approach, generalising is both inevitable and possible to a degree—what he called a ‘moderatum’ generalisation (2000: 215)—and the goal of this case is not broad generalisation *per se*, but a generalisation to theory. Employing a ‘moderatum’ generalisation, any findings will have to take into account specificities such as situatedness.

While broad generalisability in case studies is limited, an in-depth picture of the mechanisms, experiences and perceptions within the institution may suggest possibly broader similarities, especially given the isomorphism of institutions. The case study, then, is a ‘singularity [that acts as] a concentration of the global in the local’ (Hamel *et al* 1993 cited in Tellis 1997: para 68). The validity of its generalisability, while restricted, has some purchase because of the choice of an exemplary case as well as the isomorphism of universities and their embeddedness in intra-locking institutions (Witt 2006) that is indicative of the Japanese labour market.

### 4 Sampling and interviewing

Decisions regarding sampling, interviewing, data generation and analysis are outlined in this section.

#### 4.1 Sampling: purposive and snowball

Strategic sampling was aimed at a population that could potentially address the goals of the research project. Before the research proper officially began, I conducted extensive preparatory research, including informal discussions regarding gender inequality with professors in various Japanese universities, and an examination of Japanese labour-
market theories and research on gendered organisations. It was apparent that discussions with individuals who were not involved in gender reform or aware of gender segregation provided little information beyond widespread gender beliefs that posited inequality as the result of simple supply-side factors such as work/life balance, child-rearing and women’s choices that resulted in segregation. Purposive sampling was consequently used since it provides a ‘good correspondence’ of sampling procedures and the goals of this research (Bryman 2004: 333–4).

Building on information gleaned from the preparatory research, the projected initial sample also targeted professors who were or had been administrators through their membership of the Board of Directors and as current or previous Deans and Vice Deans, as they had power in decision-making regarding changes in organisational operations. All together, purposive sampling focused on five categories from:

- The gender committee: a focus on institutional initiatives to reduce gender inequality;
- The administrative executive: a focus on administrative and legal issues;
- The education committee: a focus on the relevancy of gender to teaching as a profession;
- The gender research committee: a focus on researchers of economic and sociological perspectives regarding gender inequality; and
- The international programme: a focus on internationalising the university through improvements in student and teaching diversity.

Suggestions for ideal sample sizes vary (Bryman 2004; Mason 2006). For example, Guest, Bunce and Johnson (2006) found that theoretical saturation occurred with a
sample of six to twelve interviewees. In the end, 33 faculty were interviewed (see Appendix 2) before saturation was sufficiently achieved (Bryman 2004; Mason 2006). In each of the five categories, for instance, saturation was reached quite quickly, though more so for some groups than for others. For example, the administrators in higher positions were quite matter-of-fact about the organisation being gender-neutral, unlike the senior women, who were certain that there was much to be discussed. In the latter case, a larger number of participants provided more detailed information.

5 In-depth semi-structured interviews and focus groups

In-depth semi-structured interviews and two focus groups of three women each were conducted over a two-year period. All but one of those I approached agreed to be interviewed. The interviews lasted from one hour to just over three hours and each focus group lasted the pre-determined two hours (see Table 3.1). While some of the participants agreed to be taped others were not comfortable with this and, in these cases, later on the same day I made detailed field notes. These notes were the main data source, together with other data generated from non-verbal cues, interpretations and impressions (Bryman 2004: 308). Those interviews that were taped were transcribed. Also, perceptions of unspoken data were notated, such as physical reactions and gestures, which are known to have the potential to provide important information (Mason 2006).
Table 3.1 Research participants: interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taped and transcribed (57,044 words)</th>
<th>Not taped. Summarised and notated after the interview later the same day; comments added during analysis phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration: Varied from one hour to three hours and 12 minutes.</td>
<td>13 professors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ido 3:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kai 2:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rai 1:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rie 1:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonne 1:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsuyo 1:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yama 1:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group 1 (2:00):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elemar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group 2 (2:00):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group 1 (2:00):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group 1 (2:00):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group 1 (2:00):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus groups are useful for exploring a specific theme in depth, to determine how individuals discuss issues as a member of a group (Bryman 2004: 346); the groups were thus chosen based on individuals who worked together and were comfortable discussing work-related issues as a group. The small group size was appropriate given that participants were ‘very involved in or emotionally preoccupied with the topic’ (Bryman 2004: 351). I took on the role of facilitator, with minimal involvement, though the direction of the discussions took a similar trajectory to the semi-structured interviews. The facilitator role was conducive to getting a sense of the tone and allowed for non-verbal cues to be easily observed while the group was functioning together (Bryman 2004).

All interviews were conducted in public places in order to establish a relaxed non-work atmosphere. This was decided for three reasons: to create a more social atmosphere so as not to add to the feeling of work, given the interviewees’ heavy workloads; because rapport-building is argued to be an important part of trust-building
in Japanese academia; and to get away from the physical space of the campus offices in order to provide some sense of privacy and create a personalised setting. Any direct quotes from participants that have been used in the following chapters are from the English interchanges. If there are instances where quotes include both Japanese and English, the Japanese terms are italicised in conjunction with an English translation or explanation.

5.1 Protocol and framework development

How the research actually unfolds is unpredictable, but what Yin called ‘case study protocol’—procedures and questions to provide a mental framework while doing fieldwork (2012: 13–14)—structured the interview process. Mapping inequality regimes has been taken up by researchers interested in describing institutional mechanisms that contribute to inequality. Connell’s (2006a, 2006b) framework was used as part of the protocol to guide the preliminary data collection, or what Mason (2006) called the ‘data generation’ process. From this model, four dimensions were the focus of analysis of the gender regimes: the division of labour; authority or power; cathexis; and symbolism. The main questions were:

• Why are there so few women in university faculty (tenured) positions?

• What is occurring in the university that is contributing to change or stasis?
Some other possible sub-questions were formulated based on the framework that was deemed able to provide a comprehensive analysis of an organisation’s gender regime; these formed the basis for the interview ‘protocol’.

• **Gendered Division of Labour (DoL): (social stratifications, paid and unpaid):**
  The impact of the institutional DoL (segregation) on changes in gender equality?

• **Gender Relations of Power (control, authority and force, including hierarchy):**
  How are gendered power differences, as they are manifested in the gender regime, constraining or promoting change in gender equality?

• **Emotions and Human Relations (attachment among groups, prejudice, attraction):**
  The effect of group solidarities and antagonisms on gender equality?

• **Gender Culture and Symbolism (masculine culture versus gender neutrality):**
  How does the implicit gender order affect change? Does the institutional masculine culture adversely affect change?

The four categories of the framework, while analytically distinct, were not mutually exclusive and the overlaps have been articulated within each empirical chapter. The data of the main themes that emerged were coded into three sections: meritocracy and networks; segregation; and egalitarianism and discrimination. From the initial research conceptions through to the final decision-making, changes were, not surprisingly, part of the case-study process, consistent with Stake’s argument that ‘The issues used to
organize the study may or may not be the ones used to report the case to others’ (2008: 127).

Using this framework was found to be useful in its adoption of the concept of gender as relational, which enabled detailed data generation for the analysis of gender regimes. The potential extensiveness of its coverage provided rich, interesting, contextual descriptions of the gendered establishment, painting a picture of the supposed ‘gender-neutral’ organisation as the highly gendered institution it functioned as on a daily basis. The model was more than adequate in eliciting, purposefully and unsolicited, data regarding these context-specific factors.

There were three issues of note. One was that mapping of the regime in these four categories did not correlate to context-specific factors on the co-constitutive mechanisms of the macro- and the institutional environment. For example, theories on Japanese labour-market features mentioned in the previous chapter, through constructivism’s interplay of theory and data, allowed me to give meaning to the data. A further issue was that these four categories, while theoretically distinct, overlap empirically. For example, the organisational hierarchy and cathexis were mutually implicated, as were the division of cathexis and power. Acker (1990: 85), using a similar analysis of organisations, stated that these elements of the models for mapping gender regimes are parts of the same reality. This issue was resolved through incorporating the theory outlined in the previous chapters, related to change and stasis mechanisms.
6 Data analysis

Radley and Chamberlain (2001) stated that the actual significance of the research becomes clear during the final stages of the case study. Initially, the generated data were analysed using a *literal* interpretation. However, an *interpretivist* reading of the data was used to construct meaning (Mason 2006: 148–50), resulting in the indexing of themes into the three main categories with their corresponding subthemes that form the empirical chapters.

Because participants located in different sections of the organisational hierarchy and structure generated different data, the data did not ‘necessarily use the same lens across the whole’ (Mason 2006: 165) and a holistic data generation was seen as appropriate, as each part of the whole contributed different understandings. Mason (2006) argued that it is important to let the data speak for themselves.

After the first transcriptions were finished and all field notes were organised for each interviewee, the first indexing was done, highlighting frequently recurring words, phrases and concepts gleaned from the first few interviews. The first transcriptions and scratch notes (Bryman 2004: 308) that had been written during the interviews were reviewed, indexed and categorised. I searched for data that contradicted these themes as this adds to the validity of the overall picture, given the unlikelihood of unanimity, especially on such a contentious topic as gender reform. Tellis (1997) suggested that a high-quality analysis is reached through looking for ‘disconfirming’ data, as this ‘improves the perception of the fairness and serious thinking of the researcher’ (para 61). In conclusion, this section has summarized the processing of the data generation from the initial framework, and the emerging themes that structured the findings and analysis.
7 Ethical considerations

The research process must include careful consideration of ethical issues, and this is particularly true for this case study, as sensitive issues have been explored. As Stake posited, it is the ‘intense interest’ in the personal that is the focus of case studies (2008: 140), and care needs to be exercised regarding protection of the personal information divulged by participants. This research project is in compliance with guidelines issued by The British Sociological Association, which stated that it is important to ‘anticipate, and to guard against, consequences for research participants which can be predicted to be harmful [and] to consider carefully the possibility that the research experience may be a disturbing one’ (BSA Statement of Ethical Practice cited in Bryman 2004: 510). Dealing with issues that were expected to be sensitive, such as gender inequalities, required a building up of rapport, sensitivity and candour, and data subsequently required sensitive handling.

Formal ethical practices for social-science research were followed (see, for example Bryman 2004; Denzin and Lincoln 2003). Dienier and Crandell (1978) mention four ethical areas of concern: harm to participants; lack of informed consent; invasion of privacy; and deception (cited in Bryman 2004: 509). Denzin and Lincoln outline three considerations—the means used will not cause more harm than necessary to achieve the value; no less harmful way exists at present to protect the value; the means used to achieve the value will not undermine that (2003: 139–40). Covert methods were not used, and an ethic of proportionate reason (Denzin and Lincoln 2003: 139) was employed and weighed against any consequences. In actual fact, the process was very relaxed and congenial and interviewees unanimously mentioned the experiences as being both pleasant and interesting. However, information of a
sometimes very personal and emotional nature was shared and extreme caution was exercised, especially since the institutional context was characterised by widespread information-sharing, as well as women’s general token representation that resulted in excessive scrutiny, as is described in the empirical chapters. Due attention was paid to all the above-mentioned issues throughout all stages of the research, and the following section describes how ethical issues were addressed.

Permission for the institution as a whole was not possible, nor, as Bryman (2004) stated, would it be realistic, given the large number of individuals involved and the varied ways of interacting in an institution. It was possible to get some key players (some members of the Board of Directors agreed to be interviewed) but it was not possible to gain broad permission. Confidentiality has been maintained by ensuring that the institution, notable departments, and identifiable features of the individuals have been suitably disguised, and names and personal details have been changed to conceal their identity.

Informed consent outlining the purpose of the research included obtaining written consent from the participants through their signing a consent form prior to interview. All interviewees were told of the process, purpose and details of the interview process. A ‘least harm’ approach was accomplished, for example, through establishing rapport and exercising sensitivity during the interview process. Participants were also informed of the nature of their involvement, the approximate interview length and how the data would be used and safeguarded, and were assured that withdrawal was possible at any time (Bryman 2004: 516), though no one expressed reservations nor requested this. Some sensitive information resulted in requests that information be safely guarded and names changed; these concerns have been accommodated. The University of Leicester’s Ethical Review Board approved this research. Furthermore, the ethics
committee at Shakai Daigaku was consulted and, since only matters of bioethics regarding human experiments required authorisation by the ethics committee, further approval was not required.

8 Conclusion

This chapter has described in detail the methodology of the research project in order to be transparent regarding philosophical underpinnings, constructs and the research process. The empirical results are in the following three chapters on meritocracy and networks, segregation, and egalitarianism and discrimination.
Chapter 4

MERITOCRACY

1 Introduction

The introduction and improvements in the Equal Employment Opportunity Laws in the 1980s and 1990s, combined with mandates requiring that open recruitment based on merit replace the ubiquitous practices of networking in appointing university faculty (Yonezawa 2003), created the potential for increases in the number of women faculty. With the continuing low representation of women in faculty positions in Japanese universities, the exploration of meritocracy is warranted and intriguing.

Meritocracy is generally viewed as a distributive mechanism, underpinned by equal opportunity. According to Castilla and Benard (2010: 543), it ensures for everyone has an ‘equal chance to advance and obtain rewards based on their individual merits and efforts, regardless of their gender, race, class, or other non-merit factors’. While, in many advanced capitalist countries, meritocracy in academic recruitment is now widely endorsed, at least conceptually, as fair and legitimate, this was not always so. For example, in the United States before the turn of the last century at Harvard University, ‘merit was energetically opposed by those favoring the antecedent standard of professional experience and reputation’ (Kimball 2006: 617).

The approach on meritocracy taken here is consistent with conceptions of ‘just desert’: that people should be rewarded according to their productivity, and that productivity increases exponentially with skills and education. Recent research by
Eisenkopf, Fischbacher, Föllmi-Heusi and Box (2013) found that rewards commensurate with contributions (productivity) were generally considered to be acceptable even when contributions were possibly due to luck rather than to innate or acquired skills; those from the skilled, educated population lean more strongly in this direction. This contrasts with re-distributional support, which is higher when there is a belief that luck is largely the cause of income (Eisenkopf et al. 2013). While subsequent chapters examine specifically the non-gender-neutral aspects of meritocracy in relation to segregation and statistical discrimination from cognitive bias, this chapter positions the conception of meritocracy in relation to networking praxis.

In education in Japan, as elsewhere, the legitimacy of merit has been disputed based on differing and opposing conceptions of equality of opportunity versus substantive equality. Okada argued that merit in Japan is determined quite early in a person’s academic career, upon entry to high school. The university a person enters is an indicator of academic capability and therefore of his or her future potential. The embeddedness of universities in a wider institutional network, with their direct pipelines to employment, has meant that the general public accepts that ability has been vetted before entry into university (2012). Horta et al. (2011) argue that recent changes toward koubou (open recruitment) have dramatically changed recruitment. This chapter argues that in universities this overstates the magnitude of change and that networks continue to be a main source of recruitment.

This chapter examines the conflicting relationship between meritocracy and networking. First, meritocracy in Shakai University’s recruitment will be explored through a description of how interviewees perceived meritocracy and its praxis in the university; meritocracy was mentioned in relation to varying concepts of equal

---

18 From this point ‘the university’ refers to Shakai University.
opportunity. Next, against a backdrop of the historical legacy of non-meritocratic praxis of recruitment *kone*¹⁹, or networking practices through connections, will be discussed. Three types of network were found to persist to varying degrees: the social networks of alumni; personal networks; and institutionally embedded networks. The cronyism of the past, now generally socially unacceptable, was found to have morphed into continued but modified practices of using networks. These practices persisted in the institution despite meritocracy being widely embraced.

Next, organisational regulatory mechanisms are discussed, starting with recent changes in evaluative criteria. The social construction of expertise and the legitimising of these criteria were the basis for evaluating merit in the recruitment process, yet professional identity and evaluative criteria evolve over time and external pressures such as globalisation may be relevant. The impact of internationalisation on higher education in Japan is ‘unsettled and inconsistent’ (Yonezawa 2009: 199, 210), and the country is taking steps to improve the quality of its higher education in order to meet international standards. Apart from internationalisation, Aritomo (2010) argued that it was managerial pressures that had been having an impact on the university. Regardless, with this evolution has been the introduction of accreditation of the profession (Arimoto 2010), which is putting pressure on universities to conform and has resulted in changes in evaluative criteria. Consequently, the first regulatory mechanism to be discussed is the changes in evaluative criteria that are relevant to the profession.

It has been proposed that best practice in reducing bias can be addressed through regulatory mechanisms. For example, in the Western context, Reskin and Bielby (2005) suggested various practices that would improve non-biased recruitment and appointing. For example, bias could be eliminated through clearly defined objectives of the job and

¹⁹ *Kone* comes from the English word *connections*, and will be used to include both the noun (a connection, connections), and the concept of networking as a practice, i.e. the use of connections or networks.
exact selection criteria. The authors also suggested that accountability is important. However, in the Japanese context, these regulatory mechanisms were not in place. To end this section on regulatory mechanisms, the university’s protocol will be described, including: its broad and flexible job descriptions; autonomy; the role of status and power; and the consensus decision-making that was underpinned by trust in relation to democratic processes of voting.

This chapter argues that, while there has been an incorporation of meritocratic processes, there was limited evidence that meritocracy had successfully replaced the traditional practices of networking and that the inherently entrenched male-advantaging consequences were not being significantly eroded.

2 Meritocracy described

There is a somewhat generalised assumption that everyone has equal access to education in Japan (Okada 2012); however, meritocracy is not an uncontested term. Bell (2008), in theorising on the direction of post-industrial societies, placed meritocracy in opposition to equality. Without attending to the gendered nature of institutions, conceptions of meritocracy in the recruitment of university faculty favour equal opportunity over equality of outcome. This section explores faculty conceptions of meritocracy.
3 Changes resulting from koubou (open recruitment)

‘Closed-door’ appointing policies were the norm in Japanese universities until recently. In 1968, 62% of firms hired only from a specific university, a figure which was 91% for large firms. These policies were publicly criticised in the 1970s as unfair (Brinton and Kariya 1998). There was acknowledgment by the research participants that, before koubou became policy, there were no tenured women faculty in departments. The result of open recruitment, at very specific junctures, was women being appointed for tenured positions. For example, Professor Uchi stated:

When they first introduced koubou over 20 years ago [versus using kone (networks, connections)], this was when I was hired. Three women were hired all at once in our department and now we have about 30% women.

The majority of female interviewees mentioned that there were junctures in time when a number of women were appointed at the same time: 20–25 years ago, 10 years ago and more recently. They did not correlate this to any particular events outside the university, although the periods do loosely coincide, timewise, with revisions to the Equal Employment Opportunity Laws (EEOL). Changes in attitude at the time of the implementation in the 1980s of the EEOL and its revisions in the 1990s were predicted to spur increases in the appointing of women. For example, Professor Kana mentioned that she had been appointed about 20 years ago, like Professor Uchi and other women they mentioned in different departments. She said that, about 10 years ago, another two women were appointed in her department, and then recently one or two more, giving her department about 12% women.
Professor Tsuyo concurred, emphasising that there were moments in time when women were appointed, though she thought Shakai University was somewhat behind in timing compared to other universities because of its strong male culture, as this interview extract demonstrates:

*Professor Tsuyo*: When I came here (about 10 years ago) and now after 10 more years, two more women were hired last year. I was very shocked when I came here, you know, it was and it is a very homosocial workplace.

*BH*: Why do you say it is so homosocial, such a male culture here? What’s happening?

*Professor Tsuyo*: Un, un! (yes, yes!). But here is so typical of Japanese universities. However, Shakai University took longer than other universities to make changes, you know, the male culture.

Perhaps the time junctures coincided with public discussions around equal opportunity by the general public. Okada (2012), for example, argued that fierce debates around equal opportunity were a battleground between the government and the Japanese Teachers Union (JTU). Wakakuwa and Fujimura-Fanselow (2011) described the antifeminist backlash at the turn of the millennium that resulted from neoliberalism. They argued, ‘Suppression of gender equality has been carried forth by specific groups with nationwide networks…with definitive political influence and power to determine the future direction of the Japanese nation and society’ (2011: 338). With its emphasis on preserving women’s role in the home, conservatives in the university’s senior administration may have been part of the backlash. Some interviewees thought that the lack of women being appointed during the decade could have been from this backlash,
especially given the dominance of conservative elements in the university’s senior administration. They surmised that the recent appointing of women may be due to the battle having recently subsided in the public arena, along with economic and social forces.

Professor Tsuyo’s other comments on the male culture reflect her perceptions of the overall workplace environment and its negative impact on ameliorating change. These comments are consistent with research that posits that male-dominated workplaces have a negative impact the appointing of women (Brandt 2011),

4 Equal-opportunity appointing

For some interviewees, equal opportunity in recruitment was limited to the equal opportunity to apply for positions and subsequently be considered based on merit. The monitoring and enforcement of meritocracy are considered to be fundamental to fair human-resource management praxis and crucial to eliminating bias (Moody 2012). However, the relevant criteria can be broad and has been found to increasingly include personality, as Payne’s (2000) ‘The unbearable lightness of skill’ suggests. In the Japanese university context, networks would be one form of vetting a person’s characteristics, privileging personality over formal qualifications.

Monitoring departmental processes in order to ensure meritocracy was seen as overly cumbersome by some of those in senior management. One of the members of the Board of Directors argued that the responsibility of the university was simply to have the expectation of equal opportunity and that nothing further was required. There were also narrower conceptions of equality. Professor Moto emphasised that in his
department there was reluctance to employ *koubo*. They did not want to be forced to use meritocracy, saying ‘We can do whatever we want, as we damn well please’.

The commitment to gender equality was generally questioned. Interviewees were aware that the university had a mission statement to increase the number of female faculty to 30% by 2020, in line with current government initiatives. However, the interviewees remained very skeptical, as shown by Professor Cheir:

> Before, they had the attitude ‘Women please don’t apply’. Now women are allowed to apply, kind of. ‘We will actually consider your candidacy’. And this is, maybe, considered pro-active, the only type of measure they’re taking.

There was a general belief amongst male participants that woman would be appointed over men. This organisational myth (Meyer and Rowan 1977) legitimised the belief that equality had been achieved in the institution. The unsubstantiated belief that women were being given some preference was felt by some to be having negative consequences, such as inviting complacency and pardoning any breaches. Professor Elba expressed this in describing the over-confidence of faculty members in themselves regarding their gender-free attitudes:

> They never end up hiring women, but they can feel like ‘good guys’, so progressive, by doing nothing. So, in a way, the university just makes things worse because there is no follow up, no commitment at all.
The story that faculty members were unbiased and progressive was mentioned by a number of interviewees, who felt it to be a façade and counterproductive to equality. Welle and Heilman found that having gender on the table ‘can ultimately lead to negative impression of women’s work-related characteristics…viewed as less competent, less influential, and less likely to emerge as group leader than women in the merit condition(s)’ (2005: 32, italics in original). Castilla and Benard (2010), in their research on the paradox of meritocracy, found that casual nods, versus sustained commitment, to equality could activate negative attitudes, or ‘triggers’ of bias. Because the gender initiatives of Shakai University were limited to a few statements with no substantive backing, a trigger effect seemed to be backfiring on actual gender-neutrality. Legitimacy-seeking through discursive changes in mission statements would seem to be one reason for this strategy, which resulted in counterproductive ‘myths and ceremonies’ (Meyer and Rowan 1977). For example, an initiative to consider hiring the woman in cases where there was an equally qualified woman and man, came from within a department that was under pressure to appear international as they had programmes with international connections. This points to a strategy of legitimacy-seeking from external sources, such as the networks of universities that Japanese universities strive to establish and maintain with universities outside Japan.

A few departments had recently been actively trying to deal with gender bias leading to gender inequality. Interestingly, these were the departments that already had the larger number of women, in female-friendly disciplines such as sociology and literature. Professor Rai was skeptical whether women could have much impact, as this next quote shows:
The thing is, if the committee includes some female members, that decision looks fair. Is it, though? I don’t know.

Research supports having women on appointing committees in a bid to reduce gender bias (Moody 2012), though this is no guarantee. While it was acknowledged that this may be helpful in increasing the numbers of women, interviewees from departments that practiced the inclusion of women on appointing committees also pointed out that it increased their own workload, as there were so few women and therefore they had to be on appointing committees more often than male colleagues.

5 Networking

Japanese universities have traditionally used networks to recruit new faculty (Brinton and Kariya 1998; Horta et al. 2011; Rebick 2000). This section discusses the three types of networking that were used at Shakai University: social networks, including alumni networks; graduate students within the university—termed ‘inbreeding’ in academia or ‘institutional inbreeding’; and internal labour markets, a form of promotion within the university from the ranks of part-timers and contract teachers.

5.1 Internal labour markets: firm-specific skills, trust, changing expertise

This section starts with the legacy and logic of the persistence of the system of using networks. Older faculty attributed great importance to administrative responsibilities in
relation to research and teaching. They acknowledge that they entered the university through alumni connections at a time when PhDs were not necessary, and they acquired the necessary skills, especially administrative, through internal labour markets. The following two comments from a previous Dean and a current member of the Board of Directors, are illustrative:

Professor Sato: Yes, I was recommended by others who were already in the university. This is how it was done then. It was important to be known otherwise you couldn’t get a job at a good university such as this. They trusted me. This is the Japanese way.

BH: Things were different at that time?

Professor Sato: I had just graduated with a Master’s degree. People my age, those over 60 or so, well, I didn’t need a PhD.

BH: And now?

Professor Sato: Basically I’ve done administrative stuff. Others in the department, hired in that same jidai [era], we don’t all do research. Some of us, we focus on building the university’s success. But now you need a PhD or equivalent and you have to contribute, be on committees.

Professor Ito: Why should I need a PhD? I have learnt the ‘Shakai University way’ of doing things over the years. What would a PhD do? It wouldn’t help me run the department. These young professors, they may have degrees, but when it comes to admin, they are lost, lost outside their research, so we struggle to teach them the way we do things.

BH: What about kone? And women?
Professor Ito: My senpai [senior connection from his alma mater] got me the job. Japanese women? They are not interested in careers. Mostly they use university to get good husbands.

Their comments were representative of the older, senior males’ perspectives, and introduce a number of issues that have been widely discussed regarding the Japanese labour market (see, for example, Brinton and Kariya 1998; Mouer and Kawanishi 2005). They are useful in introducing this section, which covers networking, firm-specific learning, the current yet more stringent requirements of expertise, and how trust and networking are related. Also, appointing that results in the senpai/kohai (senior/junior) relationship creates an indebtedness on the junior’s part as well as the gendered attitudes regarding women academics’ lack of commitment to careers are introduced. Some of these concepts and processes were introduced in the previous chapters.

Professor Sato is talking about the old days when appointing was based on networks with alumni. He believed he came in as someone to be trusted, since his contacts had followed the normative practices of introducing a trusted connection. This senpai/kohai relationship creates a sense of obligation. Sato also refers to his lack of formal qualifications—having no PhD not being unusual at the time, since the criterion for the job was to learn the ropes as an employee. Professor Ito’s comments illustrate the importance of administrative work. He seems to be indicating that the recent changes which now require applicants to hold a PhD are creating tension between the older professors and the younger ones. Professor Ito believes he can contribute by aiding them to learn the ropes in terms of administration. He indicates, as did some of the other senior male faculty, that women go to university for different reasons to men.
The reputation of Sakai University as one of the top private universities in Japan lies, in part, in its continuing institutional embeddedness within a network of respected corporations that hire directly from the university, with specific departments having stronger reputations than others. The quality of Japanese universities and the desirability of specific faculties tend to be related to graduates’ employment prospects (Rebick 2000: 474–5). The institutional logic and the economic survival of an organisation that is institutionally embedded in interlocking organisations or *keiretsu* (Witt 2006), would be positively reinforced by recruiting faculty with the relevant network connections. Interviewees confirmed Shakai University’s institutional embeddedness.

Maintaining and reinforcing the networks in which the university is embedded has been posited to be important in universities whose reputation depends on its direct pipeline to employment for students. Brinton and Kariya (1998: 182) argued that institutional embeddedness varied across cultural contexts. They found that, while 31% of job connections were through social networks (friends and acquaintances), 47% of employees found their first jobs through institutional embeddedness (i.e. through their universities). The authors posited that, in Japan, the pipeline from university to employment was strongly linked to social and institutional ties, though they used the term ‘hybrid embeddedness’ to indicate that employees in corporations, rather than the corporation itself, were the link to their *alma mater*. Rebick (2000: 492) also found that, for Japanese university graduates in the private sector, the majority were appointed not through *koubou* but because of the university or department they graduated from, with 60% of private-sector appointing being recruited from specific faculties. This strong connection between appointing and the university emphasises the role of *kone* in human resource management strategies. For example:
Professor Moto: We just heard in our kyoujukai [faculty meeting] that about 80% of our graduating students have been placed in full-time jobs this year.

Professor Oka: The recruitment office came to report at our kyoujukai that over 90% of our students, males and females, who are graduating this year have found full-time jobs in companies when they graduate.

The on-campus career counselling office was the intermediary between the university and the organisation. This service did not provide gender-neutral advice to students, but rather a gendered ‘logic of appropriateness’—taking into account societal gender-role expectations—imbued the advice given to students. This was defended on the grounds that it was responding to the corporate culture within which they were operating. Professor Ree said that, while the rate of placement was around 90% for both females and males, she mentioned that full-time jobs for women were generally in female-dominated, non-career-track jobs such as secretaries. She pointed out that the on-campus career counselling office strongly guided women this way, thinking that their chances of getting a job upon graduation would be higher and advising them that at some point they may be able to switch to careers, though this rarely happens. They stated that the primary goal of the office is to place students, not to place them fairly, as they were responding to the needs of the corporations, not to the desires of the students. Breaden (2013) had similar findings, noting that the satisfaction of the student was not really a factor in the process.

The interviewees also acknowledged that the dual-track system continued to exist for students who were graduating, and continued to be gendered, despite equal-
opportunity legislation that prohibits using gender to place someone in either career or non-career tracks. While this embeddedness of the university in the corporate world was not directly related to the internal labour market of Shakai University in terms of faculty recruitment, it does point to a potentially segregating tendency.

The interconnectedness of the university continued to be crucial to the university’s reputation. Some departments appointed as tenured professors a fair number of non-academics, people from industry and government, whose backgrounds were loosely related to the discipline of the department. For example, Professor Shima spoke of the status of a particular candidate, an industry executive:

_BH_: How did you evaluate him compared to the academics who applied?

Isn’t it like comparing apples and oranges? They had academic publications, teaching experience. He had neither.

_Professor Shima_, gesturing: He was clearly up here; they were down here.

You know, he had many years working in the business world.

Networking is not without gender impact. The success of building and maintaining connections through recruitment will favour men, as women will not be in this pool of candidates, given the extremely low number of women in high-status jobs. In Japan, overall, the proportion of female senior managers was just 2.4% (MHLW 2002). Given economic worries and the lack of jobs, it is important to note that the tangible result of getting employment by attending university means an unlikely decrease in appointing criteria that promote institutional connections—with all its gendered implications—but the extent of this connection was vague. Some interviewees did mention that Deans had influence on appointing decisions, especially in choosing
committee members who would heed their suggestions, but the scope of their influence was unclear and perhaps depended on their status or likeability. Also, the role of those further up the hierarchy was not particularly salient, though hinted at by interviewees.

5.2 Alumni and social networks

The senior faculty members interviewed had all, at some point in their careers, held positions higher up in the administration and admitted that connections were often used. These were seen as pragmatic choices, enabling people who were known and trusted, to be brought into the university.

Horta et al (2011), in one of the few qualitative studies on Japanese academic inbreeding—the appointing of their own graduates—found it has persisted despite changes from closed to open recruitment. They argued that appointing from a person’s alma mater persists because allegiance continues to be crucial. Inbreeding assists doctoral students in finding academic positions, and this is consistent with the paternalistic role the university has played in taking care of its members, as has traditionally been practiced in Japanese organisations generally (Mouer and Kawanishi 2005).

Inbreeding in academia has been of interest to researchers, particularly in relation to its impact on productivity. Arimoto found that inbreeding was particularly prominent in the prestigious universities, with the ‘big four’ universities having the following ratios in 2003; Tokyo, 78%; Kyoto, 72.3%; Waseda, 71.2%; and Keio, 63.8% (Yamanoi 2007 cited in Arimoto, 2008: 25).
Mishra and Smyth (2012: 2) argued that academic inbreeding has also been commonly used in the United Kingdom and the United States, but at much lower rates—less than 10 or 20%. However, as in Japan, the prestigious universities or departments may have higher inbreeding rates, and the authors cite Harvard Law School at 81% and Yale Law School at 73%, with low rates—less than 10%—for universities at the lower end of rankings.

For example, Professor Shima knew that chairing the appointing committee gave him the power to bring in someone he knew, and the anonymity of his participation in this research, he said, allowed him to speak openly about using connections:

*Professor Shima:* To be honest, it’s done all the time.

*BH:* Have you ever used *kone* when hiring?

*Professor Shima:* Yes! I was able to use my position to bring in Professor X. I know him well. It will be great to have him here and work with him.

*BH:* Where do you know him from?

*Professor Shima:* We were in university together.

*BH:* But what about *koubou*?

*Professor Shima:* Oh, he had to apply and go through the *koubou* process. He is definitely qualified, though. It was a bit tricky and I had to convince the faculty that he was the best candidate, but I was able to.

*BH:* Did his qualifications fit the job perfectly?

*Professor Shima:* It’s all fairly flexible, really. You just have to make a good case and I was successful, so I was pleased.
This seems to highlight the professor’s awareness of conflict between the meritocratic process and networking, but that the process in place, its vagueness, permitted a melding of formal qualifications and network connections. Others acknowledged that using *kone* was common. For example, when I asked Professor Shino, whom I know well and believed to be one of the most open of the administrator professors, he concurred:

*Professor Shino*: People know that when it is their turn to be on committees, they will get a chance to hire whom they want. Everyone knows this is happening. All *koubou* did was make us jump through some hoops. We have to now make an effort to justify, so they have to appear qualified. It’s easy to do when the rest of the faculty only get partial information and things are rather vague.

*BH*: How often does this happen?

*Professor Shino*: It’s certainly not all the time. Some committees are truly trying to focus on merit. And it also depends on the departments. Some have developed much stricter criteria, so it’s harder there. It’s still possible, though. It’s a game, a kind of game, really.

It is interesting that all the interviewees who admitted to *kone* being practiced also emphasised that candidates had to be sufficiently qualified in order to be fairly confident of convincing the majority of faculty members that she or he was the best candidate. For some, part of the success of this process came from lobbying, buttressed by autonomy and trust. Professor Mura, for instance, spoke of convincing a few professors whom he thought would oppose him, by offering a tit-for-tat. Professor Sato
mentioned that it was easier in the past when one did not have to go through the motions—the job postings, interviewing people they knew were not going to be appointed—which he saw as a waste of time because the choice was, in essence, already made.

Alumni networking was seen as being gendered. It was perceived as being beneficial to men, with a suggestion that the practice should be expanded by and for women. For example, Professor Yoshi drew attention to the gendered aspect:

> Look at everyone, the guys in our department. They are all from some clique. There’s the X University group, the Y University clique. No one is coming in the front door fairly. Well, not the men. All the women do. I did, Professor Z. did, we all did. The only thing we can do is to start creating our own network and recommend qualified women. If we let the hiring committees know that we are recommending a qualified woman, maybe they will listen to us.

Rather than challenging alumni networking, its inevitability was acknowledged and seen as a potentially effective way to get more women appointed. However, the effectiveness of networking for women seems unlikely, if we take international experiences as any indicator. Roos (2008), for example, found that women had different and disadvantaged forms of entry into jobs. Moody (2012: 50) argued that, in American academia, the exclusion of minorities from networks, which are deemed essential to career success, results in ‘serious deprivation’. It seems highly doubtful that women’s networks would positively influence the male networks as factors such as segregation and cognitive bias, discussed in detail in the following chapters, suggest.
5.3 Internal labour markets: being promoted

Interviewees mentioned that Shakai University often used recruitment from internal labour markets, and that it was generally seen as a promotion, rather than a contradiction to meritocracy. All full-time positions had to follow open recruitment protocols, however, and this led to feelings of conflict, as it was both a promotion and an open recruitment. Much is written on the acquisition of firm-specific skills as a core component of Japanese organisations (Keizer 2010; Mouer and Kawanishi 2005; Yuasa 2005). Thelen (2007), for example, explored the development of skill acquisition in Japan in the early industrialisation era, and described the importance of internal labour markets. Witt (2006: 181), in researching institutional change, found continuing widespread on-the-job training. Keizer (2010: 32–6) concurred that internal labour markets persist, as did the importance of firm-specific skills, with little convergence toward open-market recruitment (2010: 176). The importance of the role of senpai (the person, who brings the kohai into the organisation) in passing on the ‘Shakai University way’ was acknowledged as an ongoing practice, though the layering of formal qualifications over this traditional practice highlights the current understanding that, since the economic bubble burst, top jobs have more demanding skill requirements, often combining external and internal labour-market skills.

Professor Han: They just announced in our kyoujukai that 50% of us [teaching faculty] were hired through koubou and 50% internally.

Interpersonal relationships through family connections, keibatsu, have been well documented (see Mouer and Kawanishi 2005). Most participants acknowledged the
existence and institutional logic of kone, in this instance, as pragmatic, given the large numbers of part-time teachers and turnover rates; more than half of the teachers at the university were part-time.

Appointing for part-time teaching positions and contracts almost exclusively depended on kone; few knew of open recruitment, such as job postings, being used. Those recommended were sometimes interviewed, but generally the results were a forgone conclusion, provided that the candidate met certain minimum requirements, such as having a Master’s degree, and sometimes publications and teaching experience. This was general practice and had no negativity nor guardedness associated with it but, rather, was seen as pragmatic. Many of the interviewees stated matter-of-factly that this is the best, and sometimes only form of recruitment, where turnover is often high. Professor Shino, for example, spoke of having to fill a number of part-time teaching positions by asking other teachers for recommendations. Professor Len mentioned that using kone was the only way in which he filled part-time positions.

5.4 Meritocracy and networks summarised

When framed in terms of past practices, networking generally did not seem to engender conflict, nor did the current practice of depending on networks for part-time appointing. However, regarding full-time faculty positions, the behind-the-scenes negotiations in secrecy when inbreeding, and the lack of disclosure on networking for full-time positions are strong indicators of the dissonance they educed regarding meritocracy. Some interviewees deflected and hedged. Some of this unease was expressed through interviewees deliberately justifying that the practice was acceptable if used in
conjunction with satisfactory formal qualifications that would pass the university recruitment protocols. Most were quite matter-of-fact about the practice. According to Brinton and Kariya (1998) the English term ‘OB’ (old boys’ network) was used in the Japanese context to describe alumni networks while, in other countries (the US/UK, industrial societies) their use is hidden and viewed negatively. In Japanese universities in the 1990s, they posited, networks were actively maintained and publicised. Practices exhibited a layering of merit alongside networks.

The extent of using networking for recruitment by the university is not possible to discern given my research methodology, but it is safe to say that, while not used exclusively, it is still widely used in parallel to the university’s formalised meritocratic mandate. Meyer and Rowan (1977) called this a ‘loose coupling’ between organisational ideals and actual practices. There was a tendency towards change, at Shakai University, towards meritocratic ideals, a change that was generally embraced but which also stood in conflict with the continuing non-meritocratic praxis of networking.

Status, gender and age were having an impact on recruitment. Only a few women were aware of the fact that connections were being used for tenured-position recruitment. The majority of the women expressed a general unwavering commitment to meritocracy, sometimes accompanied by a belief in the institutional retreat from *kone*. This seems to illustrate that women viewed their professional roles in the university as based on meritocracy (regardless of what men’s pipelines were). Their professional identities were, therefore, strongly tied to the criteria on which they were judged. Women had generally come in through the front door, even those who started with entry-level part-time teaching, and this may have contributed to their belief in the meritocratic system.
No female participants mentioned being a part of networking negotiations. Because Japan has strong in-group/out-group behaviour, then appointments would be strongly impacted by homophily, generally benefiting men since there would rarely be in-groups of women. Ridgeway (2006) for example, argued that ‘in-group favoritism’ was the strongest evaluative response to those who are different. This bodes poorly for women (and also non-Japanese as an out-group) in accessing tenured faculty positions. Additionally, because most recruitment was done to replace retiring professors, Kmec’s research is pertinent; the gendering of jobs, institutionalised over time, means that ‘the sex of the current jobholder is an accurate indicator of the extent to which a position is open to women or men’ (2005: 346). This is relevant and will be covered in detail in the following chapters on segregation and cognitive bias.

Changes resulting from koubou were evident. Interviewees mentioned the changes in the gender composition of departments that had occurred over the last few decades. From the data it seems that women had been recruited from the large female-dominated pool of part-timers and contract workers. A number of women interviewees acknowledged that they themselves had been appointed from within, as a kind of promotion. They all had to go through the open recruitment process, but there was a general sense that this was a form of internal promotion, which the university supported and which is consistent with the internal labour markets that characterise the region. Professor Yama mentioned that her contacts at her alma mater were instrumental in getting her a full-time contract position, though she did not personally know the liaison professor. Professors Elemar and Rai had both worked part-time or on contracts before being appointed as tenured professors. Professors Tsuyo, Rai and Cheir had been postgraduate students.
Internal labour markets, though, are not gender-neutral. Buttigieg and Walsh (2000: 359), in the Australian context, for example, found that women ‘had to conform to a wider range of stricter criteria’ within internal labour markets. Their research found, for males, that promotion was determined by tenure in the organisation; for females, tenure as well as performance were factors. Though not in the Japanese context, Post, DiTommaso, Lowe, Farris and Cordero (2009), found no male advantage in internal labour-market promotions. However, given the highly gendered task-allocation and gender-essentialising ideologies, it seems likely that internal labour-market networking would continue to advantage males, though would not necessarily exclude talented women in this context. Reskin and Bielby (2005: 76) argued that circumventing ‘old boy’ networks through organisational processes that minimise discretion is necessary to reduce stereotyping and in-group favouritism. The gendered nature of task allocation and gender essentialising, to be discussed in detail in the following chapters, substantiates how gender impacts on task allocation, marginalising women.

6 Regulatory mechanisms: fusion praxis

From the data, two contradictory themes emerged: the university followed standard practices of open recruitment and there were mechanisms in place that, while honouring meritocratic open recruitment, were also consistent with recruitment through using networks. This section examines the regulatory mechanism and protocols for recruitment, to highlight how the formal practices permitted both recruitment methods to co-exist.
The external evaluation of universities is very recent. Starting only in 2004, universities were required to undergo mandatory certification (‘certified evaluation’) by external organisations such as the National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UD) and the Japan University Accreditation Association (JUAA), both members of the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies (Yonezawa 2011: 335). The impact of conforming to international standards, though, has not been embraced unanimously in Japan. Internationalisation has a contested presence in Japanese academia. Kudo and Hashimoto, for example, wrote ‘As globalization and internationalization of higher education are conjointly progressed at an unexpectedly rapid pace, Japanese universities are forcibly located amid dialectic tensions between nationalism and cosmopolitanism and between competition and cooperation’ (2011: 357). The speed of the process, a recurring theme in the research on higher education in Japan, may be pushing Japanese universities to quickly meet standards that they are not yet capable of meeting, resulting in changes that conform to international standards in definition only.

6.1 Changing criteria of expertise and qualifications

Interviewees mentioned that they were aware of recent changes in the profession towards the requirement for candidates to have PhDs. Professions socially construct qualifications that, over time, legitimise the profession. However, interviewees mentioned that some people recently had been appointed without PhDs, but they had equivalency in other criteria such as publications, teaching experience or industry/government backgrounds. The fairly recent adoption of the PhD requirement at
Shakai University was a concrete change, that was in line with increases in the numbers of PhDs acquired in Japan and goes toward fulfilling desires to come in line with international standards.

The fact that there is now pressure on faculty to have PhDs may be the cause of some adaptations, briefly discussed here, and may not just be related to internal labour-market faculty recruitment, but may also be indicative of wider practice in the region. Interviewees mentioned that, in the awarding of PhDs to students, there were no referees from outside the department, let alone the university. Some interviewees saw this as problematic. For example, there were concerns regarding the lack of rigour. Others mentioned how PhDs were awarded, without any adherence to academic standards, to business people on the grounds that they write up, in detail, their experiences in the professions. Professor Rai mentioned the low quality of scholarship as being similar to other universities where she had taught. Professor Ree mentioned postgraduate theses that were largely literature reviews, some with large sections plagiarised or translated directly from other languages into Japanese. This acknowledgement of a lack of monitoring was particularly problematic when departments awarded PhDs internally to professors, as demonstrated by Professor Ree:

At my last university, I witnessed something totally unfair. The department awarded a PhD to one of the professors. Yes, he had been publishing recently, but they basically all just voted on giving him a PhD because he had been publishing a lot. But it was just _kiyo_ [journals internal to the university that publish professors’ and students’ work in progress] at X University. I thought that, because Shakai University was a good university, awarding degrees internally wouldn’t happen here, but a few years ago they
did it here too. He wrote a book but the quality? Very subjective! I was on sabbatical otherwise I would have objected. What does it say about us? It is so embarrassing.

This comment illustrates Professor Ree’s view that using kiyo as the basis for awarding PhDs was unfair and the lack of rigor for books, which professors paid publishing firms to publish, were both a poor reflection of the university’s quality. This indicates a recent trend and pressure for holding advance degrees. As mentioned above, legitimacy-seeking through conforming to international standards that generally require university professors to have PhDs/doctorates would seem to result in this kind of process—which would boost the number of PhD-holding faculty to be more in line with international levels. Another qualification, publishing in Japanese kiyo, is one of the criteria considered when appointing. Interviewees mentioned that while they were listed as peer-reviewed, in actuality, they were not:

Professor Uchi: Often kiyo are working papers and reports, though sometimes they are rigorous research too. The comparative standard of scholarship is relevant in the West: vetted journals over non-vetted; A-list journals over working papers. They list the kiyo as vetted but they are not. They are simply accepted and published. They vet if students submit, but professors’ papers are automatically accepted. So, if you are hiring and compared an article from an A-list journal that’s vetted, they say the Japanese kiyo is equivalent. It’s not. Not at all.
While the quality of *kiyo* publications varied across universities, not to mention regions, interviewees mentioned the unfairness of calling in-house university journals vetted (peer reviewed) and putting them on par with internationally prestigious journals. However, some interviewees mentioned a gradual move toward academic integrity, with shifts towards requiring citations and referencing in publications and moving away from publishing translations, literature reviews and reports.

Finally, interviewees said that Shakai University had recently changed the classification of professors. There were many levels of contract teaching, hierarchically listed as Assistant Professors, and Lecturers, all non-tenure-track positions. According to participants, some levels of Assistant Professor were re-named Associate Professor in line with trend-setting universities in the region. This level of teaching contract, not coincidentally, was almost exclusively male; the contract language teachers, where the majority of female teachers were, were not re-classified. This has gendered implications, as the title of Associate Professor then enabled these contract teachers, when appointed as tenured faculty, to automatically become full professors, unlike teachers at the other contract levels who would have to be appointed as Associate Professors and were expected to fulfill certain requirements to be promoted to a full professorship.

### 6.2 The process of recruitment

Professor Shino outlined the open recruitment process that, with some variation, was used by the departments. *Koubou*, recruitment through public job postings, provided equal opportunity in applications; choices of candidates were made through a
democratic process of voting on the best candidates, and the process was buttressed by appointing committees of trustworthy members. Professor Shino outlined the recruitment process in this meritocratic manifestation:

*BH*: Job postings aren’t detailed. Mainly they mention only the field of expertise and classes to be taught.

*Professor Shino*: Yes. That is so we can get a broad range of applicants and have more to choose from. We post the jobs publicly and anyone can apply. That’s equal opportunity. The faculty approves the ones the hiring committee will interview. When they present their choices to the faculty, they explain very carefully who their top choice is and why, what criteria they used, and then the whole faculty votes. So, it's fair. The whole department decides.

*BH*: So, it is fair, based on merit?

*Professor Shino*: How do I know the hiring is fair? Because we know the people on the hiring committees. We trust them.

Professor Shino’s final comment indicates the paradoxical nature of a appointing process that embraces both meritocracy and networks when he mentions that the process is fair based on the trust they hold for the committees. The variations in the process were in the involvement of the Deans, the number of people on the appointing committees, and whether there was transparency in the process. Transparency theoretically occurred through faculty members being given summaries of all the applicants (usual), or faculty having complete access to all applicants (rare) and who attended the interviews (usually just committee members, though some departments did
this openly). Professor Shino’s comments also underline two concepts to be discussed in the following sections: the use of vague job descriptions, which are the norm in Japanese employment (Keizer 2010), and trust.

As a contrasting interpretation, Professor Rai was certain that the system was biased; she said she did not naïvely accept the system as meritocratic and judged it as no more than a performance. She also believed that the system could not be changed, a resignation to the legacy of non-meritocratic mechanisms:

The hiring looks fair, but it really isn’t. They just choose who they want. The system is set up to look like it is meritocracy, but it often is not. What a system, to have it set up so it looks fair means that it is impossible to challenge it.

Professor Rai illustrates that the appointing process has the façade of meritocratic processes that have been layered over the traditional appointing processes based on networks. These two excerpts from Professor Shino and Professor Rai, with their opposing conceptions of fairness, form the backdrop for this next section.

According to senior-management participants, using vague criteria was a benefit. For example, Professor Ito said this enabled departments ‘to attract the largest number of applicants’. He said it was natural that a man was always chosen since ‘Men are just more qualified. We choose whoever has the most qualifications’. This broadness of criteria was consistent with Japanese practices of on-the-job skill acquisition. Keizer (2010: 176) found ‘simple and broad job descriptions’ to be a continuing important aspect of the ‘Japanese model’. Management emphasised the importance of candidates having both formal qualifications, but more importantly
having ‘potential’ in administration. The overemphasis on management potential is problematic for female academics since the ideal administrator is characterised by traits associated with men and not with generalised traits associated with women. This biasing toward administration was a recurring theme and is discussed in detail throughout my thesis.

Many interviewees saw the recruitment process as having only the ‘appearance of meritocracy’ while maintaining a strong male homophily component. Professor Cheir said, when she asked about criteria, that it was fabricated in order to support the choice of someone they liked:

It’s more, like, you read the résumé and suddenly they get excited about one, they get excited about another one, or not excited, and once you’ve done your first read-through of the résumés, I think that these men just started talking to one another and saying, ‘Oooh, this one is exciting, this one is exciting, right, right’, and then the criteria appear! I think that’s how it works.

Professor Kana concurred, saying that, when reading a résumé, they were ‘getting excited about this guy, he may be your buddy, such a good fit with others in the department’. The senior women generally seemed convinced that meritocracy was not being practiced. There is research that backs up awareness developing through repeated exposure to subtle (and overt) discrimination. Sealy (2010), for example, found that senior women’s perceptions changed over time, and that their belief that meritocracy was operational changed to believing social capital to be the driving force. As a professor who had witnessed appointing for over a couple of decades, Professor Kana
had witnessed the systemic exclusion of women, always with a rationalisation that attempted to make decisions appear legitimate, and which were impossible to combat. As she said, ‘If the majority in the department argue that someone’s particular specialisation is the thing that really matters, even though this just emerged while they were “cloistered away”, then this is impossible to combat’. Another important finding, evident in the excitement of the men regarding certain candidates, was the prevalence of male homophily in the recruitment process. This also suggested an element of homo-eroticism, inevitably excluding women.

Positive attitudes toward the university’s system varied depending on one’s position in the hierarchy. Support was generally expressed by professors who were higher up in the organisation—those who had had administrative experience as Deans, Vice Deans, and in senior management. There was a stated assumption of meritocracy, with equal opportunity for all (women and men) to apply; the democracy of the process through majority voting; the benefit of vague job descriptions as beneficial in attracting the most qualified people; and trust being the core of the process. There seemed to be more approval of the system from departments that had higher percentages of female faculty. They felt that the process was quite meritocratic and that they were more specific in delineating criteria early in the recruitment process. However, for those who worked in male-dominated departments, the appointing process was a charade of meritocracy that was only actually performed on a limited basis. Professor Han described how the shortlist was decided by the departmental administration. Their role was solely to judge the sole candidate superiors had chosen to ‘make sure he was truly qualified’. She viewed this as a meritocratic ‘performance’ where they had to argue why he was the best candidate through long, detailed rationales. This was an open secret and excluded more-qualified women from the voting process.
Interviewees were fairly consistent in saying that there were fewer women applying for faculty positions. This was an argument put forward as a rationalisation for the lack of women in faculties. However, the quality of applicants put this into question. Professor Han said that most of the male candidates who applied were weak, while the women were stronger yet, in the vetting, excuses were made to conform to the belief that there were no qualified women applicants. She believed, in the end, that ‘being a man was the criteria’.

Many of the female interviewees agreed that women’s perceptions that women had little possibility of being appointed were relevant to the application process. Professor Elemar said that she resisted applying to Shakai University because everyone said it did not appoint women. Professor Kim expressed a similar sentiment, saying the lack of trust in meritocracy ‘stops women from applying. They know it’s the OB (Old Boys’ Club)’. Professor Saki said the larger number of male applicants was not an indication of men being more qualified—‘When I look at the batch of applicants, go through the list and eliminate those without even basic qualifications, the numbers start to even out. … Somehow, though, we almost always hire a man, and I am suspicious of some of the rationales’.

6.3 Autonomy

A common comment from interviewees regarding the recruitment process, particularly for tenured faculty, was that departments, and the appointing committees in particular, operated autonomously. Within that autonomy was the assumption that the appointing committees were to be trusted to choose the best candidates. This was seen as
reasonable, as the committees were headed by senior faculty who had learnt the proper procedures through observing and taking part in committees. Other committee members participated to varying degrees, though status seemed to be a factor in the final decision-making:

Professor Moto: Hiring committees operate autonomously. This works because then everyone expects that, when their turn comes, they will have the power to operate autonomously. It’s about reciprocity.

While autonomy from the university was seen as vital to ensure that departments had power to appoint whomever they wanted, within the departments themselves, decisions required a majority vote. This was combined with a form of consensus where the more-junior members of the faculty said that they were aware that they had to conform to the accepted institutional process and they were also dependent on the general support of senior faculty who could band together, sometimes along union lines, to defeat their recommendations. This was particularly evident in situations where committees were trying to introduce change, such as appointing foreigners, changing the direction of a department’s academic focus, or overtly pushing for gender inclusivity.

Horta et al (2011: 36), citing Henkel (2005), argued that, as in other countries, autonomy has been critical to the academic profession in Japan, and is ‘fiercely defended and recognized as critical for the development of the modern university’. Arimoto (2010) found that autonomy and academic freedom were highly rated. University faculty play a role in appointing new faculty in many countries, but in Japan they have tremendous influence. Arimoto (2010: 120–2) argued that, with a higher average than the 17 countries of the Carnegie 2007 survey, Japan was 84% compared
with the average of 48% in terms of faculty influence on decision-making, indicating the high level of autonomy of faculty.\textsuperscript{20} As seen in the previous interviewee’s quotes, some participants felt that autonomy was misused and, along with consensus, was an exercise in power. The effect of the vertical hierarchy in terms of power is important, and will be discussed in detail in the chapters that follow, but is addressed in the next section solely in relation to the functioning of appointing committees.

### 6.4 Status and power

Decision-making in recruitment was regarded by some as transparent. Faculty had to agree on the job postings, committees presented their shortlist for approval after the interview process, and the final shortlist of candidates was voted on in faculty meetings. Some interviewees, however, felt that this process obscured what was sometimes really happening. For example, responding to my query about the extent of understanding how the decision-making works:

\textit{Professor Kai}: Some faculty member once asked, what is your decision-making process?

\textit{BH}: Do you understand (the decision-making process) now?

\textit{Professor Kai}: Now, I feel it’s still partly a black box.

\textit{BH}: What do you mean, black box?

\textit{Professor Kai}: Usually most important topics are decided by the administration, and sometimes after the administration propose their idea,

\textsuperscript{20} Autonomy is at the root of the system of tenure worldwide; its role is to protect against the fear of losing one’s job because of one’s academic exploration.
we have some discussion in the faculty meeting, and the administration try to think and modify, but usually we don’t have a process to modify.

BH: So, they present their decision, and everybody goes…

Professor Kai: Of course, some say, ‘I don’t think it’s right, or effective, or properly works, but after some discussion, (the administration’s) decision would be accepted.

Being a junior on the appointing committee made it very difficult for some interviewees to have a voice in the appointing process. Committee members were aware that their age, seniority and gender were factors in their effectiveness or lack thereof. For example, Professors Han and Cheir had a number of qualified women on their shortlist and wanted them to be considered for interview:

Professor Cheir: [There were] all these women who these men had never mentioned.

Professor Han: It was unbelievable.

Professor Cheir: I went through them with them, so they were rationalising, saying, ‘Oh, this woman is off topic’ … ‘Oh, this one doesn’t have publications’, and so on, so it was hard for me. I also felt pressured by the committee members. I really felt pressured.

Professor Han: So, they weren’t listening to you, you felt?

Professor Cheir: No, oh God, no. I really was the one … I also think they were being condescending in the sense that I’m a woman.
With the emphasis on firm-specific training, the recruitment processes of the past were continually being taught to newer faculty. Normative isomorphism would make the integration of gender-neutral criteria—such as conceptions that embrace diversity—difficult. Many interviewees felt the pressure to conform to the system and saw its potential to exacerbate gender inequality.

6.5 Trust: enforced trust and assurance

Trust was described as being at the centre of the appointing process. Professor Sato, quoted in the network section above, stated that this trust, built over time, was in the best interest of the university. Trust was expressed as generally permeating the recruitment process:

*BH*: Do the Deans direct the appointing committees about who to hire?

*Professor Shima*: The Deans know what is best for the department, so, yes, they often advise the hiring committees about which choices would be best for the department. But, in the end, it is up to the committee to make those decisions. We trust the committees.

*BH*: Do they take your advice, always? Generally?

*Professor Shima*: Well, yes. But that is because they trust us.

The importance of trust was a recurring theme of the interviewees and much has been written in the literature on Japanese institutions about this. Ikeda and Richey demarcated one form of trust as ‘assurance’, based on Yamagishi and Yamagishi (1994
cited in Ikeda and Richey 2011: 122), as being a state where we ‘can be confident that others will not behave maliciously when they are controlled by social tit-for-tat conditions, or by regulations and laws’ (Ikeda and Richey, 2011: 122). Witt (2006: 149) explained that trust in Japan can be assured when enforced by third parties. Enforced trust is a mechanism that may compensate for the lack of laws or the enforcement of laws in countries such as Japan that are not litigious. Regarding third-party enforcement, individuals who were recommended became connected to the party who brought them into the university. Assurance, subsequently, was garnered through the senpai/kohai relationship. Trust engendered through networking enabled autonomy, within certain parameters, to be mutually guaranteed. This seemed to be the gist of the many references which interviewees made regarding trust and autonomy in the recruitment process.

In general, recommendations to appoint were rubber-stamped by faculty and fairly automatically approved by the Board of Directors. There were a few instances mentioned where the proposed candidates were not deemed qualified enough to be ratified; perhaps not coincidentally, all of whom were women. Interviewees mentioned no instances of the Board of Directors blocking appointing unless there were legal issues, such as falsified qualifications or past criminal records.

7 Conclusion

This chapter discussed the ways in which meritocracy and the various types of networks co-existed. It substantiates the findings of previous research from the last two decades in Japan that found that there are networks of direct pipelines to employment from
universities to employment in Japan (Rebick 2000; Brinton and Kariya 1998) and the persistence of academic ‘inbreeding’ (Horta et al 2011).

There were instances of institutional layering of meritocratic practices over the traditional methods of recruitment that had depended on various networks. There were no substantive university protocols to circumvent networking, leaving meritocracy to the vagaries of individuals’ and departments’ commitment to change. While the procedures in place resembled meritocratic processes, there was nothing in the regulatory mechanisms that precluded the use of networking. In other words, the protocols supported meritocracy but they also supported recruitment through networks. There was also conversion regarding the awarding of advanced degrees without external oversight and changes in classifications of faculty positions. This layering and conversion seemed to be a result of legitimacy-seeking by the university in order to conform to international standards through increasing the numbers of professors with PhDs, which was becoming increasingly institutionalised. These changes were not advantageous to women.

There were none of the regular mechanisms that are found in most liberal democracies that work to promote non-discrimination in an organisation: no equity boards, women’s caucuses, training in non-biased appointing, or accountability procedures. For example, in a US context, best practice regarding non-gender-biased recruitment includes the monitoring of the discretion of appointing agents, clearly defined objective/specific criteria at all stages of the recruitment and appointing process, and ensuring accountability (Moody 2012; Reskin and Bielby 2005). The importance of clear criteria about what the job actually entails has also been suggested. Ely and Padavic (2007: 1129) posited that appointing criteria and the actual
requirements of the job are often not ‘in sync’ since ‘since task requirements are often conflated with sex-linked traits’.

There was no evidence of enactment of CEDAW’s requirement for changing processes that produce women’s disadvantage, and the law was ‘interpreted’ as eradicating only the overt forms of discrimination. Rather than designing specific practices to override bias, the regulatory practices were premised on ensuring that there were no constraints on professors’ and departments’ behaviour. This is consistent with Arimoto (2010), who posited that Japan had one of the strongest orientations toward autonomy. Vague evaluative criteria provided professors with the means to place a broad range of peer-reviewed publications and loosely evaluated formal qualifications (PhDs) on par with those that had been vigorously evaluated. The flexible approach to job descriptions and the broad net with which they were cast provided incredible latitude in discretionary decision-making. Hierarchical power was respected and exercised by appointing committees and during the final departmental voting, which reinforced adherence to past practices. The sedimentation of autonomy in combination with mutually enforced trust potentially silenced any challenges to recommendations unless there were breaches that tarnished traditional practices.

Meritocracy, in itself, is not a gender-neutral concept (Bagihole and Goode 2001; Lewis and Simpson 2010b). Unlike the flexibility exercised around qualifications, there was strict enforcement regarding pre-existing conceptions of expertise, particularly around industry and management backgrounds, indicating the resilience of the gender regime. Ashcraft, Muhr, Rennstam and Sullivan (2012) argued that, in the ‘branding’ of a profession, the problematic of this inclusion/exclusion dialectic can be resolved by seeing that that which is included also defines what is excluded:
Chapter 4  Meritocracy

It can be argued that, whenever women occupy a place in the public world that is predicated on the exclusion/inclusion problematic, on the central denial of the significance of the Other that is involved in binary gendered thought, that place will be a profoundly uneasy one, inexplicable and irresolvable unless the exclusion/inclusion problematic is more firmly and more fully understood (Davies 1996: 672–3).

The academic profession itself had been defined at a time when it was exclusively men, and continues to be defined by male norms. This has left the profession with a legacy that has difficulty including women. The flexible protocols did nothing to curb bias, leaving that to the practices of forward-thinking individuals and the reluctance to defy senior traditionalists limited change toward progressive practices. Meyerson and Tompkins argued that seeing bias would be hardest for senior faculty and administrative, for those ‘who have been most thoroughly socialized, have benefited (sic) most from existing arrangements, and have the most to lose from change, should be most embedded, and therefore have the greatest difficulty in engaging in deliberative and critical cognitive processes’ (2007: 308–9). However, Möhwald (2002: 35), researching the Japanese context, argued that the higher women’s education is, the less support they have for male dominance and traditional gender roles and this may have been instrumental in increasing the number of women in some departments, as some of these women said they were more than willing to go up against tradition and the ‘ridiculously stupid’ attitudes of some of the senior males.

Open recruitment, when it was first instigated and at particular junctures, increased the number of women faculty. Interviewees perceived that it would be only women ‘above the cut’ who would be appointed because it would be hard to convince
the faculty to consider an obviously less-qualified 

_kone_ over a highly qualified woman—it would be apparent that they were overriding meritocracy and being biased. However, this expectation of being more qualified, combined with the low numbers of women faculty and the male culture, were assumed to have an impact on the number of women who might apply for faculty positions. Kanter’s (1977) research backs this up, as she argued that a person’s location in ‘an opportunity structure’ influences his/her attitudes toward work, and the low numbers of women faculty could signal an unlikely probability of being recruited.

There was some evidence that women had entered the university through internal labour-market networks: from part-time and contract teaching and from doctoral studies. In this respect, the networks were not exclusively male and, because Japanese organisations traditionally have promoted and continue to promote from within (Keizer 2010), this networking may have contributed to the slight increase in women’s numerical representation over the last few decades. However, it is fairly safe to extrapolate from the severe gender segregation in general in Japan that women have not benefited equally from the continued practice of networking. Reskin and Bielby (2005: 73) argued that not only are male activities considered to be more worthwhile but ‘by overstating biological sex differences, sex differentiation lends legitimacy to women’s and men’s concentration in different activities’. The privileging of administrative expertise is certainly relevant in this respect.

It was also found that the institution was described as strongly male and homosocial. Male homophily—the desire of the men to be with other men—was a strong motivating factor in the evaluation of candidates. Not only did women note that men were making choices that favoured men but that they would get ‘excited’, when looking at male candidates’ résumés, at the prospect of working together with them.
The impact of this on networking and meritocratic appointing was found to privilege male candidates. The practices of academic institutions and the institutional culture have been found to be the cause of persistent inequality. Meyerson and Tompkins (2007: 303), for example, found persistent bias ‘embedded in and reinforced by everyday codes of behavior, knowledge structures, and belief systems that are taken for granted and therefore not held up to scrutiny’.

This institutional analysis generated a lot of data directly relevant to the puzzle of why there are so few women faculty in Japanese universities. Path-dependency is useful in explaining the lack of change in recruitment praxis; past practices persisted regardless of the somewhat general discursive support for meritocratic appointing processes. Using Mahoney and Thelen’s (2010) supposition that change is continuous and endogenous, open recruitment was found to be layered over previous practices, as past practices exhibited normative isomorphism in recruitment processes as well as mimetic isomorphism around the Othering of women’s expertise and the masculinist working culture. The embeddedness of the academic institution in other institutions was instrumental in the resistance to change.

The CEDAW mandate for positive action sooner, rather than later, was not evidenced in the hiring or promotion processes, and in fact the mild attempts at positive action backfired or were met with complacency. There were no specific policies or practices, but only a generalised understanding that discrimination should be avoided. In fact, the autonomy of faculty, in conjunction with trust, served to insulate hiring committees from any scrutiny. There was some norm diffusion in terms of discursive adoption of non-discrimination norms but senior women were generally astute to the cumulative advantages that men received, while diffusion of sexual non-discrimination
Chapter 4  Meritocracy

norms and the praxis of evaluation based on non-gendered meritocratic qualifications were absent amongst upper management and some of the male faculty.

CEDAW’s requirement of equality of opportunity as well as equality of outcome, were far from institutionalised. The general lack of attention to the gendering nature of the institution and the prevalence of gender-essentialising comments indicates that the broad education of the population regarding sexual non-discrimination norms within the workplace that CEDAW requires had not been accomplished at the level of the university. This chapter explored the appointment process for faculty positions. The data show the irrepressible gap between CEDAW’s legislative requirement to eradicate practices, cultural and economic, that perpetuated inequality and normative and cultural-cognitive institutions that constrained change in recruitment practices.
Chapter 5

SEGREGATION

1 Introduction

Segregation is ubiquitous in Japanese institutions (Brinton and Kariya 1998; Charles and Grusky 2004; Grusky 2008; Mouer and Kawanishi 2005) and vertical segregation in Japan, as elsewhere, is a key contributor to gender employment inequality (Brinton and Kariya 1998). Segregation and micro-segregation within academic disciplines, as well as other supply factors such as women’s choices and societal norms, have been argued to be causal of inequalities in universities and these will be examined in the following chapter on egalitarianism. This chapter, on the other hand, examines segregation within the organisation, arguing that internal dual-labour markets that have been an omnipresent feature of Japanese labour markets generally (Mouer and Kawanishi 2005; Witt 2006) also constructed gender inequality for university faculty. This chapter shows that the form, severity and totality of segregation defined the Japanese university. It is argued that segregation positioned women as Other in the institution and excluded them from crucial decision-making processes positioning those who would otherwise potentially be the most likely to agitate for institutional change as ineffective, thereby constraining change toward gender equality.

Compared to liberal market economies (LMEs), coordinated market economies (CMEs) like Japan’s are hypothesised to be more gender-segregated due, in part, to intra-locking institutions’ long-term relationships that are underpinned by non
interrupted careers and lifetime employment (Estévez-Abe 2006, 2009; Gottfried 2008, 2013; Mandel and Shalev 2009; Witt 2006). It has also been suggested that internal labour markets advantage men because of their stronger commitment to the organisation. For example, Estévez-Abe (2006) examined the ‘gendered consequences of different varieties of capitalism’ (148, italics in original) and found that, along with strong traditional gender norms, it was firm-specific skill acquisition in CMEs that disadvantaged women. Women would be motivated to invest in the formal credentials acquired external to firms, as these would provide greater employment mobility. This chapter describes a more nuanced situation since university faculty came into the organisation with external certifications (PhDs) and yet the success of administrative roles was dependent on the internal labour market. Given that high-achieving women, who were formally credentialed, had been and continued to be on the periphery of core administrative operations, this research argues that it was the role of the institution, through marginalising mechanisms and ideational logics that constructed men as status-laden, that consequently bolstered the belief of men as more status-worthy and legitimised them securing positions in the administrative hierarchy. Generalised acceptance of a separate but equal gendered division of labour was found to be constraining individual women’s career aspirations. It also contributed to encouraging women’s inappropriately adaptive preferences (Khader 2011) that reinforced the gender-essentialised beliefs that reproduced women’s micro disadvantages. Ely and Padavic (2007: 1125) posited that men are privileged in the hierarchy in which gender is constructed, and this research examined the mechanisms that legitimised inequality and constructed women’s disadvantages.

Another issue explored throughout this chapter is institutional change. Witt (2006: 22) argued that institutional change could be considered systemic if there are
knock-on effects, changing the ‘linkages and complementarities’ that buttress systems. He contrasted this with changes that are simple adaptations needed to make adjustments. In analysing whether changes in institutions—such as anti-harassment initiatives—are, indeed, transformative instruments versus merely discursive instruments, the organisation—in the this case the university—would have to demonstrate substantive changes in policy and practice. Using CEDAW’s Article 5(a) and the recent periodic reports as a benchmark, this chapter examines two specific interrelated aspects that have been argued to have changed in Japan due to the implementation of domestic laws that had their initial impetus in CEDAW. The first was whether the establishment of harassment committees has provided effective avenues of resolution for employees and, in particular, faculty. The other area explored was whether the internal labour markets have improved to accommodate gender equality for faculty. Institutionalist theory suggests that the rate of change would probably be uneven in the different pillars of the institutions (Scott 2014). The implementation of regulatory institutions—an exogenous shock in the form of the adoption of CEDAW—resulted in the sudden introduction of the domestic equality laws (the EEOL) as mentioned in the introductory chapter. The cognitive-cultural and normative institutions often tend to lag behind (Campbell 2004; Scott 2014).

This chapter begins by discussing the diffusion of different but equal ideational logics that permeated the institution that normalised women’s segregation. Next, the internal labour market that constructs the gendered administrative core is examined in relation to the various marginalising mechanisms such as in-group affiliations, the impact of women’s forays into the core, and the gendered conceptions of expertise. The role of firm-specific knowledge and silence in relation to segregation will be explored. Mechanisms of disparagement as well as the more extreme forms of marginalisation,
such as bullying, and sexual and academic harassment, will be discussed next. Finally, exit as a strategy will be explicated in relation to the more severe marginalising forces. This research found that institutional change, while evident in a limited form, was largely discursive and that the organisation itself played an active, yet generally covert, role in the continuous, unchallenged perpetuation of segregation that disadvantaged women.

2 Different but equal: moving to the periphery

This section discusses women exercising agency through positioning themselves on the periphery. There were some participants who, while acknowledging the existence of discrimination in the university, said that they themselves were content to be away from the male workplace of excessive time demands, factions, competition and self-promotion. These women tended to believe that they were being treated equally and even articulated some advantages of being a woman. While they were restricted by their roles at the bottom of the faculty administrative hierarchy, or their horizontal segregation into gender-appropriate areas such as pastoral work or student support, they appreciated the fact that they had fewer demands put on them:

Professor Goody: Women have advantages. By not being taken seriously, we don’t have to do as much. We get away with things, men don’t.

BH: Like?

Professor Goody: Because they think we can’t do a good job, we are not asked to do as much.
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She mentioned that being a woman provides some latitude in time demands and responsibilities. She further mentioned, in addition to this comment, that she was not required to be involved in time-consuming administrative work. As a foreigner who was a language teacher, she also said she appreciated that the requirements of her job, while equally time-consuming with other women, were conducted in a pleasant atmosphere that was not totally male-dominated, since most women were in languages and literature. Professor Tsuyo also mentioned that women had the freedom to say no to administrative requests, but she indicated that men had to say yes. The gendered propensity to never refuse administrative duties could bolster potential rationales to not hire women. Professors Tsuyo and Goody seemed to be suggesting that women could take advantage of being women since it was assumed that they would take on different roles from men. However, they also believe, rightly or not, that they were being less productive, and this was somewhat acceptable. Perhaps it is worth noting here that Scott (2010: 15), in drawing on Giddens (1984, 1987), reminds us that institutions are not only constraining but also empowering. Women, in this instance, may have been empowered in the sense that they were able to pursue careers and contribute, not through the male roles of administrators, but in their roles doing important research. This was a recurring theme that, even when segregated to the periphery, women had their research and teaching—things the university enabled them to pursue.

Some women felt that they were treated equally, were recognised as doing important work and were well respected. For example, Professor Rie said that, in her centre, which is administered by the International Studies Department, 70–80% of the staff were women, though the Head and all the executive directors are men. She is one of five professors:
BH: Are women and men treated equally in your centre?

Professor Rie: All the professors are women, but we have a lot of male managers and staff. Women are more powerful in our office. Sometimes I feel like I have to encourage the men.

BH: Do you feel respected? You said last time you felt respected. Do they respect your work? Like, the atmosphere in that office is quite professional and respectful?

Professor Rie: Can you give me any example of disrespectful (things)?

I gave examples, drawing from phrases other respondents had used such as: being dismissive to ideas, condescending, colleagues waiting for them to shut up, or what they say is cute, but not pithy. She suggested that basically men do not want any disruptions:

Professor Rie: They want to keep their peaceful world, probably, and if women come in, they have to change … probably I was disturbing many committee members.

BH: Ignorance is bliss, ka na (isn’t it?).

Professor Rie: Probably that’s our, something I learned, when I was doing my first time as chair on committees. Because if I paid attention to too many things, maybe at first I pretended to ignore it, about all the issues, otherwise I wouldn’t do, you know, I wouldn’t be able to do what I needed to do … then at the same time I was supported by those members.
This is a good example of a professor who said she was comfortable with her role of being seen as different but equal. She acknowledged that she thought it was important not to disturb how things operate, including the gender relations that guaranteed the smooth working of the institution. She felt as though she was causing some disruption, ‘disturbing many committee members’, and attributed this to both her newness in the centre and her different way of doing things because she was the first woman. Nonetheless, while being aware that her gender was regarded as a difference, she forged ahead, putting aside any feelings of discomfort, and concentrated on what she felt needed to be accomplished. She felt that overall support was also there. This echoes Hills’ (2000) research of managers in Hong Kong, where she found that women acknowledged that things were predictably different, and harder, for women, but that was to be expected and it was just the way things were.

The strong focus on administrative competence to the detriment of teaching was a recurring theme voiced by many of the women, and indicated a gendered pattern that situated women as Other. For example, Professor Tsuyo revealed that it was only after she accepted the position and was part of the university that she realised it was the administrative work that, while being very time-consuming, was what was really valued:

If, you know, someone only focuses their own research, you know, probably doesn’t matter. But, you know, this university you have to do other certain, you know, rubbish work—administration, meetings, documents, and you know, I was very surprised.
Using the term ‘rubbish’, she viewed managerial work as necessary but a nuisance and expressed a preference for doing her research, which is reinforced here by also mentioning that it really didn’t matter—the research was not a priority in the eyes of others, administrative work was. This was a recurring theme that reinforced the primacy of administrative skills that, due to gender essentialism, were assumed to be held primarily by men. Ely and Padavic (2007: 1129) found that, in the non-Japanese context, male attributes such as authority and confidence were synonymous with those required to be effective administrators, thereby continuously reinforcing the gender differences and the legitimacy of men’s position in the corporate hierarchy. Professor Tsuyo mentioned that she buried herself in her research and that the students were the main importance. This is another example of making choices that positioned her on the margins of the corporate administration, giving her more time to do what she chose to do—teach and research.

Many participants voiced similar choices in focusing on teaching and research in lieu of administration. For instance, Professor Ree stated that she tried to find ways to minimise the pain of tedious administrative duties and emphasised that she only wanted to be a great teacher. She noted that the men basically ignored the development of their teaching skills to focus on their research. It seems that teaching skills were undervalued, and that this was also a way of constructing gender differences, since teaching skills were perceived to rely heavily on people-oriented skills—something women were, stereotypically, naturally good at. Unlike some regions, where students evaluate professors’ teaching and professors expend effort on building their teaching craft, in this instance, Professor Ree mentioned that teaching was not formally evaluated, and hence not highly valued in the university. It is interesting that teaching lacked status while also being viewed more as a feminine pursuit. Poole, Bornholt and Summers...
(1997), in a multi-country study, found that women generally placed more importance on teaching than men. Poole and Chen (2009) argued that *uchimuki* professors are valued for their work inside the university, such as in administration. Due to internationalising pressures, they may lose their standing to *sotomuki* professors, who focus on teaching and research. Professor Ree’s comments are a good example of the range of interviewees’ comments that suggested similar views. This could be important for changes in women who continue to concentrate on research.

3 Knowledge, status and segregation

Participants mentioned how information, knowledge and procedures were used as a way to wield power, and that the mentoring of juniors (*kohai*) by seniors (*senpai*) in management was a traditional process that marginalised women. A specialised Shakai Daigaku language had developed over the years and showing one was knowledgeable indicated the status of belonging to the in-group of the successfully career-tracked. New professors and many of the female participants, even senior women, spoke of being confused about procedures, and perceived information to be hoarded and only selectively shared. As Professor Kana says:

> Only the old guys seem to know. Old guys running things, but young don’t know how to change this power block, nor women.

The term ‘old guys’ seemed to be used derogatorily, with Professor Kana challenging their self-impressions of seniority being equated with power and status that, in her eyes,
seemed to connote being secretive and cliquey. Professor Nami perceived their information hoarding as a way to establish status through exclusion and mentioned that interchanges that depended heavily on the lingo continually reminded them of their lack of experience and their inferior status. As Professor Elba mentioned:

> It’s a kind of secret communication, using short cuts and Shakai Daigaku lingo, that reflects that the boys are a part of the in-group, being in with the big important boys. Of course, that leaves the rest of us, the gals, foreigners on the outside.

These comments illustrated the strong awareness that the core operations of the university were a male domain. Her use of the term ‘secret’ is interesting since it hinted at distrust—ironic, where trust is supposed to be crucial to relations in Japanese organisations. Also it was suggested that younger male professors seemed more comfortable with the system of hierarchal status that depended on firm-specific training and jargon, since men were able to see their potential place in senior management and they trusted the internal labour market. For women, indicators of outside status may have been perceived as being more permanent. Estévez-Abe (2006) argued that organisations would be less willing to train women in the internal labour market since it is more costly due to women’s (perceived) lack of commitment. These findings indicate an unofficial dual-track internal labour market that was gendered and functioned systematically and deliberately to structure gender within the organisation (Ely and Padavic 2007).
4  The role of silence

All the Japanese male participants, and some of the ambitious female participants took a blaming attitude towards women on the periphery. A typical example was Professor Oka, who argued that women lacked motivation:

Japanese women are timid. They aren’t ambitious about their careers. … They like to have babies. We don’t discriminate in Japan because it is against the law. But they like their freedom, to do, you know, hobbies, travel, go shopping. So, once they get hired as professors, they don’t take their careers seriously. They don’t have the same energy as men, you know, they get tired so easily. And they get upset, so you have to be careful, you know, it is really tiring for me, I have to think, tread carefully because, then, you know, they don’t have enough experience and it causes problems.

It is worth noting both the construction of women as Other using terms such as ‘timid’ and easily tired, and the irony that he gets tired because he has to consider their Otherness. As mentioned in Chapter 2, Othering positions women as inferior, resulting in discrimination, and is a strategy to maintain power and access to material resources in the institution. His language reinforced the ‘male’ opposing attributes of being experienced, not timid (brave/outspoken), and energetic, which thereby legitimised men as better qualified versus women’s frivolous pastimes. His rationale of having babies was misguided given that 75% (18/24) of the women interviewed were childless; women stated they had consciously chosen not to have children or, in building their
careers, had left it too late. As Professor Rai said: ‘It really was a case of “Oops, I forgot to have a baby”, and now it is too late’.

Even at the lower levels of the organisation’s operations, such as the faculty meetings, women did not have equal voice. For instance, Professor Kai mentioned that there were some outspoken women who were good role models, though she herself felt constrained:

It’s not easy for other female professors. Even I feel hesitation to say some objection [why] of course, at the moment, in my position [as Vice Dean] it’s easier to say ‘No, I don’t think so’, ‘It’s not right’ or ‘We should do different’, or that kind of thing, but otherwise, ha ha, I usually hesitate; I don’t know if it’s because I’m a woman or not, my personality; female, hmm, tend to have that kind of hesitate to speak out without knowing, ha ha.

[BH: But men?] No! I think they always feel less hesitation.

Professor Kai illustrates that, even though these are educated, accomplished women, their ‘doing’ gender resulted in a form of self-silencing. She significantly emphasises that, as Vice-Dean, she has the legitimacy to speak out, indicating the extent to which power was imbued in position or status, even when just as a Vice Dean. She also acknowledged that maleness itself endowed a person with a voice as they generally ‘feel less hesitation’. Her comment ‘hesitate to speak out without knowing’ seems to indicate that certitude was necessary for women (but not men) to participate. The interjection of laughing when talking about her hesitation is probably a common cultural non-linguistic indicator of embarrassment when referring to herself but when comparing women to men in the last statement, it seems to indicate that the concept of
men hesitating was incongruent with male behaviour, highlighting the opposing conceptions of gender-appropriate norms.

The Japanese women referred to by others as being the most participatory and vocal were the professors who had been educated abroad. The international influence on these and other women invariably met with incidents of social shaming, which will be discussed below in the sections on harassment and exit. Another form of social control that silenced was the almost universal disparagement of vocal, assertive women. For example:

\[BH\]: So, the women who are not timid, they get a lot of negative attacks?

\[Professor Tsuyo\]: \textit{Un, un} (yes, yes). They don’t say the words ‘shut up’, but the atmosphere…

\[BH\]: The atmosphere is negative?

\[Professor Tsuyo\]: \textit{Ee, ee} (concurring). Yeah, atmosphere.

\[BH\]: You feel that in your department?

\[Professor Tsuyo\]: Yeah, I feel it.

Expressing contempt for the assertive women on campus was widespread, and there seemed to be few, if any, vocal women who were not referred to in negative ways by both women and men. Mavin (2008) argued that women might find it difficult to function in a male-dominated workplace, since acting feminine may put them in a non-leadership position (Ely and Padavic 2007: 1129). In striving to function in masculine workplaces, women may choose to adopt masculinities, ‘stereotypical male attributes, risking censure from male and female colleagues and suppressing aspects of femininities’ (Mavin 2008: S76). With the extreme gender segregation in Japan, and the
stereotyping of femininity embodying unassertiveness, there seemed to be very few
women who had been able to find a way to adapt successfully to the expectations of the
ideal professor, with its strong male normativity. Berdahl (2007) argued that women
who crossed gender lines—the ‘uppity women’—received the most harassment, rather
than younger, attractive women. She posited that harassment acts as a form of social
sanctioning and control, posing the dilemma that to be successful in male-dominated
careers requires women to take on male behaviours that, in turn, are considered
unacceptable for women and lead to sanctions or disparagement. Professor Tsuyo’s
mention of the atmosphere that conveys to women that they should ‘shut up’ is
particularly vivid in that, through their non-verbal yet in no way silent message, they
conveyed their goal of silencing.

Her silence, itself, could be her compliance with the societal expectation of
women’s silence, in the self-disciplining, as feminist theorists such as Lewis and
Simpson 2010b) have discussed. Drawing on Foucault (1978), surveillance through
normalisation—the norms around feminine behaviour—acts as a form of social control,
through self-discipline or self-policing. This mimetic isomorphism is a powerful
mechanism since transgressions, real or imagined, are controlled through fear of being
shamed. Professor Tsuyo’s silence could have been her reaction to the message she
clearly hears in the meetings, a fear of possible public sanctions—such as the general
disparagement of women mentioned above—that have been known to be directed at
women in the university. Silence and voice are recurring themes in relation to power
and decision-making and Professor Tsuyo’s comments highlight the interplay of
societal expectations, reinforced through organisational gender relations.

Those who escaped disparaging comments seemed to be limited to women who,
as Professor Shima said, ‘were helpful’ and ‘behaved’. Being assertive and vocal
strongly violated this norm. Participants noted that speaking out was male-normative behavior and commented that men, especially senior and union members, took up a great deal of space talking in meetings. Ely and Padavic (2007: 1137–8) argued that organisations are potentially sites for change in gender inequality since, rather than reproducing traditional gender roles, they can challenge them more effectively than societal socialisation that is more distal. However, the silencing of women, particularly those interested in working towards gender equality, would reinforce organisational inaction issues.

It is worth noting that everyone initially said equal participation was guaranteed but women chose to be silent, withdrawn or inactive. As mentioned earlier, institutional myths (Meyer and Rowan 1977) such as this can act as pacifiers, which mask an unjust reality. This organisational myth of equality, however, also allowed women to feel that they themselves were exercising agency. Contradicting this, however, were narratives of particular incidents that had marginalised women, yet these same women asserted that it was their choice to be on the periphery. This apparent paradox will be explored throughout the rest of this chapter, beginning with women who had attempted full inclusion in the male corporate culture.

5 Stepping into the male culture

Recently a few interviewees were aspiring to move ahead in their careers and chose to, as Professor Rie said, ‘play like the boys’. Participants acknowledged that things were more difficult for women, but some continued to manoeuvre through the gendered organisation, using different strategies and adopting different personas in attempts to
reconcile their sex with the masculine norms that were deemed necessary for success. Ely and Padavic (2007: 1133) posited that gender differences in organisations might be developed from occupational differences and a person’s socialisation in the organisation. Since participants, both women and men, talked about learning the ropes through an apprentice-like process. It can be assumed that behaviour may therefore have been constructed through the organisational functionings requiring women to adopt behaviours that would traditionally have been considered masculine (Lutgen-Sandvik, Dickinson and Foss 2012). It has been suggested, for example, that aggression and anger are ‘not only appropriate but necessary’ (2012: 67) and the authors posited that this would potentially lead to social sanctions for women. This seems to be the case here, where the women were highly visible because of their token status. The precarious position of tokens has been found to include being overly scrutinised—‘Othered’ (Ely and Padavic 2007; Kanter 1977). Women may have found it necessary to use the same successful strategies that men used. Lutgen-Sandvik et al (2012) relayed terms such as ‘faux-male’, ‘he-male’ or ‘one of the guys’ to describe these masculine females’ behaviour.

The disparaging comments about women which interviewees mentioned included terms such as ‘aggressive’, ‘pushy’, ‘bullies’ and ‘nuts’, which indicate that women were perceived to have crossed gender lines and were therefore, as Professor Yoshi said, ‘not respected by men’. Fagenson (1990) found that women who are in senior management have been described has having masculine attributes, though the direction of causality was not determined. However, this research project found that those who opted to remove themselves from the power hierarchy posed little threat to the implicit gender norms and received no opprobrium.
Ely and Padavic (2007), in a non-Japanese context, found similar gender essentialising. However, in this context it seemed more extreme, with little latitude for variation. Borrowing Connell’s (1987) terminology, Ely and Padavic defined ‘hegemonic masculinity’ as that which ‘tends to emphasize authority, autonomy, and self-sufficiency’, while they defined ‘essentialized femininity’ as ‘oriented to accommodating the interests and desires of men and therefore emphasizes dependency, nurturance, and compliance’ (1129). Martin (2003: 360 cited in Nemoto 2013a: 157) also found that women who did not adjust their behaviour to the masculine styles that were normative in management, but instead remained feminine, were disadvantaged.

Even women who do not support this gender essentialisation of women’s femininity may be judged by it, and this puts masculine-acting women in a problematic relationship with work; women who take on masculine behaviour call into question their status as women, but the double bind is that those who act in traditionally feminine ways will not be viewed as having the qualities that are needed for leadership, qualities that are considered to be male—such as acting assertively and competently (Ely and Padavic 2007: 1129). The flipside of this, which became apparent during this research, was that women who did not attenuate their behaviour yet still attempted to be equally participatory were invariably unnoticed. Professor Yoshi, for example, stated that having men respect her was what was important for her career, yet her somewhat passive behaviour, including not being vocal, resulted in her, as she said ‘not being noticed, not being respected’.
6 Women’s expertise disparaged and invisible

Participants mentioned numerous ways in which women’s expertise was diminished and made invisible, robbing them of the status and rewards that men routinely received:

*Professor Kana:* Just a few days ago I finished my research project, that one, you know, I received that large government grant for. In the faculty meeting they congratulated everyone on their research, except me, the only woman. The thing that gets me is that they probably didn’t do it deliberately, they just ‘forget’, don’t care. I am invisible as a woman.

This comment indicates that Professor Kana was not surprised that she had been overlooked, perceiving this as yet another incident that confirmed that women’s accomplishments are irrelevant. She also reported that she knew of two other female professors who were actively looking for other positions because they felt they were always being criticised, were not respected, and were academically and personally undermined and ignored. This illustrates that, while women needed to have formal qualifications, such as PhDs, to get into a university or department, once hired, their academic work became their own personal affair, while the men’s accomplishments were public, acknowledged and heralded. Interviewees mentioned that the constant reinforcement of the men being on track or exceeding expectations in relation to their predicted advancement reinforced the workplace masculinity. Nemoto (2013a; 2013b) similarly found reinforcement of organisational masculinity, and postulated this constantly constructed women’s position as Other. It is interesting that Professor Kana
mentions that she thought the ignoring was not deliberate. This seems to illustrate that
discounting her accomplishments was not only inconsequential but also normative.

Other participants, such as Professor Elba, mentioned various examples of this
Othering through disregard:

…and the Dean introduced all the newly hired professors, but he forgot to
introduce the one woman. They didn’t even notice that she was not noticed!
She is quite accomplished but they just don’t see her as a relevant player,
just ignore her expertise.

Professor Elba indicates that the invisibility has become so normative that no one is
aware of the omissions. This is completely inconsistent with understandings of the
Japanese corporate culture, where respecting those who are accomplished and
acknowledging their high status is the norm. Professor Elba also seemed to recognise
that the status or power that is derived from academic expertise was inconsequential if
the person was a woman. As the newly hired female professor’s actual expertise was
comparable or superior to the others, Professor Elba interpreted this as just one more
incidence of women being treated as inconsequential. Ely and Padavic (2007) argued
that gender is constructed in a ‘hierarchy that privileges men’, and that emphasising the
differences justifies the unequal treatment of the sexes. These are two examples of
heralding men’s accomplishments and the normative discounting of women’s,
reinforced the organisational conception of men as holders of expertise that entitles
them to power.

Some women were unsuccessful in their attempts to permeate the administrative
hierarchy, and were subsequently nudged or pushed aside. Some acknowledged that, in
the end, they preferred to focus on their students and their personal research, though felt deprived of the status and financial rewards that should have been equally available to them. Ely and Meyerson (2000: 5) have argued that masculinity in the workplace, and the effort that goes into proving masculinity, are costly to organisations as they negatively impact on decision-making and workplace relationships, including the marginalization of women. They found that, in focusing on bolstering masculinity, stereotypes of competence and expertise were reinforced in lieu of the actual job requirements. These findings support their suppositions, particularly in the negative repercussions of workplace relationships; this next section describes more-extreme gender-marginalising mechanisms.

7 Harassment

7.1 Seku-hara: sexual harassment

In a 1989 national survey of Japan, sexual harassment, mostly from supervisors, was reported by the majority of working women; the number has since risen to two-thirds of women (Uggen and Shinohara 2009: 206). The exogenous shock of new anti-harassment legislation would probably be accompanied by lags in normative and cognitive-cultural changes. At the level of the organisation, the formal rules on harassment may be subverted by male faculty for a number of reasons, such as mimetic isomorphism—behaviour which is not viewed as problematic since it was, until the new legislation, accepted as normal; entitlement to continue behaviour due to status in the institutional hierarchy; rejection of values from ‘the West’ being imposed through
international pressure; and reinterpreting the laws as only applicable to extreme cases of harassment (like rape). Officially established in 2005 in accordance with government directives, official university policies and processes for harassment were quite a new development.

The newly instituted procedures, used by students, were not well-utilised by faculty. Professor Yoshi said that, whenever harassment was mentioned in a faculty meeting, men’s snickering would be accompanied by comments that accusations seemed to point to ‘normal’ behaviour, or they would link harassment to men’s right to date students, especially graduate students, with some comments linking grading and sex. The perceptions of these professors indicate the unevenness of changes in conceptions of appropriate workplace relations. The enactment of substantive process was problematized by the ‘interpretation’ of the laws. This resulted in problems in the institutional handling of harassment, which focused on protecting the university from legal problems instead of protecting women from harassment. Professor Elemar indicted that the focus was male employees’ concerns, not eradicating harassment. Assignment to the committee was just another mandatory administrative duty that did not require professional expertise to handle potentially difficult issues. This rotation of administrative personnel through all sectors of the organisation was consistent with descriptions of the widespread practice in Japanese organisational structures that encourages career-track employees to participate in the broad range of its structure from the bottom up (Charles and Grusky 2004; Mouer and Kawanishi 2005). There was an attempt, however, to always include one woman in the process.

The public nature of the proceedings and the large number of people involved in resolving the complaints were deterrents for faculty who were being sexually harassed. A further deterrent for lodging complaints, as Professor Mura said, was the difficulty of
having to work together with either the harasser or the harasser’s ‘buddies’, making it difficult for women to pursue complaints, leaving them to *gaman* (suffer the harassment in silence) or resign. Furthermore, maintaining harmony while having to work in close proximity to harassers left their victims with limited alternatives. As Muta (2008) stated, the Japanese concept of workplace *wa* (harmony) complicates challenges to inappropriate behaviour.

### 7.2 Academic harassment

Power harassment or *akahara* (academic harassment) and non-sexual bullying have also entered the public consciousness. In the formative years of awareness of *akahara*, Ogoshi (2001), who won an academic harassment case, wrote that hostile work environments were an ‘increasingly notorious but rarely highlighted issue in Japan’. Her case was based on ‘unjust distribution of research funds; attempts to force me to resign or transfer; and refusal to sign documents needed for my work to be done’. She wrote, ‘Bullying towards women or those who do not conform in Japan’s academia is rampant’ (396). Participants acknowledged that *akahara* continued to be a major obstacle for women—Professor Elemar said ‘Professor Rie was bullied last year, Professor Yama has been totally silenced, Professor Ichiro was dragged through the coals’.

Kato and Steven highlighted the differing conceptions of human-resource management in Japanese organisations across the decades as a polemic of ‘loyalty for benevolence’ versus ‘intrusive and overbearing control’, a kind of ‘super-Fordism, even more ruthless in the exploitation of workers’ (Kato and Steven 1993 cited in
Throughout this research, the participants suggested elements of these two extremes. Regarding sexual and academic harassment, these two conceptions seemed to explain the real tension between appropriate and inappropriate social relations. Other recent research has also found that the harassment of women was a gendered form of social control that, while acknowledged as being unacceptable, continued to be prevalent in Japanese organisations (Nemoto 2013a; Uggen and Shinohara 2009: 206).

### 7.3 Exit strategy

Interviewees mentioned that a number of women had left faculty positions at Shakai Daigaku (and other universities) due to hostile work environments—a further factor contributing to women’s low numerical representation. Obtaining tenured positions is difficult and thus it would be unlikely that minor infractions would be the motivation for resigning. A few interviewees who had been forced to leave agreed to be interviewed, as set out below. Disconcerting also were the number of female professors at Shakai Daigaku who were searching for other employment and seriously contemplating leaving.

Professor Gooch left the university recently because of the disrespectful work environment, even though she had 12 years as a tenured professor. Other interviewees were aware of her situation and mentioned that she was an accomplished and hardworking professor who was well-respected and appreciated by her students. Other interviewees frequently voiced concern about the organisation being dysfunctional because of the lack of support from colleagues when there was bullying or harassment.
by superiors. Professor Cheir spoke of an incident in her department where the male faculty started yelling at Professor Mori, who had asked for an extension of her research project:

At the meeting, there was a little bit of whispering, and then, one by one, the men, they started yelling at Professor Mori...then they stood up one by one and started yelling at her, saying ‘This woman doesn’t, yeah, she’s abusing the system, come on, seriously, who does she think she is?’ Even if she was asking for more than was reasonable, it was the way they totally bullied her. And no one stood up for her. They just sat in silence, this silent support they always talk about, and afterwards, well, they said they thought it was so inappropriate … She has totally withdrawn, it’s like, she went from being an active faculty member to totally disappearing. Totally silent. And now, she wants to quit and she is seriously considering how to do it.

Professor Cheir’s description of the male faculty, one by one, standing over this female professor and yelling at her emphasises that the harassment was more than just verbal, as it included a physical affront, and the whispering beforehand, she said, indicated that it had been a pre-mediated group attack. Given that it was in the workplace in front of all the departmental colleagues, it was a severe shock to Professor Cheir and, as was later relayed, shook up others in the department. The most disturbing aspect, according to Professor Cheir, who said she was traumatised, was the fact that everyone just sat in silence and did not stand up for her yet, afterwards, they privately voiced their extreme disapproval. Martin (1990) argued that conflict at work is met with silence in order to avoid disruption of the power relations. Simpson and Lewis (2005: 1262) examined
voice (silence) and visibility (transparency) through their absences in the workplace. They argued that ‘privileged discursive regimes are based largely on hegemonic understandings of masculinity’. They mentioned that ‘normative rules marginalize and suppress sexual harassment’ by labelling it as insignificant and therefore not worth discussing (2005: 1262). Male displays of power and women’s powerlessness were clearly evidenced by the overwhelming silence.

Professor Niesen described an ongoing situation where a senior male professor continuously berated almost everyone by yelling, insulting and screaming, and was particularly vicious with some of the women. This had been going on for years and, as Professor Len said, ‘Everyone just gaman shimashita’ (put up with it), not speaking out against his behaviour. Professor Len said that the explanations for the lack of action were cultural. This is encapsulated by Professor Shino’s ironic comment that ‘Japanese people don’t want to say anything because they value harmony’.

The irony of responding with silence to these two examples of extreme social sanctions in the workplace—group humiliation, as Professor Cheir described it, or the long-term constant badgering that Professor Niesen spoke of—by attributing it to the cultural practice of wa (harmony) is difficult to explain. Muta’s (2008) observation, as mentioned above, about the incompatibility of maintaining harmony and challenging harassment is again pertinent here. However, some interviewees argued that this was just how things were done in Japan, and that it was not in the least inappropriate. For example, Professor Shima said of the group sanctioning of Professor Mori that, while he thought she should have been granted her request, the others who disagreed had the right to voice their anger, and this was a culturally appropriate incident. However he noted a man would never receive this treatment, adding that a man would ‘just know what others were thinking’. Some parallels can be drawn between this and LeBlanc’s
LeBlanc found that men believed they had a common understanding that contributed to the sophisticated silence they used to communicate; this contrasted with women articulating processes and understandings, which was seen as problematic and inferior.

Professor Niesen had been looking for another faculty position for quite some time; however, in her case, her age was making it difficult. Jacobs (2008: 798) found that women leaving employment was ‘one of the more disturbing findings documented … a startling rate of attrition of women in male-dominated occupations, even as those occupations appear to be opening their doors to them’. His concept of ‘revolving doors’ is relevant here, with the attrition of women faculty contributing to their low representation.

### 7.4 Gender specialists segregated

Disparagement was particularly harsh for gender specialists. The example below indicates the pervasive resistance to gender experts, including feminists, as experienced by Professor Tomio:

Professor Tomio left because of the constant disrespect and bullying by key managers. She said she had integrated gender studies into all of her courses, as this was not only important for student learning, but also this was required by CEDAW. She started having problems when a powerful male professor who was against her feminism began bullying her. A group of her colleagues knew what was happening but all they offered was ‘silent
support’ so she should ‘fight on’. Because of the recently compiled list of fabricated complaints that were being used as an excuse to harass her, as well as the lack of overt support, she said she would have no chance of winning any fight against the department. She said she had an emotional breakdown, losing her career, livelihood and lost faith in humanity because of everyone’s silence.

One would expect that it would be someone with these particular characteristics—a strong feminist, a senior faculty member, an accomplished academic—who would have utilised the harassment procedures. Yet the reality of the corporate culture dissuaded even her, since it stifled allies speaking out on her behalf. Some research has posited that employees have options of exit, voice and loyalty (Hirschman 1970); the Japanese employment system is specifically being characterised by voice and loyalty over exit (Keizer 2010; Mouer and Kawanishi 2005; Witt 2006). However their research is premised on the male normative model. Professor Tomio had no voice, and the only viable option would be exiting. Lack of voice was further indicated by her colleagues’ inability to speak out.

Mackey and Martinko (2012: 52) distinguished harassment from bullying and stated that harassment is the inability to defend oneself while bullying makes it difficult, and Professor Tomio was a clear case of harassment. She said that being deprived of her livelihood was devastating, but not as devastating as her lack of power to do anything. Workplace bullying and harassment can become normative in a corporate culture, and therefore may be underreported. Furthermore, people may be reluctant to report any harassment and bullying not directed at themselves (Kassing 2011: 121), leaving employees, in this case Professors Gooch and Tomio, no option but
to resign. While the university has complied with Japanese law to formalise harassment procedures, it is significant that a well-informed feminist was unable to win in a situation that her colleagues acknowledged was abusive.

8 Conclusion

This chapter has examined segregation mechanisms internal to the organisation. Some women exercised agency by choosing to focus on their teaching and research, at times voicing little respect for the work culture that required men to devote a much larger part of their lives to the institution, if they hoped to be successful. However, for women who had aspired to take part equally with men, marginalising mechanisms varied from mild nudging, professional disrespect and disparagement, to extreme harassment that resulted in pushing them to the margins in a state of self-doubt and disrespect. At the extreme, an inordinate number of women were driven from the university through varying uses and abuses of power. This contradicts theories that suggest that inequality, including women’s low numerical representation in high-level positions, is largely due to women’s choices or lack of commitment. In actuality, the organisation exhibited little commitment to the women faculty, not investing in their long-term skill development. This contravenes a main tenet of CEDAW that demands women receive the same opportunities as men, and the gendered social sanctions clearly contravened this.

Ely and Padavic (2007: 1131) have theorised that power operates ‘on two mutually reinforcing fronts: external and internal’, with the internal operating as self-enforced compliance. Foucault’s use of the panopticon is useful here in that it operates
as a form of self-policing without a person ever knowing when s/he is actually being watched and evaluated, and therefore explicit enforcement becomes secondary (1997 cited in Ely and Padavic 2007: 1131). However, transgressions clearly resulted in severe consequences and women were probably aware of instances on campus and acted accordingly, through, as Professor Han said, ‘keeping out of men’s way because they are dangerous when they are crossed’. Gendered self-censoring in anticipation of sanctions also indicates gendered societal expectations that contravene CEDAW’s requirement that social practices should not disadvantage women. Mimetic mechanisms by men and (at times) women seemed to be causal, and eradication of disadvantaging socialisation and norms would, therefore, require the broad education that CEDAW mandates.

This chapter found that, despite domestic laws and institutional policies and processes, such as harassment committees, women were not protected from unjust workplace practices and behaviour. Regarding domestic laws and policies on harassment, the harassment centre seemed to be wedged into the exiting corporate structure, with little adjustment for crucial factors such as employing qualified, specialised staff or providing privacy. This indicates that the change regarding a positive workplace for women was not substantive.

Generalised acceptance of a division of labour based on gender was clearly found to be destructive of individual women’s career aspirations. I found that some tokens, to a certain degree, were finding success within the organisation, though none had pierced the glass ceiling beyond the position of Vice Dean and the women mentioned they invariably became secretaries for the Deans, reproducing a societal expectation of women as supporters of men’s aspirations. Professor Kai said, when I asked her about being the Vice Dean, ‘I feel like a secretary. Always, yeah, always’. This was unlike the
male Vice Deans, who were said to embody power and status, meet famous experts, and move into Deanships. Of course, Deanships came with heavy workloads for anyone, but the Vice Deanships were stepping-stones themselves that led to the next layer of the internal dual-labour market.

I also found women to be less committed, for good reason, to their careers within the firm’s administrative track, though not to their research and teaching; however, their lesser commitment was caused by the organisation itself, through marginalising mechanisms that ranged from women’s resignation to the inevitability of being Other, and to their hostile exclusion. Because the career track is where in-firm training takes place, research on Japan has posited that firms would be reluctant to train women due to factors such as their shorter employment tenure and supposedly lesser commitments to their careers (Estévez-Abe 2006). It was also instrumental in segregating academic women. Despite government directives that disallow separate tracks that contribute to discrimination against women, the university’s internal dual-labour market, while unofficial, was fully functional. This alternative career track that provided women work/life balance was seen as a useful development for some women. However, the inability to avoid this alternative goes against CEDAW’s requirement for equal opportunity.

Segregation operated through the relational micro-levels of the organisation. This then resulted in women being perceived as having exercised their choice to withdraw to the periphery, resulting in a self-fulfilling prophesy of inevitably reproducing the corporate culture that positioned men as status-worthy. Charles and Grusky’s (2004) supposition, from research in the Japanese context, that men are viewed as more status-worthy has its causality, in this context, in attitudes that positioned women as Other,
combined with forceful mechanisms that worked continuously and doggedly at the relational micro-level of the organisation.

The Asian-values debates are conflicted in the suggestion that human rights are not compatible with Asian or Confucian values, with some researchers (Ikeda and Richey 2011) demonstrating that Japan sits between East and West. Japan was also found to be the least aligned with Confucian values in Asia; and Asian values occurred mostly in the home. I found, both in the previous and in this chapter, that human-resource management practices did not encourage women’s human rights. The system of consensus-building, which has been stalling the substantive change that CEDAW demands, can only be overturned through consensus, unless it is challenged by academics themselves, which still does not appear likely.

Nemoto (2010: 203) found that ‘Japanese organizational culture, through its normalization of male dominance and female subordination, fosters and obscures harmful behaviors’. I have shown this in this chapter, and illustrated some of the mechanisms that contribute to persistent gender inequality. The reality that highly educated gender-aware professors were pessimistic about institutional change is cause for concern. Khader (2011), building on Amartya Sen’s (2009) and Martha Nussbaum’s (2001; 2012) bodies of research, suggest that inappropriately adaptive preferences can be at play, and these may contribute to reproducing women’s micro disadvantages, though successful challenges may require a critical mass that still does not exist, and the severe sanctions that have accompanied previous challenges are a substantive concern for those agitating for change. Ely and Padavic (2007: 1125) proposed that there were different gendered consequences and argued that gender is constructed ‘in a hierarchy that privileges men’, also implicitly attributing causality to past and present practices. Data outlined in this chapter attributes causality to proximate operations of the
organisation at the micro level, suggesting that separate but equal ideational logics Othered women, permeated the organisation and reinforced segregating mechanisms. CEDAW’s basic requirement of equality of opportunity, let alone equality of outcome, was nowhere near being met, with mimetic and normative mechanisms constraining much of the potential for change.
Chapter 6  

EGALITARIANISM AND DISCRIMINATION

1 Introduction

This chapter explores egalitarianism in relation to changes in gender relations and their impact on women’s representation in universities. It is assumed that changes in legislative, formal and informal institutions occur unevenly (Campbell 2004). Hollingsworth (2000: 601) described these cognitive, normative institutions, at the first level of analysis for institutions, as having the most stability and permanence. This would hold for gender interactions, which are argued to be highly impermeable. It has been theorised that social arrangements contribute to path dependency (Hall and Taylor 1996) and some of the more informal, cultural-cognitive institutions have been argued to be the slowest to change. Scott (2014) argued that assumptions about reality may be the most taken-for-granted. These assumptions of reality are not necessarily held consciously and, since they are argued to be continuously produced and reproduced through social interactions, they are reinforced, promoting stability.

A discursive institutionalist approach, described earlier in Chapter 2, was used to examine the different conceptions of egalitarianism in the institution, with liberal egalitarianism the focus of equality of opportunity, not equality of outcome—the institutional norm. The strength of using discursive institutionalism—which focuses on a ‘logic of communication’ in ‘generating, deliberating, and/or legitimizing ideas’ (Schmidt 2011: 47)—is its ability to uncover incremental change (Schmidt 2010); this
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is useful for this research. Béland (2009: 561) argued that there has been a move to attend to ideational factors in analysing institutional change. Building on Parsons, he argued that ‘ideas, cultural symbols, and discursive frames constitute key ideational processes that help actors give meaning to their world’.

This chapter first examines conceptions of egalitarianism, followed by discrimination related to gender essentialism, ryosai kenbo (good wife, wise mother), and the construction of the masculine workplace through the discourses of demands of the job and age normativity. Cognitive bias is then discussed, before the final sections focus on the empirical results from those who questioned the fairness of recruitment praxis.

There were various views on egalitarianism, with liberal egalitarianism’s equality of opportunity predominating. Some participants strongly supported equality of outcome (which is consistent with CEDAW’s mandate). These two standpoints contrasted with the ‘old guard’s’ general non-egalitarian position. Even those who identified with egalitarian principles were aware of contributing to and rationalising gender bias. Kelan (2009) found, in the North American context, that people who held egalitarian views had gender ‘fatigue’ resulting from their awareness of the continuing discrimination. This sometimes resulted in the blame being put on victims or differences (inequality) being attributed to women’s choices. In contrast, in this Japanese context, not only were egalitarian views sparsely scattered, but there has yet to be a broad acknowledgement that discrimination continued and thus little was being done about ameliorating it.
2 Ideational changes and gender essentialism

This section examines how academics’ ideas about gender equality play a role in the university. National surveys in Japan on gender relations indicate changing attitudes toward the division of labour and gender roles, with the majority of the population no longer endorsing the strict separation of gender roles (Takao 2007: 157).21 This section also examines contexts where gender egalitarian views emerge. It seems possible that substantive improvements in the workplace could occur in academia given the freer access that academics have to international research and transnational movements that have the potential to propel the adoption of substantive egalitarianism. However, since conservatives would potentially continue to have the power to stop changes in gender relations, especially in universities that have strong ties to industries such as banking, finance and politics, it is safe to assume mimetic isomorphism would constrain change, and that there would probably be ideational diversity. Grusky and Levanon (2008) posited that essentialism still holds much sway even for those with egalitarian views—different gendered choices are expressions of women’s proclivities, and interfering with women’s rights in this regard would be considered unjust. These tensions have been touched upon in the previous chapters, and are explored here specifically in relation to gender equality.

21 The Cabinet Office (Naikakufu) (2007) results of the nation-wide survey on gender equality showed changes in women’s and men’s attitudes toward traditional gender roles. In 2002, the first time ever, attitudes toward the gendered division of labour were evenly split (47% supporting and 47% opposing the statement that ‘Husbands should work outside the home and wives should take care of their families’). By 2007, there were further changes, with 57.3% of women and 46.1% of men no longer supporting traditional roles, as indicated by participants’ disagreement with the statement that a husband should work outside and a wife should take care of the family at home.
Some participants viewed gender equality as a historical process of change resulting in improved conditions for women in Japan. Professor Kai, a researcher in gender segregation, said:

The satisfaction level is a bit higher—for female in Japan than male—even though the real objective situation is lower so, probably their criteria [for judging] are so low and their factor to, probably their reference, is different. The reference for males, they have their reference group. It’s different for women to other women. So, even if women’s situation is lower than male. Of course some women compare with male situation, objective male, but others, many females, compare with other females’ situations and with the former situation of women, such as their mother’s and grandmother’s, so they feel their situation, they are doing better. So we have to feel satisfaction.

BH: Is this published?

Professor Kai: No but, using social stratification or social mobility data, we sometimes discuss why female satisfaction is higher.

This illustrates a number of key points regarding institutional change and gender. The first is a person’s identification with his/her reference group. Japan’s in-group/out-group (uchi/soto) is well known. Identification with one’s in-group, the identification with those who are similar, was posed as a reason for women’s greater contentment despite the fact that their actual position in Japanese society—the ‘objective situation’—was worse than men’s. Later in the interview, Professor Kai referred to regulative changes that have occurred due, in part, to compliance with both the
transnational norms and the synchronous changes in domestic laws (Gottfried and O’Reilly 2002). Here she referred to tensions between the informal institutions and the cognitive-cultural institutions—she contrasted women’s disadvantages with improvements that have occurred over generations—as a temporal unevenness.

Another revealing point is the use of other women versus men as the comparative reference group, as in Professor Kai’s terminology, the ‘objective male’. Here, it seems she is suggesting that this evaluation of focusing on women’s past is relative but not objective, while acknowledging it is the striking improvements historically that contribute to women’s overall stronger satisfaction than men’s. In the not-too-distant past, the situation for women was appalling and stories of their mothers and grandmothers highlight how recent this change has been (Shigematsu 2012). The ‘objective’ evaluation would be to compare themselves to men, where they would be relatively disadvantaged but which would give an accurate assessment—male normativity as the true benchmark. There was, generally, a disparity between women and men regarding views on equality. Women had thought about inequality and generally believed they were in a stream of progress. Women had hope for change while men assumed that equality had already been achieved or was just not meant to be achieved, since women’s choices would always differ from men’s.

There were diverse views regarding the future. For example, Professor Kana was both pessimistic and optimistic, saying, ‘I think nothing will change, but then again, at some point something could all of a sudden happen and then everyone will be hiring women, and there will be a sudden big change’. These two conflicting views were held by many of the women. Actively pursuing change was not generally embraced, but a possible future, orchestrated process, perhaps from senior management responding to changes in legal enforcement, was viewed as the path to substantive change. However,
as mentioned in the introductory chapter, the Japanese legal system lacks enforcement mechanisms. Mimetic isomorphism, in the form of legitimacy-seeking in the regional setting, would be one possible force.

Waiting for change to be orchestrated was a common theme. Professor Tsuyo, for instance, said:

We cannot expect bottom-up change. Perhaps top-down change is OK, and just, you know, top-down is a kind of chance, we gradually change, you know, really I think that will be the best way [to make change].

*BH*: We already have a top-down plan.

*Professor Tsuyo*: Yeah, that’s a problem. Yeah. Ha ha. Sometimes it goes well, but sometimes nothing changes!

Professor Tsuyo expressed resignation at the uncertainty of change while simultaneously hoping that there would be improvements. She assumed that change would be managed, though not from activism or agitation from the bottom up. Given the weaknesses of legal enforcement mechanisms, broad diffusion of egalitarian norms and legitimacy-seeking from the wider, perhaps international, community would be possible. It is interesting that she expressed hope for change even though policies were already in place, no coercive measures have been activated, and evidence confirmed that there has yet to be substantive improvement. It is also interesting that the possibility of bottom-up norm diffusion in the university was absent, even though bottom-up diffusion has been theorised (Finnemore 1996b; Finnemore and Sikkink 1998) and evidence of this has been found in Japanese civil society (Chan-Tiberghien 2004a; Gurowitz 1999).
Professor Tsuyo’s comments were representative of many of the women’s views, which contrasted sharply with those of the male interviewees and some of the women. All the men (except the one who researched masculinities), when asked about improvements in gender equality, said they had not given it any thought at all. When pressed, their responses indicated that gender equality was something only women thought about, as Professor Shima says: ‘I know nothing about ladies’ empowerment’. His body language—a puffing-up of the chest and a dismissive wave of the hand—illustrated that this was not his concern but a ‘ladies’ thing’. Collinson and Hearn (1994) argued that gender power relations are shrouded through universalising male normativity, which results in gender being associated with women; men are not seen as gendered, they are the standard, the norm, and women have or are the problem.

Those, such as Professor Ito, who were in a position to enforce government guidelines for gender equality thought, when pressed, that, apart from admitting to never thinking about gender inequality, the best tactic was waiting:

I think the only strategy, like most of the men who are supportive of gender issues, is to wait. We need to wait for the older guys to leave Shakai U, which will be in about 5–7 years, maybe more, because some of the younger profs are also very conservative about gender issues. We have to wait for them to leave, because they have too much seniority, power to be overridden by the faculty.

He seemed to be indicating that there were men supportive of gender equality, but that those with power due to seniority would not be supportive of initiatives and therefore change would not happen as long as there were any top administrators with recalcitrant
views. Also of note, when asked how he knew that other men supported equality, he said that he had never actually talked about gender issues with them though he just ‘got the feeling’ that they would. This strongly contrasts with the women’s hopeful views which, in light of Professor Ito’s and other male administrators’ comments, seem uninformed or overly optimistic.

It was not just men who were less than optimistic. Professor Rai had a very strong response when asked about changes in gender inequality:

I am really angry because men should be fixing things. They should be doing gender research. Why women? There are two genders, and they are most of the problem. I have avoided the gender issue, long avoided thinking about it because when I do, it makes me really mad. Who do they think they are?

She questioned the assumption that ameliorating gender problems is women’s responsibility, which confirms what Broadbridge and Simpson (2011: 477) found. This was clearly a very emotional response, as indicated by her tone of voice, the tension in her gestures, the fact that she had avoided even thinking about gender inequality, and her resentment of the fact that, while men were the cause of the inequalities, they were not involved in finding solutions. This interchange with the expression of anger and frustration, along with others described below, was quite revealing.

Waiting for those in power to leave and for newcomers to be appointed who would hold the egalitarian views seen as a necessity for change, while synchronously acknowledging that younger, incoming professors also held traditional views about

---

22 In cross-referencing participants with those he mentioned during the interview, it was clear that they were not generally supportive of equality.
gender relations, was the general strategy for change. Waiting for change directly contravenes CEDAW (Luera 2004: 635) and Japanese gender equality laws also suggest positive action. This again brings up the unevenness of change at different levels of the institution. Some norm diffusion was exhibited at the level of the individual, indicating changes in cognitive-cultural institutions. However, normative change at the organisational level was not found. The recent gender initiatives that were accompanied by meetings and discussions within the university indicated the stickiness of institutional processes (due, perhaps, to recalcitrant views of some administrators in power).

The rationales for inaction were similarly articulated, almost word-for-word, by a number of interviewees. Professor Shima, when pressed to give his views on gender discrimination, also indicated that it was a non-issue, but for different reasons:

Prof. Shima: There is no discrimination in Japan because it is against the law to discriminate.

Most of the male interviewees indicated that they believed there were no conflicts or tensions between the formal, legislative institutions of gender equality and the more informal cognitive-cultural elements. Assuming that equality had been accomplished contrasted with the evidence of discrimination expressed by many of the female interviewees. Narratives of liberal egalitarianism that were concerned only with equality of opportunity and not equality of outcome have also been found to coexist comfortably with discrimination that contributes to inequality (Charles and Grusky 2004; Grusky and Levanon 2008; Lewis and Simpson 2010b). Liberal conceptions of egalitarianism can obscure inequalities since inequalities are assumed to be premised on
choice, yet the bounded nature of choices as well as the actual processes that interfere with equality of opportunity are made opaque due to an underlying belief in meritocracy (Wajcman 1998).

Charles and Grusky (2004), in their multi-country research that included Japan, found that liberal-egalitarian views coexisted with gender essentialism, which resulted in a ‘different but equal’ view of gender relations. Liberal egalitarianism supported equal opportunity without addressing societal discrimination—societal differences in aspirations. The ‘different but equal’ conception of equality contravenes CEDAW’s mandate, particularly Article 5(a), as mentioned in Chapter 1, since the convention aims to eradicate gender role segregation as it has been found to invariably subordinate women; convergence with these international norms mandated by this UN convention has therefore been impeded (Steans 2013). For example, specifically focusing on women’s high-status positions, Hills’ (1995) study of Hong Kong women in managerial roles argued that women were resigned to the fact that they needed to prove themselves more than men because of a difference view of gender. Some participants in this research in a Japanese university context may have held this difference view, though there were numerous others who strongly disagreed and were hoping for equality of outcome, not only equality of opportunity. The diversity of views mirrors what national surveys have found—that changes in attitudes about gender roles have been converging toward international norms that reject strict gender roles of women at home, men at work. Professor Moto summed up the perception that it was just a matter of time, stating:

It’s not that things are worse in Japan than elsewhere. Well, they are at the moment, but it’s because of timing. Japan has emerged from its backwards
roots only recently...Japan is just behind 50 years...[women] are dependent on men, especially economically, you know, and there are no good jobs to break away from that, so it’s kind of like an endless circle. Women are stuck with few choices, like, uh, not like prisoners, but like servants to different men. But it was the same in the US 50 years ago, no?

It is notable that Professor Moto used the terms ‘prisoners’ and ‘servants to different men’ to describe women’s past and also present situation. She viewed dependency on men as problematic and the result of a lack of employment that would provide a break from an otherwise inescapable social process that has resulted in and continues to result in sexism and discrimination. The time lag of ‘behind by 50 years’ as a comparison of Japan with the US—as the ideal prototype of the West—has been frequently voiced anecdotally and was confirmed by other interviewees. Professor Moto believed there would be convergence toward international norms of equality. There was a tension between conflicting views—the ‘endless circle’ of inequality and the assumption that change would inevitably be in line with ‘the West’s’ improved conditions. Beliefs, schema and assumptions are often taken for granted (Scott 2014: 127) and the myth of the university as a gender-neutral institution was discussed in the previous chapter on meritocracy. On a conscious level, the cognitive frame of inevitable change was used to justify and not challenge the continuity of inequalities.

The ideational changes have been uneven and were reflected in the contradictory conceptions of equality—generally conservative or liberal-egalitarian. However, CEDAW and the Japanese domestic equality laws require an egalitarianism that promotes equality of outcome. The ideational backdrop described in this section forms the background for discussion of the next two sections, which reveal the ‘frozen
landscape’ of normative institutions of recruitment. Wajcman (1998) argued that, within a framework of equality, women are subordinated through obscuring the inequality of outcomes; the institutional processes of concealment make their identification difficult, and the next sections on discrimination shed light on the processes that obscure inequality and obstruct equality.

3 Discrimination

Interviewees mentioned instances when discrimination was perceived to be negatively impacting the appointing of women to full-time tenured positions. A number of key factors emerged. The first was the assumption that the severe gender segregation in society at large made women of childbearing age suspect in terms of their capability to fulfill a faculty position. The ideology of *ryosai kenbo*—good wife, wise mother—Othered women and positioned them as lacking the necessary toughness and flexibility to fulfill the role of a tenured professor. Finally, age normativity appointing, while no longer legal, continued to be a norm in the process. This section discusses each of these in turn.

Factors such as the strict gender segregation in Japan’s labour markets (Charles and Grusky 2004), the complementarities of the labour market (Estévez-Abe 2013), state welfare policies that overemphasised childbearing and underemphasised women’s fair employment, and strict gender-role segregation, have been argued to contribute to women’s disadvantage Other explanations have included the dual-labour market, Asian values, and the demands that women be responsible for family care as a cushion for services that are provided by the state in other welfare regimes. Gottfried and O’Reilly
(2002), for example, argued that the Japanese state, in continuing to promote the male breadwinner model, is complicit in women’s subordination with the continued promotion of the gender separation of roles through the welfare system and tax schemes. Shire (2002: 28) argued that high-skilled women in Japan were appointed as temporary, precarious workers (and this would include female part-time teachers who have advanced degrees) who buttressed the male core workers while excluding women from standard, core positions. A number of interviewees mentioned that this inequality led to men being able to have it all and that this was a human-rights issue that needed to change. This contrasts with other research (Nemoto 2013a) that constructed men as disadvantaged in the workplace and deprived of their time at home with their families. This is an important finding, more of which is discussed below in the ‘demands of the job’ section. Here it is worth noting, though, that perhaps the incursion of some women into the male workplace may have started the process of dismantling some of the institutional myths that have been constructed in order to maintain gender segregation and women’s exclusion.

Another striking finding is the clear contempt for the ‘Asian values’ narrative, which participants such as Professor Yama viewed as regressive and oppressive. Ikeda and Richey (2011) argued that there was a lack of Confucian values in Japanese corporate settings, though these values were strongly present mainly within the family. Professor Yama voiced strong opposition to this ‘feudal system’ that subordinates a woman to various men who have a right to authority over women. Esping-Andersen (2008: 988–9) used the term homo familius and wrote of the categorisation of the family, such as in the Asian context, that ‘respect and status is due to the father … the family is the unrivalled source of solidarity and community because it alone knows what its members need’. Professor Yama was critiquing this version of the family as
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well as the role of a state that does not address women’s economic disadvantage. This disadvantage has been argued to have arisen precisely due to the state’s prior and continuing policies (Gottfried and O’Reilly 2002; Peng 2001). Shigematsu (2012) outlined the role of the state in promulgating the ideology of ryosai kenbo (good wife, wise mother), with motherhood constructed as a role that served the state. The continuing lack of options for women is not unique to Japan. What was interesting was the strong rejection, by numerous female interviewees, of Confucian values, which they were perceived they were being used as an unjust rationale to subjugate women.

3.1  Ryosai kenbo (good wife, wise mother)

The participants acknowledged that, in the appointing process, concerns about women’s roles as mothers impacted on decision-making. When asked about hiring committees:

Professor Kai: Strict stereotypes until child grow up until three years old, the mother should take care of children, means that committee members will rationalise excuses about discounting women with small children, or at that age they might have kids.

BH: Have you ever witnessed this?

Professor Kai: All the time. At first it seems kind of plausible, you know. But it just happens again and again, and it starts to look like, hmm, wait a minute, something weird is happening here, always some excuse, not outright, just manipulating.

BH: What kind of committee members have you seen doing this?
Professor Kai: Everyone. We all try to make sure our work doesn’t increase. Women also are against hiring women/mothers—they are viewed with suspicion.

Professor Kai considered the discounting of women candidates as something that was common and that many were complicit in. This was a recurring theme of the interviewees. Appointing-committee members were attempting to work within the norms of the open recruitment, meritocratic process rather than blatantly discounting candidates while maintaining a facade of equality and non-discrimination. They were also practicing statistical discrimination without naming it but through unspoken, complicit processes. Over time, it seemed apparent to Professor Kai that this was just how things were done, an unspoken rule. Others concurred. Professor Tsuyo said:

Professor Kai: No one says that kind of things but, if female candidates have a baby, probably they will avoid hiring her.

This shows that the formal rules were acknowledged yet informally ignored through implicit coordination, and commonly practiced even by women and men with children. The underlying rationale was a concern that a person’s personal workload might increase, indicating the rigidity of the male normative institution that demanded at least a facade of total commitment, though not necessarily actual total commitment, as will be discussed below. Normative change is hypothesised to be slower than other institutional change (Campbell 2004; Hollingsworth 2000; Scott 2010). In these instances we see professors who are ideologically committed to equality of opportunity, and even some to equality of outcome, who nonetheless participate in normative
practices that directly result in discrimination. This *bricolage*—i.e. the ‘creative combination of symbolic and structural elements garnered from varying sources and traditions’ (Scott 2014: 142)—of egalitarianism and conscious, implicit discrimination was a clear indication of a tension between the formal institutions of equal opportunity legislation and norms with the informal ideational institutions of egalitarianism.

Roles in the home are highly gendered and have been constructed as being under the sole purview of women (Shigematsu 2012). The *ryosai kenbo* ideology that positioned women as solely responsible within the home was found to contribute to discrimination in appointing, based on an assumption that women would not be able to balance work and home. Despite so few faculty women having children, the possibility of a candidate being appointed who may request special accommodations that could possibly create more work for others resulted in overt and sometimes subtle sabotage regarding the appointment of women. It has been found that cultural-value orientations impact on women’s employment (Pfau-Effinger 2012). Those without any mothering responsibilities were found to be negatively influenced by society-wide values that continued to support *ryosai kenbo*.

### 3.2 Constructing the masculine workplace

Discrimination occurred not only regarding motherhood, but also because it was suggested by some that, in general, women would not be able to ‘physically’ handle a faculty position as they do not have the necessary endurance or stamina. For example, in discussing particular positions that involved negotiation and overseas travel, Professor Ito argued that women would not be appropriate:
It would be hard for a woman to be able to travel abroad and represent our department. That takes stamina, energy. Also, Japanese women have trouble speaking out. That is needed, an effective faculty member has to negotiate and be tough. Japanese women can’t do this.

The previous chapters elucidated how women have summarily been excluded from internal labour markets where skill development, such as negotiation and management skills, would normally be developed. Organisations structure gender and being excluded from the processes of skill building in the internal labour market would reinforce the ‘lack of competence’ narrative. Furthermore, in the last chapter we saw how there were very few women who were able to find a way to be visible and effective within an acceptable performance of femininity, reinforcing the stereotyped views of women. Professor Ito articulated here a similar view of incompatibility between gender performance and task requirements and believed this justified their exclusion as viable candidates. The actual requirements of faculty positions were being distorted by the excessive focus on what may be a minor part of the faculty position, if indeed a requirement at all. Yet by masculinising the requirements of toughness, freedom and confidence to travel, and ability to negotiate, they constructed discrimination as opaque and hard to identify. This would allow Professor Ito to reconcile the tension between discrimination and normative institutions that mandated equality of opportunity. Professor Ito had described himself as in favour of gender equality and did not view this as a discriminatory attitude because it was, he said, ‘just a fact’ and simply the nature of Japanese women.
Women also held similar essentialising views. For example, Professor Tsuyo, in discussing faculty positions that required interdepartmental and international negotiation, said:

Negotiation skills are needed, so people think it will be quite difficult for women to make agreements. Negotiation, going abroad, also the workload is tough for women.

In saying ‘so people think’ she removed herself from this sentiment that rationalised summarily discounting women from faculty positions. She was implying that these were common perceptions that Japanese women cannot be tough enough in business negotiations, which were considered to be integral to faculty positions. She questioned, though, how central these skills actually were in other comments not quoted here. For example, she noted that they had recently appointed a man over a woman, after being impressed with his computer skills, which, in the end, were not utilised since the computer centre handled technical tasks. This kind of justification, focusing on male-normative skills that were peripheral at best, was mentioned by a number of interviewees, indicating that maleness was a key criteria in appointing. Plumwood (2012) outlined how gender dualism of hyperseparation denies similarities or overlaps between women and men. The elimination of overlaps, such as the assumptions that an ideal academic is male—with technical expertise, toughness, and stamina indicating maleness—eliminated the women candidates. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) described hegemonic masculinity as embodying authority and self-sufficiency while femininity embodied the accommodation of men’s desires and interests that required compliance and dependency. Since femininity (and ‘subordinated masculinities’) are
socially inferior and toughness in negotiation constructed masculinity in opposition to a femininity that is assumed to have gentleness (not toughness) and accommodation (not forceful negotiator) at its core, women were constructed as inferior Others and therefore as inappropriate as candidates. Professor Tsuyo mentioned almost the same job requirements as Professor Ito and a number of other interviewees, and this seems to indicate a prototypical faculty position rather than actual requirements for each and every or indeed most positions—the myth and ceremony (Meyer and Rowan 1977) of a faculty position were narrated, reproducing male normativity.

Long working hours have been discussed as fundamental to Japanese core employment (Keizer 2010; Mouer and Kawanishi 2005; Nemoto 2013a) and many of the interviewees mentioned long hours as a source of differentiation of women and men, though for different reasons: some mentioned that this created extreme demands on all faculty, others that men used this as an excuse to socialise with their colleagues, and yet others that this was a way for men to avoid going home and contributing to housework and care work. For example:

Professor Ree: I overheard these guys, male professors, saying how they had set up their offices so they could watch football or hang out together so that they didn’t have to go home and help out. One guy said he loved his job because they always ‘had to’ (gestures with ersatz quotes) socialise for work, ha, ha, ‘Our work is so demanding, we work such long hours’. They all just laughed. So, they know what they are doing, very deliberate.

BH: Do you think this is common?
Professor Ree: Mochiron! (absolutely!). And they’re all married! Also, some of the foreign guys are happy to join in—Len²³ (she names a number of others besides the participant in this research project), paying for sex, lap dancers in these clubs, well you know all about those sex establishments they use, pre-pubescent girls and all. Remember that time we had that departmental dinner last semester?

BH: Un, un (Yeah, yeah).

Professor Ree: The guys were up to something, planning a nijikai (a second get together). I thought I’d test them, so I jumped in, ‘Oh, I’d like to go out for the nijikai’. Ha, ha! This made them so (emphasis) uncomfortable and they said ‘I’m sure you must be so tired’ to discourage me. Ha ha, so I said ‘oh, no’, then they got squirmish and said ‘Actually, women can’t go there, it’s a men’s sunaku’ [from the English word ‘snack’, a club where men socialise and have (non-intercourse) sexual relations with those who work there].

The comments here were centred around the construction of a male normative job that Professor Ree believed was based on a myth of working long hours. It was formulated in opposition to the private sphere, thereby reinforcing the work culture as a male domain that was incompatible with women while emphasising the home as incompatible with men. Mavin (2008: S76) posited that women in high-status jobs were marginalised through the ‘heroic masculinism, the traditional and hierarchical form of management which depicts executives as solitary (male) heroes engaged in unending

²³ In cross-referencing participants in this research project, Professor Ree refers to a non-Japanese, Professor Len, whose comments will be quoted next.
trials of endurance’ and argued that this may have a negative impact on women’s aspirations.

The demanding work culture was described in conjunction with the normalised role of male homophily. The emphasis was on male bonding and included a sexualised component, a sharing of sexuality mediated through women’s bodies by paying for sex. There were so many data generated in this research on the subject of the workplace and the after-work socialising related to sexual rewards for men that they cannot all be addressed in this chapter. This is mentioned here solely to indicate that the practice is exclusionary and to note that it was not uniformly unchallenged by women. Professor Ree seemed intent on exposing the inappropriateness of the men’s plans and the exclusionary intent by feigning ignorance. This seems to illustrate that there was norm diffusion of expectations that the workplace should not be exclusionary to women. Here the homosocial, sexualised relations and the long working hours reinforced each other in defining networking as masculine—watching football, drinking, going to men’s clubs—all actions that constructed their appropriate roles in opposition to their roles in the home.

Professor Ree saw the male professors participating in a ceremony of constructing male homophily as something they were required to (‘had to’) do as part of their job—socialising and bonding that removed them from the home. Lewis and Simpson (2010b) argued that the trust in meritocracy in organisations meant that women were hesitant to see the gender regimes, such as men’s sexualised homophily, that resulted in their exclusion. Here the men were, in Professor Ree’s view, constructing their identity as ‘heroic workers’ and exhibiting their power to purchase women for sex while simultaneously reinforcing a masculinity of endurance (Mavin 2008) through their comments referring to long hours.
Professor Ree, through a probing banter, attempted to expose the exclusionary process. She made it clear that she felt she had stayed within an acceptable norm while making her point that she disapproved. The operation of power through gender identity (Ely and Padavic 2007) is exercised through external and internal forces, and Professor Ree is aware of self-monitoring the level of confrontation. She contested the male normativity by making it visible through pressuring the men to name it. Taking a post-structuralist interpretation, Simpson and Lewis (2005: 1264–5) argued that there is power in the invisibility of practices that are so taken for granted since they are unmarked and struggles would occur in contesting norms, which Professor Ree did through naming the practice. She clearly thought it was important to confront the exclusion, but power was operating internally (Foucault 1978) through gendered alternatives of appropriateness, delimiting the possible approaches; she seemed to feel she had little option but to confront them head on and limited the interaction to making them feel ‘uncomfortable’. It has been found that there is silence around conflict in organisations that may be due to sexual harassment and care work. In this case male normativity was accomplished through denying the existence of demands that might challenge the dominant normative processes (Acker 1990; Martin 1990, 2000: 213); claiming something is normal or universal silences dissenting views. Kelan (2010: 190) argued that even the act of women entering male-dominated jobs is a challenge to masculinities and femininities and, perhaps in this context, women in professorship roles acted as such a strong challenge that other expressions of conflict would be difficult.
Professor Ree also mentioned non-Japanese taking part in after-work sexualised socialising\(^\text{24}\) and it was revealing that she disapproved of their having become assimilated into the sexualised culture in Japan that occurred outside the home. This *bricolage* of adopting what would be unacceptable, even illegal, behaviour in their home countries reinforced the culturally context-specific construction of maleness at the core of faculty positions. Nemoto (2013a) had similar findings, where men’s sexuality was something they shared with other men that was mediated through women’s bodies, including aspects of humiliation of younger men by senior men. Hicks (2013) found the sexualised nature of the English-language-teaching (ELT) sector in Japan for male professionals functioned to the exclusion of women, particularly non-Japanese women.

One of the non-Japanese male professors, in discussing after-work socialising, shed some light on the after-work culture:

*Professor Len:* We say *ostukare*, *gaman*, and *osakini shitureishimasu* and these just confirm this crap that everyone is working hard. I go out with profs, yes, only the guys, hmm, anyway, I know exactly what’s really going on. Everyone, um, it is a way to deflect any more work being thrown at you. Saying *tsukaretai!, isogashii!* is just a defense so no one will think you have a life outside of work, you have to just pretend you don’t. The culture here at Shakai, at least for professors, is not about, you know, being forced to work late. It’s mostly they choose it. They don’t have to go out drinking and socialising, yeah, and the whole sex trade, lap-dancing thing. They just

---

\(^{24}\) Later on in the interview, Professor Ree emphasised that they were all married to Japanese women. She also expressed frustration that, rather than the non-Japanese men having a positive influence on Japanese men so that they moved away from ‘objectifying women’, the non-Japanese men contributed to ‘regressive masculine practices’ that kept women oppressed.
choose to. Many of them actually just head out and do their ‘hobbies’ (ersatz quotes), golfing, tennis, whatever, others go out for a drink. In the UK, we would call this going to the pub after work to de-stress; they call it work.

Professor Len, like some of the other non-Japanese male professors, had been privy to the ‘sex trade, lap-dancing thing’. The female professors seemed to be either unaware or to turn a blind eye to it and were not interested in it nor invited to participate. Professor Len’s comments were interesting in that they shed light on the after-hours socialising culture and its role in male homophily that was not necessarily connected to workplace requirements, but was a matter of choice, sometimes motivated through shirking family responsibilities. He tried to balance the tensions between admitting to participating and separating himself, by using ‘they’ to refer to Japanese men. This is an example of men’s legitimacy-seeking strategies to justify behaviour, at the micro level of the institution, which reinforced the male work culture that subsequently excluded women. He criticised the practice, which he believed was based on a cultural norm of pretending to be busy and stated that this was used to reinforce gender differences of the appropriate spheres.

Early work on gendered organisations (Kanter 1977: 221) described the long working hours as ‘boundary heightening’ behaviour, and a culture of working long hours ‘Othered’ those who did not, which is how women were generally viewed at Shakai University. Regarding the long work hours, Nemoto (2013b) argued that it was a general consensus that men had it the hardest because of the work demands that dug

---

25 While beyond the scope of this research, little has been researched on women’s role in the sexual industry. Before this millennium started, the media covered stories of women condoning sex outside of marriage. For example, there was a campaign to fight AIDS that included billboards at airports showing wives handing their husbands condoms as they departed for business trips in other part of Asia (Buckley 1997: 150–4).
into their personal lives, while women had the option of opting out. This research, however, found a much more nuanced reality regarding time demands. The post-war conception of the ideal work ethic demanded selfless devotion and this has defined the ideal worker as, inevitably, male (Gottfried and Hayashi-Kato 1998; Shigematsu 2012). While this image is still ubiquitous, the results of this research found that long work hours were, at times, an institutional myth that men performed, or simply expressed discursively, to reinforce masculinity. It sometimes had substance but at other times after-work socialising was self-imposed and used as an excuse to go out for dinner, drink, watch a football game, or go to sex bars so as to avoid responsibilities at home. Furthermore, as discussed in the previous chapters, faculty positions provided some flexibility for those women (and men) who decided to remain somewhat on the periphery of the corporate ladder and concentrate on their teaching while doing their research at their own pace. In this respect, it has the potential to be somewhat of an ideal career for highly educated women, and perhaps the ‘myths’ and ‘ceremonies’ of the career were dissuasive, as was confirmed by anecdotal evidence from women who taught in non-core teaching positions.

26 From this point 'the university' refers to Shakai University. 26 Kone comes from the English word connections, and will be used to include both the noun (a connection, connections), and the concept of networking as a practice, i.e. the use of connections or networks Anecdotal in the sense that these data were not collected as part of this research project focusing on full-time tenured professors. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that part-time and contract teachers state that the main advantage is not having to put in the long hours. The long hours include research, which may be a large proportion, perhaps 30% or more in this particular university. How and when this time is used may provide flexibility for those with caring responsibilities.
3.3 Age normativity

An issue that has been addressed recently is legislation against discrimination based on age (Sakuraba 2009). Age-normative appointing has severely disadvantaged women in Japan (Charles and Grusky 2004) and has been found to persist in the recruitment of university professors (Hayes 2013), negatively affecting predominantly women, as these results confirm:

Professor Kana: When I was hired for tenure, I was already considered too old, at 33! Master’s students, then, would be hired for these positions in their 20s. Now it has edged up to being acceptable to the mid-40s, but only sometimes. If you are 36 with a PhD you are in; older you are usually in the bin. It’s against the law, but if no one objects, they [candidates] just get rejected before any assessment even begins.

Professor Kana’s remarks are a good example of many of the interviewees’ comments. The appointing norms based on age were seen to have shifted, most probably to accommodate increases in the demand for PhDs that would naturally push the recruiting age up for all applicants, since the previous appointing of MAs meant younger graduates would have been considered. Some women who may be re-entering the workforce in their mid- to late-40s, once infants and young children have aged, may benefit from this change. However, age-normativity requirements in appointing were discovered to continue to be prevalent despite a generalised awareness of the changes in the law that prohibited recruitment based on age. There is potential for this new law to positively affect women who would otherwise have been discounted due to their age,
provided the candidate has somehow continued to meet the age-normative requirements in order to remain competitive. The formal (legal) and the normative (shift in age-appropriate hiring) institutions have experienced conversion and this has the potential to positively impact on the hiring of women; however, at the cognitive-cultural level, rigidity was found.

3.4 Cognitive bias

Non-conscious discrimination—distortion that occurs from filtering information through a person’s bias or perceptions—has been found to be a factor in discriminatory hiring (Reskin 2008a; 2008b). Petersen (2008: 782) argued that non-conscious bias would probably not contribute substantially to discrimination, though statistical discrimination may well be the most common type and would most probably persist, as it is argued to be economically efficient and rational. Regarding non-conscious discrimination, he argued that in ‘the West’ there have been substantial changes to conscious processes and he posited that non-conscious processes have most probably changed as well (2008: 785). Since recent research on diversity management has shown conscious and nonconscious discrimination continue to be problematic, Petersen’s views may be overly optimistic. In this non-Western context, essentialism emphasising gender differences was found to temper the ideational changes that seemed to exist in the self-declared egalitarian identities, as reported in the above section. While the previous chapter on meritocracy found that there was a diversity of perceptions regarding the actual realisation of meritocratic appointing, with some believing the
system to be fair and others not, this section focuses exclusively on instances of
cognitive bias.

The previous chapter on meritocracy revealed the judgments of candidates’
accomplishments to often be gendered, resulting in women’s disadvantage. It is, of
course, hard to know if these assessments were conscious or not, but interviewees
thought they were a mixture of conscious and non-conscious discrimination.
Perceptions of potential were extremely gendered. For example, Professor Rai said that
female candidates were generally viewed as lacking potential, while male candidates
had unbounded expertise and promise:

Professor Rai: They say, ‘Her area of expertise is too broad’, ‘It’s too narrow’, ‘It’s not interesting to students’, ‘It’s not relevant to our
department’, ‘She may not be able to do research’ or ‘teach our classes’ (use
of ersatz quotes) etc. etc. This kind of stuff. But for a man, it’s always, ‘He
may not have the experience, the right PhD, but we expect he can do
anything we ask, because, hey, he’s a man!’

BH: Hmm. Do you think they know they are assessing women and men
differently?

Professor Rai: Sometimes I think, yeah, they know exactly what they are
doing. Other times I think it is not conscious, they are just so used to
thinking that way. We expect the committee members will do these sorts of
manipulation. Probably we expect men will never say no.

BH: Never say no?

Professor Rai: They assume men will try to do everything. Women will say
no to everything, so they are not confident.
BH: Women lack confidence?

Professor Rai: But even a female, because, you know, normal females, even if they have a lot of confidence they, unlike men, they never say they can do more than they can do. Men will just say they can do anything, even if they have no idea whether they are able to be successful or not. Then, also, the committees can use this to justify why they chose him over her, you know?

BH: Hmm. Has it always been like this?

Professor Rai: Ha! Yes! I am sure it has. When I first came here I thought, hey, they have a hiring system in place that seems fair. Bit by bit, over time, though, I just kept hearing the same excuses. He can, she can’t, he can, he can, you know what I mean. So it’s clear there is discrimination, but it’s hard to nail them, especially if you are not on the committee.

Professor Rai’s comments were comprehensive in listing a number of points mentioned by many other interviewees. First, there was the flexibility in assessing credentials that, conscious or not, invariably privileged men. Their potential was assumed, while women’s was invariably doubted. There was the belief in men’s unbounded confidence that may not actually reflect reality yet put them in good standing, while women lacked the confidence to speak up and defend their expertise and this was viewed as indicating that, if they could not be confident, it was their loss, with the onus being put on women’s gendered presentation of themselves. She used the term ‘normal’ to describe women who are confident. She contrasted this with men who expressed confidence without any evidence to substantiate it. She argued that this would help men to get a job since actual capabilities would be judged on their self-assessments as superior to women’s and used to rationalise choosing them as the successful candidate. Professor
Rai voiced here what many of the interviewees had said, some of which was mentioned in the previous chapter on meritocracy about perceptions of women’s confidence and competence as being presented and judged differently in the recruitment process.

While this research project did not take the approach of quantitatively analysing these kinds of data, there were three camps on this topic: the male administrators—the ‘old guard’; some of the newer professors who stated that there was no statistical or non-conscious bias; and others, including most senior female faculty, who saw both these forms of discrimination as rampant and fundamental to discrimination and segregation. Sturm (2001) discussed ‘second-generation discrimination’, less overt, subtle discrimination, and argued that formal and informal institutions, such as rules in an organisation, are insufficient in addressing discrimination that occurs due to the structures and processes that operate on a continual basis. She argued that real equality would come from equal respect and this needed to be nurtured in the institutional processes. Formal institutions in countries like the US, though, have yet to promote the change that is required. In the Japanese university context, first-generation (overt, exclusionary) segregation and conscious stereotyping were found to be widespread. Given the general lack of equal respect for women as high-status professionals, it was not surprising that conscious and non-conscious discrimination continued to be commonplace and their existence retards institutional change regarding equality. The findings here indicate that gender bias that results in discrimination and inequality is more extreme and overt than in other industrialised countries.
4 Conclusion

Drawing on Becker (1971) (cited in Blau, et al. 2006: 218), there are three types of discrimination: a ‘taste for discrimination’, ‘statistical discrimination’ and ‘feedback’ effects. Becker described the taste for discrimination by employers and employees as a prejudice associated with those from a certain group. Coordinated market economies (CMEs) such as Japan are likely to have high levels of statistical discrimination. The participants’ personal views on egalitarianism had no impact on desk rejections of mothers and potential mothers, and even women with children admitted to discriminating, justifying this on the grounds that they could not afford any more demands on their own personal workloads. Women, at least, recognised that this was discriminatory. The diffusion of egalitarian norms was not matched by normative changes in praxis.

It was found that male homophily, as evidenced by comments about men getting excited about young men’s résumés and the continuing importance of after-work socialising, contributed to bias in choosing candidates. This also led to statistical discrimination. Finally, there were also feedback effects—widespread segregation and discrimination are known to negatively impact women’s career choices (Blau, Ferber and Winkler 2006: 203). Some of the women’s choices to avoid entering the vertical hierarchy, as mentioned in previous chapters, were also an indication of this. Further, while somewhat anecdotally it was found that women who remained in part-time and contract work rather than pursuing tenured employment indicated that the myths surrounding the profession, such as long work hours, heroic masculinity, as well as the exclusionary practices of the male work culture, had a negative impact on women’s aspirations, potentially contributing to the low numbers of women academics.
Becker’s (2009) human capital theories assume that these forms of discrimination, due to movement towards economic equilibrium, will disappear over time, though a time frame is not theorised. However sociological institutionalists provide other explanations, such as rationalisation through the myths of the profession (Meyer and Rowan 1977). Myths around long working hours, in particular, were instrumental in excluding women at the initial phases of recruiting as well as from the internal networks that were known to be a source for promotion to senior-level management positions. This was discussed in the previous chapters. It was found that the above three forms of discrimination were overt and widespread, and were underscored by the importance men placed on their (sometimes sexualised, sometimes homo-erotic) relationships with other men. These were likely mimetic as well as normative mechanisms that contributed to isomorphism constraining change.

Some institutional change was found in the challenges to the male culture of entitlement to after-work sex through voicing disapproval; though this did not seem to result in changes in men’s behaviour, there were indications that its overt nature was no longer going totally unchallenged. One intriguing finding was the prevalence of the ‘myth’ of long working hours (Nemoto 2013b). It was ascertained that there were numerous institutional myths that constructed masculinity, such as the ‘heroic, enduring male’, in opposition to femininity, hence Othering women’s capabilities and competence.

Various forms of institutional change were found through this empirical research. Ideational change was evident in the various views of egalitarianism, from support for equality of outcome, to equality of opportunity. The traditional belief that women should stay out of men’s domain because they were not suited to the demands on the profession persisted as well. While distinctions between members of different groups
were not the focus of this research, there did seem to be a trend with senior women who had witnessed the subtle, continuous bias against women who supported equality of opportunity, while the senior (male) administrators either assumed that Japanese women were just not capable or not meant to be in the core positions, and were better suited for part-time and contract positions ‘for their own good’ as mothers and wives. Conversion, in the form of the movement toward equality of outcome would be an indication of the diffus ion of international norms. Prior internationalising influences of instruments like CEDAW resulted in little evidence of egalitarianism. Ideational change generally did not have an impact on principles and praxis.

Rationales for appointing that advantaged men were similar to those found in other countries, though they were more overt and the essentialising rationales were more extreme. For instance, in the US context, long working hours, no conflicting time or energy commitments, age appropriateness, and tough negotiating skills (Ely and Meyerson 2000; Meyerson and Tomkins 2007) were rationales that have gained legitimacy and therefore tended to be resistant to change (Meyer and Rowan 1977). This research confirmed that these male-advantaging criteria were also evident in the Japanese context. The construction of the definition of the profession in male terms positioned women as lacking the necessary competence, resulting in desk rejections that disqualified them in the initial stages of the appointing process. While there was evidence of the norm diffusion of egalitarian ideals, it was scattered and found to co-exist with persistent discriminatory practices. The myth of the gender-neutral institution was able to persist, in part, due to the unacceptability of discourses on gender and discrimination, as discussed in the previous chapter on segregation. This silence promoted an undeserved trust in university processes, which were actually contributing to gender inequality.
Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

1 Introduction

This thesis examined change and continuity in a university gender regime and makes a significant empirical contribution to the debates on institutional change and continuity. The goals of CEDAW undergirded the theoretical conceptions. CEDAW has been utilized to enact both top-down changes in the form of domestic equality laws and policies, as well as in bottom-up civil-society initiatives (Chan-Tiberghien 2003; Gurowitz 1999; Takao 2007). Located in between these two strata are the meso-level organizations and institutions. Gender inequality in organizations finds its explanation through a multitude of mechanisms. Research examining inequality at the organisational level has found, for example, discrimination (taste for discrimination, statistical and institutional); internalisation (preferences of career choices within organizations, self-evaluation); labour-force commitment (domestic division of labour, workplace adaptations); cultural devaluation (pollution, cultural devaluation); and feedback effects (expectations of discrimination, expected sanctions) (Blau, Brinton and Grusky 2006: 8). This research, in examining the institution of the university, contributes to this body of work by mapping how these occur in the Japanese organizational context. However, this research goes beyond a mapping of the gender regimes, and explores change and continuity in gender inequality. As its starting point,
this research uses CEDAW's mandate, since appeals to international treaties such as this have been the basis of changes in legislative and civil society initiatives in Japan. However, there is a gap in empirical research at the meso-level especially in Japan. Investigation at the meso-level is necessary in order to provide salient information on gender inequality if equal employment policies are to have a substantive impact.

This kind of research, that aims to illuminate the inner workings of an organisation, is challenging in that access to organisations is difficult due to their closed nature. Also, building rapport and the necessary relationships in order to gain the trust of participants, generally tends to be challenging. Dye and Mills (2012: 280-281) contended that these are some of the reasons that the empirical research necessary to gain a clear understanding of the gender regimes in organisations has yet to be done, and this thesis undertook this challenge, making a small but significant contribution that may be drawn upon in further research. In this conclusion chapter, a summary of the research findings regarding institutional change and stasis will be presented. How CEDAW's mandate was useful in evaluating Japan's low standing regarding gender equality is then discussed. The chapter and the thesis closes with the research contributions, limitations, and suggestions for possible future research.

2 Institutional change summarized

Institutional change had occurred and will be summarized in this section in relation to internationalisation, the vertical hierarchy, and inequalities of power. Internationalisation had an impact on institutional change regarding open recruitment, changes in qualification criteria, and adjustments to how employment was recorded.
Some of these changes had potential to benefit women but the gender regime tempered most of the potential. There were also changes in the vertical hierarchy with women entering tenured positions in greater numbers as well as some changes in the administrative core; however, the power and status embodied in these positions were not equally bestowed on women when they took on these roles; rather, women continued to be relegated to supportive roles regardless of the positions they were in. Finally, there were changes such as anti-harassment policies that aimed to deal with inequalities of power; however the taken-for-grantedness of gendered power inequalities and the façade of the gender neutrality of the institution hindered most substantive change.

2.1 Internationalisation

In terms of institutional change, internationalisation had a great deal of influence and this resulted in change in the form of layering and conversion in the university. There was institutional layering in the university, with koubou (open recruitment) being increasingly adopted as a form of recruitment that was layered alongside the more traditional and firmly established network recruitment. The university had incorporated a semblance of meritocracy in departmental and university-wide processes that included identifying pertinent criteria, public announcements, and ratification through voting. Layering was also evident in the increasing requirement of formal qualifications in the form of Doctorate Degrees while networking continued to be used for faculty appointments.
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These changes due to internationalisation had some potential to positively impact gender equality; however, the gender regime mitigated much of this change. For example, open recruitment benefitted some women who were exceptionally qualified, since meritocratic-like processes made it more difficult to summarily exclude them. Women who were similarly qualified to men, though, were excluded if the majority of faculty could be persuaded that a male candidate’s area of academic expertise was more ‘desirable’. Mimetic and normative isomorphism were powerful forces in maintaining the male-normative conceptions of expertise (England and Li 2006) and therefore persuasion was generally accomplished to favour male candidates since the gendered micro-segregation that existed in most fields of expertise were considered to be sufficient rationales. This research supported findings that meritocracy in academia reinforces ‘the advantage that men have over women in the competition for scarce rewards in the workplace’ (Knights and Richards 2003: 218-220) and reproduces masculine values.

A further significant change due to internationalisation was the increasing requirement of PhDs, since Japan’s rates have been found to be low compared to international standards. Internally awarded PhDs was one way that the numbers were increased; however, only men had benefitted from this practice as no women had been awarded such degrees. In this way women were clearly excluded in the community of professional development and the ability to contribute to the building of institutional status. Women were not part of this gendered internationalisation of institutional standards.

Conforming to international equality standards puts pressure on government and institutions to produce and increase women’s participation. This legitimacy-seeking took the form of increasing the number of women in some of the higher positions of the
university. However, rather than substantive change in numerical representation, the university renamed some of temporary teachers and researchers as assistant and associate professors. By including contract workers, most of whom were women, as assistant and associate professors, this conflated part-time and temporary workers with permanent, tenured faculty positions, obfuscating the continuing low number of women in core positions of secure employment. The impression that substantive change in gender inequality had been occurring was, in reality, solely discursive change in reporting in order to satisfy legitimacy-seeking from the international or domestic communities. This is important since this paints an overly optimistic picture of improvements in women’s employment when statistics on women’s employment are disseminated and published. Shakai Daigaku was a trendsetter in the regions and there was also anecdotal evidence that other universities were following suit, which may very well further distort the reporting of improvements in gender inequality.

2.2 Vertical hierarchy

There was some change in the form of conversion in the vertical hierarchy. Until recently, there had been almost no women in the university administrative positions. The lack of women in upper management may have contributed to the lack of substantive attention to women’s issues. There was some conversion in the vertical hierarchy and women had recently entered lower administrative roles, such as Vice Deanships. Also, the internal labour market, which has been a key feature in Japanese university recruitment, continued to be a strong pipeline to tenured positions. About half of tenured positions had been filled from within this pipeline. It could be argued
that this pipeline might be beneficial for women, since open recruitment may be characterized by hyper-competitiveness, which could put women at more of a disadvantage. However, the power and prestige of women entering positions higher up in the vertical hierarchy were subsequently diminished. For example, when women were Vice Deans, the role became a supporting role to administrators above them in the hierarchy (all of whom were men) versus a prestigious position in its own right, which it was when it was held exclusively by men. The feminisation of occupations (Mandel 2013) and gender pollution (Goldin 2006) have explained how women’s entry into occupations is viewed as devaluing them. Charles and Grusky (2004) posited that inequalities could be partly attributed to men being viewed as more status worthy by both women and men. Men’s vested interests in maintaining the status quo, and perhaps a fear of threats to the premium that is awarded to male dominated professions such as the professoriate, operated to exclude women. Exclusionary factors, such as hypersegregation, which defines women in opposition to men (Plumwood 2012), was found to be useful in explaining the Othering that disadvantaged women in administrative positions. As Kelan said, ‘being perceived as a woman excludes being perceived as a professional’ (2009: 184). As women entered management positions, this conversion of the vertical hierarchy was accompanied by conversion in the form of a devaluing of the status of the positions held by women.

It was found that the majority of women who had aspirations to break the glass ceiling were constrained by the gender regime, since acceptable masculinity and femininity were prescribed and proscribed by the ‘gendered logic of appropriateness’ (Chappell and Waylen 2013). Men were described as ‘tough’ and ‘hard working’; the myth of heroic endurance and long work hours worked to exclude women in the early stages of hiring and acted as a feedback affect to dissuade women to pursue tenured
positions. Women were described in a binary of either being ‘gentle’ and ‘helpful’ or, disparagingly as ‘too strong’ or ‘manipulative’. Most of the effective and noticeable women were under severe scrutiny and criticized; the ones with ‘gentle smiles’ generally operated on the margins or as ‘cheerleaders for the men’. The difficulty balancing femininity and success in male-dominated arenas has been a focus of much research (Mavin 2008; West and Zimmerman 1987, 2009). In this context, mimetic and normative isomorphism regarding appropriate gender roles disadvantaged women’s success in judgments about their competence and potential in the vertical hierarchy, while *instrumentalism*—the judgment of women in terms of their success in serving men’s needs—Othered women (Plumwood 2012: 257–8) in roles of support for men’s careers. Glick and Fiske’s research on gender stereotyping has found that most biases result in the bifurcation of warmth and competence, with the former applied to women and the latter to men (1999). Since competence is valued in high-status employment, these biases would disadvantage women, and this research confirmed this effect.

### 2.3 Inequalities of power

Finally, change had occurred with the implementation of harassment procedures, though these were only utilized by faculty for some severe cases of sexual harassment. Sexual and power harassment of female faculty was widespread, resulting in varying levels of withdrawal with women losing their commitment to work or, in more severe cases, terminating their employment. With the introduction of anti-harassment legislation, lags between different levels of institutions—the legislative, formal and informal institutions—are found in most industrialised societies and therefore it was not
unexpected that there would be unevenness regarding anti-harassment policies. However, the almost universal lack of support from colleagues for women who were targets of harassment (disparaging, disrespecting, bullying, shunning, group attacks, power harassment, sexual harassment) was disturbing and indicated that norms, such as those promulgated by CEDAW, were not being used to challenge harassment. The absence of support from colleagues was rationalized by many participants as being socially acceptable, and the focus of discussions often turned to men’s rights being infringed upon and concerns that the university needed to be protected from unfounded harassment lawsuits, versus a focus on women’s welfare. Harassment is about the abuse of power (Reich and Hershcovis 2012), and therefore rationales that the social sanctions were culturally appropriate (such as those against women who crossed gender lines) indicated that the nexus of power underpinned by maleness, age, and seniority continued to undermine positive changes in the workplace for women; men were generally not subjected to the disparagement, shunning, and group attacks that women suffered.

3 Institutional change: agency and structure

This summary of the empirical research results will be useful in indicating the form that gender equality policies should take. The gendered nature of the institutional changes indicated that the gender regime mediated much of the potential for change. Clearly, the results dispute the rationale that women’s choices were the predominant cause of inequality. There were significant events in the institution that contributed to discrimination. Since discrimination undermines equality of opportunity, women’s
choices, therefore, cannot be realized where gender discrimination occurs. The role of agency and structure is a key debate in gender inequality. For example, Hakim (2000, 2007) argued that inequality resulted primarily from women’s choices, while others argued that this underdetermined structures (Crompton and Lyonette 2005, 2007). While Hakim (2000, 2007) contended women’s proclivities were the cause of inequalities, this is clearly challenged by the existence of gender biases. She posited that the broad acceptance of egalitarianism in industrially advanced countries precluded most gender discrimination, but egalitarian norms cannot be assumed to have broadly diffused in the Japanese context, since this in-depth research indicated otherwise. The evidence from the empirical data in this research indicated that structure accounted for the bulk of inequalities, as discrimination operated at every level of the recruitment process, from the formulation of job descriptions, the short-listing of applicants, the interview processes and final ratification. Normative and cognitive-cultural institutions constrained much of the potential for change that could have occurred as meritocratic processes were introduced. For example, feedback effects and statistical discrimination\(^{27}\) (Becker 1971) continued unchallenged in the university. Furthermore, some Japan-specific practices such as consensus decision-making and the emphasis on harmony in the workplace functioned, not as inclusive mechanisms, but to silence challenges to the gender regime, thereby constraining change.

Research has shown that ‘oppressed groups are also muted groups’ (Lutgen-Sandvik, Dickinson and Foss 2012: 66 italics in original), and this was a key finding in the empirical research. There were strong expectations that women should remain silent and marginalized. Some feminists have drawn on Foucault’s (1978) theories on self-discipline—mimetic isomorphism of gender appropriate behaviour—to explain the

\(^{27}\) For a critique of human capital explanations, see Lips (2013).
resilience of gender regimes, which may be useful in explaining why some of the women chose to be on the margins. However, women were aware that those who had transgressed gendered expectations were subjected to social sanctions ranging from disparagement to group bullying; both women and men monitored and enforced gender normativity. However, some of the women who declared they had made choices to be on the margins were actually viewed by others as having been pushed out of the male-dominated vertical hierarchy, indicating the interplay between bounded choices and an individual’s need to feel they were exercising agency. Khadar (2011) argued that all choices are adaptive preferences and that it is important to distinguish which ones are inappropriately adaptive. Ely and Meyerson (2000) argued that it takes a tipping point in the number of women entering previously male-dominated fields for the supposed gender-neutral processes to be exposed, and even then the underlying beliefs make it hard to dislodge the structures. The suppression of gender through Japanese specific practices of consensus building and workplace harmony, combined with the above-mentioned social sanctions should gender norms be transgressed, seemed to preclude any corporate citizenship behaviour regarding women’s human rights. Gender specialists/feminists had been particularly penalised in the past and this had resulted in an organisation that had strong taboos around changes in the gender regimes let alone the mention of gender, which was treated harshly.

Women were put in a catch 22, balancing between what was considered gender appropriate behaviour—expectations of femininity—with being respected as academics and being taken seriously in the organisational hierarchy. Not only did women have difficulties balancing these expectations but they were often disparaged by both men and other women academics. At the same time the organisation was clearly gendered in roles and expectations, research has problematized the lack of gender neutrality in
academia (Bailyn 2003; Deem 2003; Knights and Richards 2003) and shown that organisations, while operating under the illusion of neutrality, are based on the needs and aspirations of the male professional. Beyond focusing on gender neutrality, organisational research on gender has also problematised the gender binary, building on West and Zimmerman’s (2002b) doing gender approach. This is instructive in understanding that although gender is performative, it ‘remains surprisingly stable and re-establishes itself’ (Kelan 2010: 176). The sanctions that women had to deal with were directly related to their attempts to move out of the prescribed femininity and into the professional realm. The strength of sanctions on deviations from the ‘logic of gender-appropriate’ behaviour depended on the degree of deviation from the norms, which constrained change in specific, and in general. The force for even minor infractions such as speaking out in public, however, was quite severe and the strength escalated to stronger measures for stronger infractions. Even those women who had undergone serious sanctions, though, said they had ‘chosen’ their place on the periphery. The need for these women to believe they were exercising agency, in spite of being ostracized, while not unique to this context, was a common outcome.

This research found that, in order to be successful academics, women were attempting to do gender differently (West and Zimmerman 1987, 2009). Appropriate femininities precluded women from being viewed as ‘serious academics’, and attempts at changes in gender performativity were viewed as gender transgressions, which had, at least up until now, received little tolerance. It would seem appropriate, at some point in this research, to bring in cultural explanations; the masculine and collectivist nature of Japanese society (Hofstede 2001)\(^{28}\), or the collectivism and ingroupism/outgroupism of Confucian or Asian values, to describe the extreme gender segregation. It is true that

\(^{28}\) However, see Baskerville (2003) and Sweeney (2002) for critiques of these cultural explanations.
gender roles were highly segregated; however, the university was complicit in multiple ways in excluding women, and the discriminatory mechanisms were similar to those found in many other regions, though they were more extreme and overt in Japan. Silence, for instance, has been theorized to be a form of (lack of) power (Foucault 1978; Simpson and Lewis 2005) and Munakata (2001) found this in the Japanese context. A number of women participants believed their almost complete silence in meetings was due to their personalities and not due to their powerlessness. However, it was also clear that all new faculty knew they were expected to remain relatively silent for the first few years (three years) and that their newness indicated their lack of expertise and seniority. However, while women continued to maintain silence unless they were called upon to report specific information, men took up space once they had become integrated into the vertical hierarchy. Silence, therefore, was an indication of powerlessness, though individual women generally explained this as a personality trait sometimes in the form of their personal failing.

4 CEDAW

The impact of CEDAW has been of interest not only to international relations scholars, but also sociologists who have examined its implementation at local levels (Shawkii 2011). Finnemore posited that sociological institutionalism also ‘provides a framework’ to problematise some of the unexamined assumptions of international relations, including assumptions regarding human rights (1996b: 337-338). Rather than exploring how CEDAW’s mandate had been utilised to exact change, as others have done (Gray et al 2006; Gurowitz 1999), this thesis used CEDAW to assess the university
mechanisms that constrained or promoted change toward meeting its obligations of sexual non-discrimination. Three requirements of CEDAW were deemed relevant to the goals of this research: educating people on what equality is in order to override cultural relativist rationales that perpetuate inequality (egalitarian norm diffusion); ensuring non-discriminatory practices such as gender discrimination in employment; and implementing positive action.

It may be useful here to recap the importance of CEDAW as well as the domestic laws that are relevant to gender employment discrimination, since this research is unique in using CEDAW to frame the analysis of inequality. CEDAW mandates equality of outcome. CEDAW also supersedes domestic laws in Japan, as is theoretically true of all monist states. However, the domestic laws in Japan emphasise equality of opportunity and equality of opportunity was generally embraced by most of the faculty. Documenting the contours of discrimination was imperative in order to establish that even the minimum requirements of equality of opportunity were not being met. As long as the majority believed the university had fulfilled its duty and the university was gender neutral, it would be difficult to implement any positive action. Various participants said, ‘there is no discrimination in Japan because it is against the law’. An imperative of researchers, therefore, is to map out the contours of inequality in order to be able to press for positive action, which is in line with government proposals for positive action to ameliorate gender inequality. A recent Cabinet Office White Paper stated:

universities have been taking various positive action (sic) so far, such as setting up numerical targets, developing gender equality plans, and providing financial assistance or training sessions for women… (however) the speed and current
status of women’s participation are not sufficient…(in order to) accelerate
women’s participation for attaining the target of ‘30% by 2020’, it is necessary to
draw on best practices at home and abroad, further encourage stakeholders in
various fields, and further examine the feasibility of possible approaches for
pushing ahead with positive action. (2011: 13)

States that ratify international human rights treaties such as CEDAW solely as a form of
legitimacy seeking do so without substantive implementation of change initiatives
(Zwingel 2012: 116-117). Japan has been one case where there have been accusations
that CEDAW has resulted in solely discursive changes. For example, some participants
viewed the laws and the university policies that were to enforce them as ‘all smoke and
mirrors’ and ‘a total façade’.

4.1  **CEDAW: broad education, non-discrimination, and positive action**

On all three of the CEDAW requirements (broad education on gender equality, equality
of opportunity, and positive action) the university in this study had insufficiently met its
obligations.

4.1.1  **Norm diffusion: broad education on gender equality**

Norm diffusion of egalitarian ideals in line with CEDAW was not substantiated in the
empirical data. There were various individual ideas on equality. Ideas ranged from
support for *different but equal* conceptions of gender to strong support for equality of
outcome; anti-equality sentiments were also expressed that emphasized women’s appropriate roles as mothers and wives. However, norms differ from ideas in that they guide behaviour, and while some participants embraced egalitarian ideals, egalitarian norms had not become institutionalized. While people’s attitudes do not necessarily provide evidence of behavior, ‘attitudes do matter’ (Scott, J.L. 2008: 173). If those in power believe that women should not be in academia and administrative positions in the university, this would likely negatively impact the implementation of gender policies regarding recruitment and hiring. The combination of upper-management’s overtly discriminatory attitudes and denial that the university played any role in inequality indicated that egalitarian norms had not diffused throughout the university—CEDAW is specific in the requirement of equality of outcome as is the ‘30% by 2020’ domestic program. Since upper management is where decisions would be made regarding substantive change, this might explain why gender initiatives were solely discursive; it satisfied the university’s legitimacy seeking from society regarding compliance with legislative policies.

Gender issues could generally not be broached; there was, as Ueno and Osawa (2001) said, an ‘allergy’ to the topic of gender and, in some cases, those who broached the topic were greeted with severe social sanctions (bullying, shunning, harassment), indicating little change in normative and cognitive-cultural institutions. There was organizational silence on the topic of gender discrimination and this was further evidence that egalitarian norm diffusion had not yet occurred. Kelen (2009) argued that the co-existence of the belief in the gender neutrality of organisations with the awareness of recurring inequality created a tension between confidence in women’s agency and a ‘sense of powerlessness that women can experience when they encounter persistent sexist attitudes within a context where gender is effectively invisible’ (2009:
206). However, it is unclear in this context there was even a general belief of the gender neutrality of the institution. Male vested interests would benefit from dismissing concerns through using a rationale of gender neutrality and further research is needed on this particular aspect since it is difficult to discern motivation.

4.1.2 Equality of opportunity: non-discrimination

The second of CEDAW’s requirements—equality of opportunity—would be undergirded by non-discriminatory praxis and would be evidenced in gender-neutral meritocratic recruitment, hiring, and promotion. This would entail, for instance, the inclusion of diversity of academic expertise in order to move away from biased male-normative definitions of what an appropriate field of expertise entails. Removing barriers such as the requirement of uninterrupted careers and age normative hiring would also indicate a commitment to equality of opportunity. There was no evidence that any adjustments had been made to male-normative conceptions of expertise. There was some evidence that open recruitment was contributing to equality of opportunity, but its success was dependent on the good intentions of individuals and its success was undone through a lack of substantive accountability.

4.1.3 Positive action

Finally, the third requirement, positive action, was also not fulfilled. Gender initiatives were limited to discursive compliance in line with the government’s ‘30% by 2020’ domestic gender initiatives. This involved publication on the university Webpage and in
promotional publications. A few departments had made scattered attempts to consider discrimination. This had resulted in a feeling that women were now being given preferential treatment and resulted in a general belief that discrimination had been ‘solved’. This created a backlash that exacerbated the discrimination that was found to be common at all levels of the recruitment process.

The general lack of commitment to equality by the university administration resulted in no positive action on the part of the institution. Japan has had a focus on economic viability over women’s rights (Peng 2001, 2012). The outcome of this in the university was the almost complete lack of commitment to substantive equality in the recruitment process, which resulted in continuing gender discrimination. It would not be unexpected that the exogenous shock of the government driven changes in legislative institutions would be accompanied by lags in changing the normative and cognitive-cultural institutions (Scott 2014). Protecting vested interests through reinterpreting and subverting regulatory changes by blaming women’s choices or failings subverted the formal rules and left men’s sense of entitlement intact.

This thesis looked for evidence of the diffusion of egalitarian norms, which is a minimum requirement for states that have ratified CEDAW. Embracing egalitarian norms may not be motivation for non-discriminatory behaviour, but not embracing egalitarian norms would likely not result in changes toward egalitarian practices. The periodic CEDAW reports have repeatedly warned Japan that it has not fulfilled its basic obligation of broad education in egalitarian norms, since the majority of the population still has not embraced egalitarian ideals. The continued employment discrimination would likely be related to the lack of knowledge about: what discrimination is; how it occurs; and unawareness that Japan is legally obliged to promote equality of outcome. Since universities are well-placed to educate the public, professors would be a key
nexus of knowledge, and therefore, empirical research on their beliefs, ideas, and values was critical in understanding the specificities of the prevailing gender norms. Of more direct interest, though, was the interplay between norms and women’s persistent inequality in relation to men within the professorship.

5 Contribution and significance of the research

Similar patterns of behaviour and lags between formal and informal institutions are found in most industrialized societies, and men operate globally in a variety of ways that exclude women, especially from activities involving large financial and high-status gains. There is very little qualitative research on gender in organisations within Japan, making this research important as it showed both the similarities and the overt nature of discrimination.

This research also showed that Japanese-style consensus does not play out how Western researchers have typically characterised it, and rather than benefitting women, it contributed to reproducing power inequalities. Nor did fairness practices, such as meritocracy, that continues to be much heralded as a more neutral arbitrator of qualifications, contribute to the amelioration of gender inequality. This research revealed how gendered norms continued to steer the male-normative practice of meritocracy. This is important as Japan is embracing the idea of meritocracy and the illusion of its neutrality as one factor on the path to international legitimacy.

A very noteworthy finding was that Japan does not embrace a general acceptance of egalitarian norms despite the existing laws and policy rhetoric. It is still generally acceptable to overtly refer to age, sex, race and other such potential intersections of
discrimination in hiring processes. The stigma that is attached to expressions of sexist attitudes in other industrialised states (Kelan 2009) was not generally a deterrent in Shakai University, and overt expressions of gender differences, while socially frowned upon by some, was still expressed openly by others.

Substantiating existing discrimination is important since domestic laws mandate positive action to address past and existing discrimination, and counteracts the widespread cultural arguments that women’s choices are the cause of inequalities. CEDAW’s mandate addresses the inherent non-gender-neutral problems of meritocracy in mandating equality of outcome. This research aims to fill the lacuna of research in substantiating that meritocratic processes are not being fairly exercised and also that professional standards are gendered. This can undergird the mandates of domestic equality laws in that positive action is permissible and required to rectify inequality where there has been discrimination in the past. This research would also be of interest to those who are interested specifically in gender equality in the Japanese context. There is a void in the research on the gendered aspects of changes in the Japanese labour market.

Finally, this research took a unique approach in using CEDAW to analyse society at the meso-level by interrogating the gendered organisation in order to determine how Japan’s efforts in fulfilling its international obligations are being met. Since is it often difficult to navigate cultural norms when researching gender inequalities in cultural contexts other than Western democracies, CEDAW’s requirements were useful in undergirding the empirical research since cultural relativist explanations of discrimination can be problematised. Furthermore, directly linking CEDAW to the institution proved to be a fruitful approach to analysing the gender regime, since specific elements of CEDAW’s mandate are unequivocally relevant to the research
context. This research supports its efficacy as a rubric to frame an analysis of institutional change. Teasing out the mechanisms of change (and constraint) that were indicated within the recommendations from the CEDAW Committee’s periodic reports, would seems to be a useful way to move forward in interrogating the direct role institutions play in persistent discrimination.

6 Research limitations and possible future research

This research project used a single case study of one university in the Kansai region. While isomorphic pressures would indicate that universities would tend to have many similarities, this cannot be assumed. However, since the local is a capsule of the global, there would also likely be aspects of the wider social environment in which the university is embedded that would emerge through a relational approach. However, the mapping of gender regimes across a broad range of institutions would be useful in capturing the specificities of gender inequality.

It was also found that organisational ‘logics of gender appropriateness’ (Chappell and Waylen, 2013) of femininity and masculinity mitigated much of the potential for changes in gender inequality. While some institutional change had occurred, in the form of layering and conversion, the generally endorsed separate but equal view of gender strongly underemphasised commonalities between women and men. Conscious (and non-conscious) biases were reinforced by this ideal and challenges to gender differences were nearly impossible because of these norms. More empirical research is required to make sense of this complex issue.
Further research on the Japanese context would be useful. Even though CEDAW overrides cultural relativist rationales, there is still much to be understood regarding cross-cultural comparisons, and, therefore, comparative qualitative research would help answer some of the issues that could not be addressed in this research that were precluded due to the research methods and theoretical underpinnings.
## Appendix 1

### Japanese Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akahara</td>
<td>academic or power harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chiki gentei shogoshoku</td>
<td>region-based management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danjo byodo</td>
<td>gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danjo kyodosankaku</td>
<td>male/female joint participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danjo kyosei</td>
<td>harmonious co-existence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eikyuu shuushoku</td>
<td>eternal service (i.e. a woman’s role in the home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminizumu</td>
<td>Japanese feminism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaman</td>
<td>suffer harassment in silence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaman shimashita</td>
<td>put up with something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ie</td>
<td>household family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ie seido</td>
<td>household (family) system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ippanshoku</td>
<td>employment track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isogashii!</td>
<td>We’re so busy!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jidai</td>
<td>era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jun shogoshoku</td>
<td>quasi-management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka na</td>
<td>isn’t it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keibatsu</td>
<td>family connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiretsu</td>
<td>interlocking organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kireigoto</td>
<td>whitewashing difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiyo</td>
<td>journals internal to a university that publish professors’ and students’ work in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokusaika</td>
<td>internationalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kone</td>
<td>(noun) a connection, connections; (concept) the use of connections or networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koseki seido</td>
<td>family registration system, the legal requirement to register the family in the registration system of 1872, that continues to function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koshikake</td>
<td>temporary workers (literally: empty seat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koubou</td>
<td>open recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoujukai</td>
<td>faculty meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mochiron!</td>
<td>of course, absolutely!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naikakufu</td>
<td>Cabinet Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nihonjinron</td>
<td>Japan’s cultural uniqueness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijikai</td>
<td>a follow-up event or second get-together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Old Boys’ Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG</td>
<td>Old Girls’ Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osakini shitsureishimasu</td>
<td>sorry to be so rude as to leave before you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostukare</td>
<td>you must be tired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryosai kenbo</td>
<td>good wife, wise mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seku-hara</td>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sennin</td>
<td>full-time, tenured faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senpai/kohai</td>
<td>senior/junior status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakai Daigaku</td>
<td>Pseudonym: Name of the university used for this case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakai kengaku</td>
<td>to experience life (literally: social observation/study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shougoushoku/Shogoshoku</td>
<td>career-track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soto</td>
<td>out-group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotomuki professors</td>
<td>professors who focus on teaching and research (and who are more highly valued than uchimuki professors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunaku</strong></td>
<td>from the English word ‘snack’, a club where men socialise and have (non-intercourse) sexual relations with those who work there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tatemae</strong></td>
<td>facade or mask; telling someone what they want to hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tsukareta!</strong></td>
<td>I’m tired; I’m so busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tsukiai</strong></td>
<td>the mandatory after-work socialising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uchimuki</strong></td>
<td>professors whose value comes from their work inside the university, such as administrative duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uchi</strong></td>
<td>in-group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uman ribu</strong></td>
<td>women’s liberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wa</strong></td>
<td>harmony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2

Research participants (N=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Years’ seniority in university</th>
<th>Positions related to appointment—membership in gender association or appointing committee</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese women (N=15)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>International studies for foreign students</td>
<td>Prof. Ida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vice Dean: Education Committee</td>
<td>Prof. Kai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Past Cheir, Harassment Committee</td>
<td>Prof. Kana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>International Programme focusing on international appointing</td>
<td>Prof. Mai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology of Education</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Past Vice Dean: Harassment Committee; Education Committee</td>
<td>Prof. Moto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education Committee</td>
<td>Prof. Nami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>2 (8 p/t)</td>
<td>Administration from business world—no gender focus</td>
<td>Prof. Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Past Vice Dean</td>
<td>Prof. Ree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Past Vice Dean; Committee on Working Conditions</td>
<td>Prof. Rie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Linguistics</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Resigned due to lack of respect</td>
<td>Prof. Saki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Resigned, due to power harassment</td>
<td>Prof. Tomio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Policy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Past Vice Dean; Specialisation in welfare; Gender Research Committee</td>
<td>Prof. Tsuyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Past Vice Dean; Specialisation in gender and art; Gender Research Committee</td>
<td>Prof. Uchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Union; Gender Specialisation: segregation in employment; Gender Research Committee</td>
<td>Prof. Yama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Harassment Committee</td>
<td>Prof. Yoshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese male (N=6)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dean; Board of Directors; Chair of Education Committee + gender issues</td>
<td>Prof. Ita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Law Geography</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Past Dean; Board of Executives</td>
<td>Prof. Shima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Masculinity Studies</td>
<td>Prof. Nakamura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Economy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Departmental Gender Appointing Committee</td>
<td>Prof. Oka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies, Race</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Previous Dean; Union Chair</td>
<td>Prof. Sato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Departmental Gender Appointing</td>
<td>Prof. Shino</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Non-Japanese female (N=9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Committee Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Relations (2 years)</td>
<td>International Programme focusing on International Appointing</td>
<td>Prof. Cheir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies (5 years)</td>
<td>Departmental Gender Appointing Committee</td>
<td>Prof. Elba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>International Programme; Education Committee</td>
<td>Prof. Elemar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured Law</td>
<td>Resigned due to lack of respect</td>
<td>Prof. Gooch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>Head of Appointing of non-English Foreign Languages</td>
<td>Prof. Goody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Welfare Policy and Minority Rights</td>
<td>Prof. Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>International Programme focusing on International Appointing</td>
<td>Prof. Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>International Programme focusing on Appointing; Gender Specialisation: Literature</td>
<td>Prof. Nieson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
<td>International Programme focusing on Appointing; Gender Specialisation: violence</td>
<td>Prof. Sonne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Japanese male (N=3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Committee Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Homosexuality Studies</td>
<td>Prof. Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>International Programme for foreign students</td>
<td>Prof. Len</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Appointing Committee; Education Committee; Masculinity Studies</td>
<td>Prof. Son</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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