International faculty member's perceived Professional Learning and Development (PLD) experiences at a Japanese university

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education
in
Teaching and Learning

at Massey University, New Zealand

Lucia Sunyoung Ju
2024

Abstract

This thesis examines international faculty members' (IFM) current perceptions of professional learning and development (PLD) in Japanese universities. Recent internationalisation initiatives by the Japanese government involved hiring faculty members from overseas to become agents of change. These faculty members are tasked with introducing new educational theories and pedagogy and engaging in research. However, IFM encountered challenges in integrating into Japanese universities due to language barriers, cultural misunderstandings and work-related factors.

To gain a comprehensive understanding of the current situation of PLD for IFM, data were collected via semi-structured interviews with eight IFM across universities in Japan. The data were analysed using Braun and Clark's (2006) six phases of thematic analysis. The analysis showed the alignment between the factors that impeded IFM's integration into Japanese universities and their limited participation in PLD. Nonetheless, IFM recognised the importance of communication and engagement in PLD and actively sought learning opportunities. Currently, there is little to no published work about IFM's perception of PLD in Japanese universities. Therefore, a key strength of this study was that it could serve as a base for future studies that investigate IFM's perceptions of PLD in other East Asian countries and IFM new to the teaching profession, women IFM involvement in Japanese universities and IFM's perceptions of specific PLD (i.e., peer observation, feedback etc.)

Keywords: professional learning and development, international faculty, integration, internationalisation, Japanese university, higher education

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Professor Jenny Poskitt and Dr Philippa Butler for their invaluable patience, feedback and words of encouragement throughout my Masters journey. Additionally, I am highly grateful for the generous support from Massey University, who provided financial support for my research.

I would also like to extend my sincerest appreciation to all participants who expressed their desire to participate in the research and shared their stories with me to make this research possible.

Lastly, I would be remiss in not mentioning my family and friends for their kind moral and emotional support. I am also grateful to my co-workers for their valuable examples, ideas and suggestions about Japanese universities and Japanese culture.

Table of Contents

List of tables

Introduction

Higher education in Japan is currently in the midst of rapid change due to Japan's aging and declining population and to compete with global universities (Green, 2022; Hammond & Radjai, 2022; Nakano et al., 2016; Yonezawa, 2020). The reformation of higher education in Japan involves the implementation of four initiatives from 2009: The Global 30 Project (2009 to 2014), The Top Global University Project (2014-2023) and the initiative to increase the number of international students in Japan to 400,000, send 500,000 Japanese students overseas by 2033 (Davila, 2022; Kakuchi, 2023; Lassegard, 2016), and the "Grand Design for Higher Education toward 2040" (2018 to current) (Ozeki et al., 2023, p. 2). These policies and initiatives aim to prepare and nurture well-rounded students, create a learner-centred environment, develop global mindsets and competencies of students and incorporate international and global teaching pedagogy, curriculum, assessment and learning methodology (Gonzales et al., 2021; Hammond & Radjai, 2022; Ozeki et al., 2023; Yamada, 2022). To provide and implement high-quality teaching pedagogy and curriculum content, Japanese universities hired tertiary educators from overseas (Huang, 2021; Yamada, 2022), with the expectation that educators would: become agents of change, implement international knowledge and skills in Japanese universities (Brotherhood et al., 2020), teach in English (Alhasnawi, 2022; Huang, 2021), build intercultural awareness and competencies (Hammond & Radjai, 2022) and conduct research (Huang, 2018; Huang, 2021).

However, although there is an increasing number of tertiary educators from overseas, several studies have shown that they face difficulties integrating into the Japanese university community (Chen, 2022a; Chen, 2022b; Huang et al., 2019). Furthermore, in recent years, especially after the COVID-19 pandemic, there has been an increasing significance of professional learning and development (PLD) for tertiary educators in Japan. PLD for tertiary educators became significant because there was an urgent need for institutions to develop new teaching methods to allow students to sustain their education when learning via face-to-face was suspended (Al-Naabi et al., 2021; DeVaney et al., 2020; Sotardi & Brogt, 2023). Currently, a vast amount of research is available in the field of PLD (e.g., Cole, 2012; Hargreaves, 2005; Saunders, 2012; Timperley, 2008; Tripp & Rich, 2012; Whitworth & Chiu, 2015), and there has been research regarding the difficulties that tertiary educators from overseas face in becoming involved in Japanese

universities (Chen, 2022a; Huang et al., 2019). However, studies have not explored the IFM's perceptions of PLD in Japanese universities. Furthermore, this research has arisen from my experience of working at a Japanese university alongside tertiary educators from overseas who seemed to lack the motivation for PLD. Therefore, this research used a qualitative case study approach to gain a further understanding of IFM's perceptions and experiences of PLD in Japanese universities. Data for this research were collected through semi-structured one-on-one interviews aiming to gain authentic stories and experiences from IFM within their everyday contexts (Alpi & Evans, 2019; Punch & Oancea, 2014).

Literature Review

Introduction

Extensive research on professional learning and development (PLD) recognises the significance of implementing PLD in education as it leads to positive outcomes for both students and educators (Cole, 2012; Poskitt & Taylor, 2008). Additionally, recent evidence highlights various factors that impede the involvement of tertiary educators from overseas in Japanese universities (Chen, 2022a; Huang et al., 2019). Due to the limited number of works of literature regarding factors that impede the involvement of tertiary educators from overseas in Japanese universities, the literature review extends to recent literature from overseas, such as the United States or the United Kingdom. This literature review will address two main themes: the various characteristics of effective PLD and work and cultural factors that impede the involvement of tertiary educators from overseas in Japanese universities. Although the literature presents various characteristics of effective PLD, this thesis will focus on the professional career stage, communication and collaboration, peer observation and feedback, teacher inquiry, trust and respect, motivation, time, and PLD in Japanese universities. As the research is based in Japan, the scope of the literature for the two themes will also extend to works in the Japanese language.

Characteristics of effective PLD

Professional Learning and Development (PLD) is an increasingly important area to explore in Japanese universities. There is a high demand for tertiary educators to change from a lecture-style teaching method to a more learner-centred approach as a part of the government initiatives (Ozeki et al., 2023) and to adhere to the diverse population of students (Adams et al., 2023). One approach to support tertiary educators during this change is the implementation of various PLD opportunities. Generally, many tertiary educators may experience PLD through opportunities provided by institutions such as universities and organisations where they work. However, Hughes et al. (2022) and Sotardi and Brogt (2023) explain that in tertiary education, PLD sessions are selected by the university, and therefore, PLD sessions may be perceived as irrelevant to the educator since they have not been involved in the decision about the content of their PLD. Similarly, in April 2008, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Japan (MEXT) made PLD mandatory in Japanese universities. The intention of mandatory PLD was to improve education quality and to provide tertiary educators with skills to

become autonomous learners (i.e., problem-solving skills) (National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE), 2014). However, research highlights that top-down implementation of PLD often disregards the educators' needs, and it may not align with the context, reality and beliefs of the educators, which could lead to a decrease in the educator's self-efficacy (Kern & Graber, 2018; Pischetola et al., 2023). Furthermore, top-down decisions by the government and universities may detrimentally influence the tertiary educators' participation rate in PLD, loss of trust in the university, and some may leave the profession as their needs do not align (Hargreaves, 2019).

Studies in adult learning state that effective professional learning occurs when learning is voluntary and autonomous, there is a supportive learning environment, learning is relevant to their needs (Easton, 2008; Gravani, 2012; Poskitt, 2014), and learning occurs through practice in authentic situations (Fenwick & Tennant, 2004). For example, learning can occur when tertiary educators integrate professional learning into current practice and when PLD is offered at the right time with the appropriate resources, ideas and equipment (Duignan et al., 2016). Additionally, studies highlight that approximately 30 or more contact hours are advised for effective learning to take place (Guskey & Yoon, 2009).

Professional Career Stage

However, depending on the tertiary educator's professional stage in their career and age, they may believe that PLD is unnecessary and thus choose not to engage in further learning. For example, tertiary educators at the later stage of their career may reach a status quo and maintain existing and familiar practices as they may believe they cannot make a difference due to lack of time left in their career (Kern & Graber, 2018; Maskit, 2011). In contrast, tertiary educators, directly from their doctorate degree or those recently entering the profession, may be motivated to improve their knowledge, skills and teaching practices. This motivation may derive from their desire to gain acceptance among colleagues and establish job security, motivating tertiary educators to exhibit enthusiasm for learning (Maskit, 2011). Although experienced educators may exhibit a decreased motivation for learning, Hargreaves (2005) notes that experienced educators have a vast amount of experience and knowledge accumulated and built throughout their careers. Therefore, it could be suggested that fostering collaboration and communication

between experienced and new tertiary educators could generate innovative ideas for teaching and learning (Cole, 2012; Poskitt & Taylor, 2008).

Communication and Collaboration

Much literature has investigated the effectiveness of communication and collaboration in PLD. Listening to their colleagues' experiences may allow tertiary educators to broaden their worldviews and could help develop or affirm their deeply held beliefs about teaching and learning. A relatively large body of literature highlights that high-quality learning occurs through collaboration, group work, collegial sharing and suggesting ideas and peer support through observation, feedback and reflection (Berry, 2015; Chaharbashloo et al., 2024; Chester, 2012; Cole, 2012; Duignan et al., 2016; Gast et al., 2017; Hussey et al., 2011; Whitworth & Chiu, 2015). Studies show that meaningful collaborative PLD activities increase teacher self-efficacy, increase confidence, improve teachers' motivation to reflect and make changes to the classroom, and positively impact student achievement (Gast et al., 2017; Harris & Jones, 2017). Furthermore, Chester (2012) adds that when teachers share their teaching and learning ideas, talk about their students and reflect with one another, they will develop greater ownership and responsibility for their teaching and promote an increased sense of collegiality.

However, Gast et al. (2017) state that "working in teams is a fairly new concept for higher education teachers…[and] have generally been neglected thus far" (p.738-739). A possible explanation for this is that tertiary educators' fundamental focus is research, and they are more likely to deliver knowledge through lecturing. Studies state that tertiary educators are less accustomed to talking about their own teaching practice, student learning and outcomes (Gast et al., 2017; Hughes et al., 2022). Additionally, some researchers suggest that tertiary educators may view PLD differently due to their identity as a 'professional' rather than their identity as a 'teacher' (Bolyanatz, 2017; Maurice-Takerei & Anderson, 2013). For example, Bolyanatz (2017) questioned why they are called 'teachers' and believed that the main responsibility of tertiary educators is to deliver information to students and be available as a resource for questions and discussions about their professional area. Manzi and Benet-Martinez (2022) explain that individuals can become comfortable with multiple identities and have better self-regulation once they reach a certain degree of acceptance. Additionally, positive or negative emotions one

experiences in their teaching experience can also influence how an individual perceives themselves (Merkin, 2018).

Moreover, most tertiary educators enter the teaching field after their doctorate or from their professional jobs and are specialists in their specific area (Hughes et al., 2022). They may need more knowledge of educational theory, pedagogy, teaching methodology and practice (Duignan et al., 2016; Maurice-Takerei & Anderson, 2013). Therefore, tertiary educators unfamiliar with sharing ideas or feedback from observations or collaborative work may initially feel anxious. For example, they may not know how to provide and receive constructive feedback without causing harm to others (Chester, 2012) or become hesitant to share their concerns as it may be perceived as fear of losing the respect of their colleagues (Hughes et al., 2022). However, literature about collaboration and communication in the tertiary education sector also emphasises the effectiveness of teamwork. For example, community building with other faculty members in other departments built a sense of belonging and connection (Al-Naabi et al., 2021; Steinert et al., 2016), gain an open mindset to critical feedback (Hughes et al., 2022), gain wider connections for research collaborations (Gast et al., 2017; Yoon & Hong, 2022) and colleagues can support each other to embrace and adapt to change (Chaharbashloo et al., 2024).

However, further studies show that an individual's values, thoughts, or cultural habits that were believed to be the norm can vary depending on the social context or environment. For example, when residing in another country, people tend to adjust their beliefs, how they speak or behave and their perception of self to 'fit in' to the cultural context (Moran & Abramson, 2017). Additionally, the social and cultural context can influence our gestures, facial expressions, language, the values we want to teach students, and even how we view the distance between people (University of Minnesota, 2016). Furthermore, people also desire to make meaning of the situation and validate their understanding of the world through communicating and engaging with others (Simko & Olick, 2021; Vaughn, 2019). However, Nishikawa's (2020) study revealed that in Japanese universities, communication was not a prevalent practice between the tertiary educators in Japan. This may be due to the difference in the meaning of communication and collaboration. For example, collaboration is typically considered to be about discussing together with colleagues to "report, communicate and consult" before making a final decision (Himeno,

2021, para. 1), and communication usually occurs when a mistake is discovered; while silence is an indication that one's performance is deemed satisfactory (Barton, 2016). Furthermore, the Japanese language itself is indirect, leading Japanese people to be hesitant to offer direct critical feedback (Butch, 2024). Therefore, for tertiary educators to adjust and avoid conflict, they may change their way of communication or collaboration to reduce stress and meet social standards of the working environment (Eaude, 2020; Graham, 2022; Merkin, 2018; Torabian, 2022).

Observation and Feedback

Another significant feature of PLD is the value and benefits of peer observation and feedback for tertiary educators. Through peer observation and feedback, tertiary educators can identify areas of improvement, learn about other's teaching practices (Hendry & Oliver, 2012; McDaniel et al., 2019) and increase motivation and strengthen their sense of self-efficacy through vicarious experiences (Hammersley & Orsmond, 2004; Hendry & Oliver, 2012). Although there are benefits to peer observation and feedback, there are concerns regarding the purpose of the observation results. For example, in many tertiary sectors, peer observation and feedback mainly serve for tertiary educators' appraisals and involve observations by senior management. Tertiary educators may feel anxious as they find themselves in the spotlight and alter their usual teaching behaviour or actions to gain a better evaluation (Bell & Cooper, 2013; Hammersley & Orsmond, 2004; Ngubane & Gumede, 2017). Additionally, concerns are raised about the lack of confidentiality, the discomfort of receiving and giving feedback to colleagues, non-specific feedback and insufficient time to listen, accept and implement feedback to practice (Bell & Cooper, 2013; Hammersley & Orsmond, 2004; McDaniel et al., 2019; Shortland, 2004).

Therefore, as an initial step, tertiary educators can learn by observing their own teaching through video recordings; a practice that may be rare in tertiary education (Tripp & Rich, 2012). Observation of one's teaching can help tertiary educators notice their deeply held assumptions about teaching, identify their strengths and weaknesses, recognise their gaps and compare their teaching with past videos to gain a sense that their teaching has improved (Tripp & Rich, 2012). This may decrease the sense of being judged and protect their confidentiality from other faculty members. In both peer and self-observation of teaching, tertiary educators may need to establish a shared understanding of the purpose of observation and feedback. To build this understanding,

special workshops can facilitate learning and tertiary educators can practice observing and giving constructive feedback to others (Bell & Cooper, 2013; Hammersley & Orsmond, 2004). Additionally, tertiary educators could adequately prepare for observation, develop their ability to 'notice' and allocate time for post-sessions to gain optimal benefit from observation and feedback (Russell, 2013; Sherin et al., 2021).

Teacher Inquiry

In contrast, tertiary educators may highlight strengths in teacher inquiry as tertiary educators are professionals in research. Currently, the need for evidence-based learning is increasing for school teachers and tertiary educators in Japan (Colby & Hill, 2016; Ozeki et al., 2023). Through engagement in inquiry, educators will ask questions about their teaching, gather and analyse evidence and present and share the data with their colleagues (Clayton & Kilbane, 2016). Currently, Japanese universities are leveraging the expertise of tertiary educators in research by implementing a practice known as "Institutional Research (IR)" as a part of the "Quality Assurance in Japanese Higher Education Policy" (Yamada, 2016, p. 25). According to the National Institution for Academic Degrees and Quality Enhancement of Higher Education (2021), IR refers to a system in "which a higher education institution gathers, researches and analyses information in a systematic and centralised manner. The purpose of this practice is to provide information that will support institutional planning, policymaking and decision-making relating to education and research" (para. 2). The university, tertiary educators, and staff will gather, analyse and reflect on student data such as student feedback and course grades to identify the professional learning needs of the tertiary educators and to improve the educational system of the university (Kansai University of International Studies, 2024). Teacher inquiry could lead to the development of one's professional practice, promote sustained learning, engage teachers to be reflective learners and positively influence student achievement (Clayton & Kilbane, 2016; Gillis & Mitton-Kükner, 2019). However, teacher inquiry may differ from academic research as teacher inquiry focuses on critically reflecting and questioning own teaching practices and student achievement (Clayton & Kilbane, 2016; Colby & Hill, 2016; Gillis & Mitton-Kükner, 2019).

Trust and Respect

It is important to note that trust and respect are necessary for communication, collaboration, observation, feedback and teacher inquiry (Al-Naabi et al., 2021; Steinert et al., 2016). Trust and respect are foundational for educators to believe that their peers will respect and support their honest opinions (Timperley, 2008). Furthermore, studies identify that developing trust and mutual respect among educators increased motivation and enthusiasm for learning and fostered innovation (Frost et al., 2009; Hughes et al., 2022; Steinert et al., 2016). Building a positive learning community can help educators feel further connected to the university and increase their motivation to develop their teaching practices, suggest changes in the curriculum or establish PLD programmes at their university (Steinert et al., 2016). However, building trust and respect may be difficult for tertiary educators as the work conditions differ from school teachers. For example, it is common for tertiary educators to be on sabbatical leave for research, meaning that they will not be present for a significant portion of the time (Gast et al., 2017), short-term contract restrictions, heavy teaching loads (Brotherhood et al., 2020; Chen, 2022a) and the significant change of their role from a lecturer to an educator (Gast et al., 2017; Sotardi & Brogt, 2023). These factors may hinder their ability to invest in time to build trust and respect as well as gaining the motivation to collaborate with others.

Motivation to Participate in PLD

Furthermore, studies of PLD in higher education commonly state the importance of rewarding tertiary educators by recognising their innovation and achievement (Chaharbashloo et al., 2024; Duignan et al., 2016; Steinert et al., 2016). Universities could consider recognising tertiary educator involvement in the university by providing them with the opportunity to lead PLD sessions, granting tenure or academic positions, gaining grants or allocating dedicated time in the schedule to participate in PLD (Hughes et al., 2022; Steinert et al., 2016). Harlen (2012) states that motivation is the "engine" (p.171) that can drive tertiary educators to invest time and effort to act, such as participating in PLD. Motivation is driven by two types of motivation: extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. Extrinsic motivation pertains to the behaviours driven by the desire to attain the reward (e.g., certification). On the other hand, intrinsic motivation stems from self-interest and satisfaction, which can lead to sustained learning (Harlen, 2012; Harlen & Crick, 2003; Hidi & Harackiewicz, 2000). Although studies have stated that intrinsic motivation is

comparatively 'better' than extrinsic motivation, combining both types of motivation is necessary for increased learning of tertiary educators (Harlen, 2012).

However, incentives may pose a challenge as Japanese universities may lack government funds or voluntary donations by alums, individuals or organisations (Hornyak, 2017). Furthermore, incentives to tertiary educators in Japan are "often only extended to the graduates of the respective institutions, creating lifelong educators at one institution" (Nishikawa, 2020, p. 46). Moreover, as tertiary educators are typically research-oriented, they may prioritise gaining incentives for writing publications over enhancing teaching practices (Amano & Poole, 2005; Gast et al., 2017). Whilst providing incentives or rewards may be difficult for tertiary educators, Japanese universities must recognise the efforts of tertiary educators who are endeavouring to change teaching and learning, inspire others with innovative ideas and be part of the internationalisation of Japanese universities (Duignan et al., 2016; Lassegard, 2016).

Differences between PL and PD

Overall, studies concerning effective PLD and adult learning highlight that effective learning involves features of teacher-centred learning relevant to their daily teaching practices, provides opportunities for collaborative learning, undertaking ongoing feedback, reflection, change and implementation and becoming engaged in inquiry-oriented practices (Colby & Hill, 2016; Cole, 2012; Poskitt, 2014). These features are commonly referred to as professional learning (PL) in the literature (Poskitt, 2014). On the other hand, the term professional development (PD) describes learning opportunities through lectures, presentations by an external expert or one-off workshops (Cirkony et al., 2024). The word 'development' may imply that teachers need to be developed or improved by someone else (Cirkony et al., 2024; Easton, 2008). PD is generally delivered to pass new knowledge to the teachers in the short term, and sessions are pre-planned (Easton, 2008; Poskitt, 2014). For tertiary educators, given that the most common teaching method in universities is lectures, many learn by observing how their lecturers teach in universities. They may be familiar with receiving knowledge from the educational expert rather than engaging in finding personal interests and relevance (Adams et al., 2023; Hughes et al., 2022). Nevertheless, PD is also a necessary aspect for tertiary educators to develop their educational knowledge and skills through professional readings and outside experts to raise their

awareness of how students learn and gain knowledge in educational theory, pedagogy and practice through outside experts (Adams et al., 2023; Al-Naabi et al., 2021; Duignan et al., 2016; Frost et al., 2009; Gast et al., 2017; Hughes et al., 2022; Maurice-Takerei & Anderson, 2013; Poskitt, 2014). Subsequently, when the tertiary educator gains educational knowledge, the focus could shift towards implementing collaborative, teacher-centred and reflective professional learning opportunities.

Both PL and PD share a common goal to improve tertiary educator's teaching and learning knowledge and skills. Therefore, it is essential to offer various learning opportunities through PLD as deeply rooted tacit knowledge about teaching and learning is challenging to change. Studies specific to tertiary educators' PLD identified the necessity for designated time (Duignan et al., 2016; Ghasemi et al., 2023), open communication with the university senior management (Sotardi & Brogt, 2023), implementing reward systems (i.e., promotion, lead PLD sessions) (Chaharbashloo et al., 2024; Duignan et al., 2016; Hughes et al., 2022) and individual support (Chaharbashloo et al., 2024; Koellner et al., 2024). Additionally, tertiary educators must strive to understand that reflecting on and questioning one's practice can support open-mindedness in new learning (Chaharbashloo et al., 2024; Stone, 2010).

Faculty Development in Japanese Universities

However, in Japanese universities, PLD activities are commonly referred to as 'faculty development' (FD). Japanese universities abide by the Standards for Establishments of Universities (SEU), legislation stipulating the curriculum, faculty members' teaching hours and student-teacher ratios (Amano & Poole, 2005). According to Negishi (2018), FD is mandated for implementation in Japanese universities as stated in the SEU. Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Japan (MEXT) (2003) defines FD as comprehending knowledge of the university philosophy and goals, enhancing research, teaching and administration skills and improving the quality of their profession. For example, FD in Japanese universities include workshops to learn about the big picture of Japanese universities (educational law, university standards, philosophy, etc.), support or mentor programmes to improve teaching methods, class evaluation by students, supportive system for research and self-evaluation activities (MEXT,

2003). Other FD opportunities also include mandatory lectures, workshops, class evaluations and class observations set by the university (Suzuki, 2013).

In a nationwide survey conducted by MEXT, 763 out of 786 Japanese universities responded, revealing that 77% of Japanese universities implemented FD in 2019 (MEXT, 2021; Ozeki et al., 2023). The main purpose for FD was to improve content and teaching practices (59%; 450 universities), develop the curriculum and educational system (22%; 171 universities) and evaluate faculty member's performance and activities (11%; 84 universities). Most FD were provided through lectures (62%; 474 universities), following peer class observations and evaluations (53%; 403 universities) and workshops to improve teaching practices (50%; 377 universities) (MEXT, 2021; Ozeki et al., 2023). Additionally, this survey indicates that 52% (396) universities have tenured faculty members attending 75% to 99% of the set FD programmes (MEXT, 2021). The high implementation rate of FD in Japanese universities and the high number of lecture-type FD may be due to the top-down approaches as governmental grants are awarded to encourage further implementation of FD in the universities (Roloff Rothman, 2020). In Japanese universities, the word 'training' appears to be commonly used for FD, and FD appears to lean towards professional development characteristics. Additionally, there is a preference for top-down approaches, evident in implementing various national-level educational policies and governmental initiatives by Japanese universities (Roloff Rothman, 2020).

However, although Japanese universities provide workshops to discuss teaching practices (MEXT, 2021; Ozeki et al., 2023), the concept of a 'workshop' may be interpreted differently in actual practice. For example, workshops in Japanese universities tend to "focus on mechanics of teaching and less on methodology or practices" (Roloff Rothman, 2020, p. 312). Moreover, although the MEXT definition of FD mentions the 'support or mentor' programmes, it seems that tertiary educators from overseas are treated differently. This may be due to the Japanese universities' perception of tertiary educators from overseas as a 'temporary visitor' status. Because they are assumed to have a short-term contract with the university, they may be excluded from important opportunities, such as the support or mentoring system (Brotherhood et al., 2020; Green, 2022; Nishikawa, 2020). However, tertiary educators from overseas who are entering the education field directly after their doctorate or professional job may need one-on-

one mentoring support from an experienced tertiary educator or an induction programme set by the university (Maskit, 2011; Maurice-Takerei & Anderson, 2013). Mentoring can assist in gaining an understanding of the socio and educational culture in Japan (Boafo-Arthur & Tsevi, 2022), the sense of relief that there will be a designated go-to person in need of support (Crasborn et al., 2008), assisting in navigating through the initial teaching and adapting to Japanese experiences and facilitates the development of pedagogical teaching practices (Castañeda-Londoño, 2017). There is a consensus in the literature that university support systems are essential to ensure the widespread and inclusive implementation of PLD (Chaharbashloo et al., 2024; Koellner et al., 2024).

Sufficient Time for PLD

Although PLD implementation and engagement are vital, tertiary educators require sufficient and flexible time to learn new knowledge and skills, implement them in the classrooms and reflect on their practices. Thus, tertiary educators should be provided with more informal sessions, create 'bite-sized' sessions or provide hybrid type PLD (i.e., a mixture of online and in-person PLD) (Al-Naabi et al., 2021; Chaharbashloo et al., 2024; Cole, 2012; Ghasemi et al., 2023; Gravani, 2012). It is important to note that having sufficient time to acquire new educational knowledge and skills, implementing them into practice, receiving feedback and reflecting on this learning process helps tertiary educators to become observant of their own teaching beliefs and practices and further increase their productivity to work on other activities (Poskitt, 2014; Steinert et al., 2016).

Overall, the literature indicates the value and significance of PLD for tertiary educators and Japanese universities. Previous studies have established that the key features of effective PLD include; creating meaningful communication and collaborative opportunities (Chester, 2012; Gast et al., 2017; Koellner et al., 2024; Pischetola et al., 2023; Scott et al., 2023), sustained and short sessions (Al-Naabi et al., 2021; Easton, 2008; Poskitt, 2014; Sotardi & Brogt, 2023), peer observation and feedback (Bell & Cooper, 2013; McDaniel et al., 2019) and continuous reflection and questioning of their teaching and learning (Chaharbashloo et al., 2024; Gillis & Mitton-Kükner, 2019; Rix & Paige-Smith, 2011). Despite the high value of PLD, studies highlight that the interpretation of PLD may differ in Japanese universities. Therefore, tertiary

educators from overseas may need more motivation to attend PLD in Japanese universities due to the unfamiliarity of PLD compared to their previous experiences. The next section will discuss the aspects of overseas tertiary educators' participation in Japanese universities.

Faculty and International Faculty Member Terminology

Before delving into the next section, it is essential to clarify the terminology used in the section, as the meaning of the words may differ between contexts and countries. In New Zealand, the word 'faculty' is commonly used to describe an academic unit with different departments (e.g., Faculty of Education). However, in Japanese universities, tertiary educators (professors, lecturers and teachers) are commonly referred to as 'faculty'. To ensure clarity and reduce confusion with the New Zealand term, hereafter, the term 'faculty member' (FM) will be used to refer to all tertiary educators in the context of Japan and 'international faculty members' (IFM) will refer to a non-Japanese tertiary educator teaching at a Japanese university. The word 'international faculty' is a commonly used term in higher education literature (Huang, 2018; Nishikawa, 2020), and the word 'international' is used to convey the diverse backgrounds and identities of the IFM.

International Faculty Members in Japanese Universities

Many IFM from diverse demographic backgrounds with varying cultural and educational values, beliefs and experiences have recently been hired to work in Japanese universities. Currently, there are 14,573 IFM out of 201,693 full-time faculty members working in Japanese universities, accounting for 7% of the total number of faculty members (MEXT, 2023). This figure steadily increased from a decade ago when there were 12,424 IFM (MEXT, 2013). IFM are hired to become agents of change to improve universities' global rankings by contributing to research and promoting internationalisation in education (Chen, 2023). Despite the steady increase in IFM, several studies have shown that many IFM struggle to integrate into the Japanese university community and that work and cultural factors impeded the integration of IFM into Japanese universities (Chen, 2022a; Chen, 2022b; Huang et al., 2019).

Work-related Factors

Firstly, work-related factors include insecurity of fixed-term contracts, limited opportunities for professional activities, and higher teaching loads compared to their Japanese colleagues. Although Japanese universities are hiring IFM for their value, knowledge and innovative ideas, IFM perceived the reason for their hire was for them to become a symbolic representation of the internationalisation scheme of Japanese universities (Brotherhood et al., 2020). This perception was notably identified among the IFM, who have Western appearances, making it apparent to local and international stakeholders, such as the prospective students, that the university offers English courses and is on board with the internationalisation initiatives (Brotherhood et al., 2020; Brown, 2019). The perceptions that Japanese universities possess regarding IFM may potentially lead them to leave the country or their jobs as they may perceive that their skills, knowledge and experiences are not valued for the university (Huang et al., 2019).

Additionally, IFM have an increased teaching load compared to their Japanese colleagues (Chen, 2022a). According to Williams (2019), in Japan, faculty members usually teach classes for 28-30 weeks (over one year), spread out over four days per week with one ‘research day’. Some universities require faculty members to be present at work even on non-teaching days. Full-time IFM in Japanese universities usually teach 7.5 hours per week for one semester (15 weeks), which is more than the tertiary educators in the United States who teach two courses per year (Watanabe, 2011). Moreover, if the university is research-oriented, IFM’s workload and responsibilities may be inundated with both teaching and research work with no capacity for additional activities (Sotardi & Brogt, 2023). Huang (2018) further adds that the IFM may experience heavier teaching responsibilities depending on their varying purpose of employment and their nationality. For example, Huang (2018) found that most IFM are from China, Korea, the US and the United Kingdom (UK). IFM from China and Korea usually hold doctorate degrees with a high level of Japanese language proficiency, tend to focus on research activities and engage in similar responsibilities as their Japanese colleagues. In contrast, IFM from the USA and UK are usually master's degree holders with a lower level of Japanese language proficiency, mainly hired to focus on language teaching, such as English and have an increased teaching load. However, as all other nationalities were placed into the ‘other’ group, it is difficult to identify that the varying responsibilities by nationality apply to all IFM. As a result of the

work-related factors, IFM may experience elevated anxiety levels, display reluctance to interact with colleagues as they anticipate their departure from the job, focus solely on fulfilling minimum responsibilities rather than committing to other university matters (e.g., involvement in committees or meetings) and decrease motivation to update further their current knowledge and skills (Brotherhood et al., 2020; Chen, 2022a; Chen, 2023).

Cultural Factors

Secondly, cultural factors that impede the integration of IFM include lack of Japanese language proficiency (Chen, 2022b). Studies indicate that Japanese language proficiency for IFM is a fundamental skill required to work in Japanese universities for a prolonged period of time, to be involved in meetings and committees and for teacher appraisal and promotion (Chen, 2022b; Green, 2022). Given that the majority of university affairs are conducted in Japanese, if IFM are aspiring for promotion (i.e., tenured positions, leadership roles) and deeper involvement in matters beyond teaching, then it is highly recommended that the IFM acquire the Japanese language (Green, 2022). Chen (2022a) found that IFM are expected to be proficient in both Japanese and English, and those who had resided in Japan in the past did not face challenges in the language or culture. Furthermore, Roloff Rothman (2020) explains that most English-related PLD sessions are about enhancing the English language skills of Japanese faculty members. Additionally, while a few PLD sessions are conducted in English, the descriptions and instructions are only in Japanese, making it challenging for IFM to comprehend the content and requirements (Roloff Rothman, 2020).

Proficiency in the Japanese Language

Studies indicate the significance of acquiring the Japanese language, however it is not required when hiring IFM (Chen, 2022a; Huang, 2018). This is due to the growth of the various English medium courses to accommodate the increasing enrolment of international students in Japanese universities. Therefore, the Japanese language may seem unnecessary for IFM in the workplace (Nishikawa, 2020). However, new findings in IFM provide a broader perspective of language concerns that were also raised in English-speaking countries. For example, African faculty members in US universities were expected to spend more time improving their English, preparing for classes and writing papers for publication (Boafo-Arthur & Tsevi, 2022); Chinese

faculty members with over a decade of teaching experience in US universities, also encountered English misunderstandings when giving feedback to students. The feedback provided to the student was unclear, causing misunderstandings and negatively affecting the relationship between the student and faculty member (Hu & Chen, 2022).

Non-verbal Cues in Communication

Furthermore, faculty members from Korea, Japan, India, the Philippines and China found that their accents negatively affected the student evaluation results (Amos, 2022; Liang, 2022). Similarly, Lee (2022) writes that faculty members from East Asia, Africa and Arab are less likely to raise their concerns to their seniors and administrators due to the "respect your elders" (p.165) values which are different to the Western (e.g., European, Latin American and North American) ways of communication. Furthermore, faculty members from East Asia and Africa tend not to look people in the eye as it is a sign of disrespect. In contrast, in the Western context, not maintaining eye contact during communication may lead to faculty members perceiving that one is concealing information or that they are not paying attention (Lee, 2022). Therefore, the differences in language and nonverbal cues among IFM of diverse backgrounds may lead to misunderstandings and miscommunications with Japanese universities and colleagues.

The Western Teaching Ideal

However, to further internationalisation efforts, many universities in Japan are incorporating English as the main medium of instruction (EMI) in their courses and reforming their curriculum to reflect this change (Alhasnawi, 2022; Davila, 2022; Huang, 2021; Lassegard, 2016). Japanese universities expect the IFM to enhance students' intercultural awareness and global mindsets through the English-based curriculum and courses (Hammond & Radjai, 2022). However, Hammond and Radjai (2022) add that most of the IFM in Japan are either not familiar with the term internationalisation because it does not relate to their course, or they already believe that their course, which covers global and international topics, does not require further development to enhance students' intercultural awareness and competencies. This may suggest that some IFM believe that further development of their teaching pedagogy is unnecessary as it is their responsibility to introduce Western teaching knowledge, which they view as the ideal. As a

result, the IFM may not see the need to update further or improve their teaching instruction (Eppolite & Burford, 2022).

Currently, in Japanese universities, there is a move towards implementing Western ways of education in the university curriculum, teaching values, teaching pedagogy, learning strategies and assessment strategies mainly deriving from the US or the UK (Amos, 2022; Casinder, 2014; Ota, 2018; Shrestha & Khanal, 2016). Several researchers identify a concern that there is a tendency to believe that Western teaching values and beliefs are superior and mainstream for quality education (Eppolite & Burford, 2022; Erdman, 2017; Graham, 2022; Ota, 2018; Shrestha & Khanal, 2016). As a result, while implementing Western teaching knowledge and practices, IFM may experience tension or discomfort between what they believe teaching and learning to be the norm in their own culture and what is considered the norm in Japan. Vaughn (2019) states that depending on the IFM's country of origin, their behaviour, shared thoughts, emotions and personalities can differ amongst cultures. Several studies have revealed that in each country, region and community, a preferred or desired way of thinking exists, and these collective thoughts, concepts, and beliefs tend to become accepted as the norm to maintain balance and harmony (Casinder, 2014; Erdman, 2017; Graham, 2022). If people fail to adapt to the norm, it becomes challenging to continue their daily activities (Graham, 2022). However, in education, there is an assumption that students, educators and staff operate with a single way of thinking regardless of one's cultural background (Casinder, 2014). This means that it is vital for IFM to recognise and become aware of their underlying cultural values as this may influence teachers' interpretations in the classroom and response to the students and their teaching instructions both consciously and unconsciously (Cabiles, 2021; Dreher et al., 2021; Graham, 2022).

Insider vs Outsider Values

Another cultural aspect that impedes the IFM involvement in Japanese universities is the concept of 'insider (uchi) and outsider (soto)' values (Green, 2022). Green (2022) describes the concept as "close internal group relations (uchi), along with an avoidance of outsiders (soto)" (p. 143). In Japan, people from overseas are often perceived as outsiders and Japanese people tend to use formal language and speak in an ambiguous manner to respect the 'temporary visitor' (Green, 2022; Nakata, 2014). As such, the IFM may also be perceived as a 'temporary visitor' as non-

tenured teaching positions in Japanese universities are typically between one to five years with or without opportunity for tenure (Nishikawa, 2020). Due to this perception, IFM may feel excluded from important announcements, meetings or decision-making roles and communications from the Japanese university may sound ambiguous and unclear (Brotherhood et al., 2020; Green, 2022; Nishikawa, 2020).

One concern of the 'outsider' value is that IFM may be at risk of isolation as a means of self-protection and to save face from others due to language and cultural tensions and misunderstandings (Chen, 2022b; Merkin, 2018; Roloff Rothman, 2020). For example, this arises from the belief that these conflicts could decline their scholarly reputation and influence their appraisal results (Chen, 2022a). Furthermore, Japanese universities may perceive the IFM's behaviour of isolation as a lack of willingness to communicate and engage with others (Chen, 2022b). As a result, this may lead to the impression that IFM are not interested in university matters and, therefore, not suitable for other positions in the university (e.g., proposing changes to the curriculum or becoming a leader for PLD) (Roloff Rothman, 2020). On the other hand, studies show that IFM with a higher Japanese language proficiency were further involved in the university's activities and communicating with their Japanese colleagues (Chen, 2022a; Huang et al., 2019).

However, further research states that the sense of being an 'outsider' is also evident in US universities where rural areas have an "ingroup culture" (Lee, 2022, p. 166). Other faculty members in US universities also felt a "sense of foreignness…struggle with the idea of fitting in" (Hu & Chen, 2022, p. 66). Hu and Chen (2022) describe that faculty members from overseas may experience a sense of being an outsider due to the lack of educational knowledge of the host country, limited understanding of linguistic nuances and unfamiliarity with the organisational culture. These barriers often lead to the reluctance of faculty members to socialise with others and be left to solve problems independently (Boafo-Arthur & Tsevi, 2022; Chen, 2022a; Liang, 2022). Glass et al. (2022) state that the issue of isolation can lead to a decrease in motivation, self-efficacy, creativity and productivity and diminished job satisfaction. However, the existing literature on cultural and language issues in other countries mainly focuses on US universities. This may be due to the high number of faculty members from overseas working in the US. For

example, between 2018-2019, approximately 98,130 faculty members from overseas were hired at US universities (Alberts & Hazen, 2022).

Experiences of Female FM and IFM

Furthermore, some authors in the Western context attempted to explore the perspectives of Asian women faculty members who are teaching in universities. Yoon and Hong's (2022) study of Asian female scholars in US universities demonstrates that many Asian female faculty members are disadvantaged through stereotypical perceptions. For example, they are viewed as non-threatening, compliant, always smiling, often viewed as housewives with low English-speaking ability or even mistaken for post-graduate students. Another account of an experience in a US university was that the faculty members felt they had lower status than their peers and could not participate in discussions or meetings (Hu & Chen, 2022). Liang (2022) also observed that Asian women faculty members tend to experience heightened anxiety and discomfort when negotiating for leave and workloads for the reasons of caring for their family or children. This is similar to Japan, where faculty members are predominantly male, and it is rare for female faculty members to occupy leadership positions (The University of Tokyo, 2021).

Value of IFM

Perera and Greenidge (2022) emphasise the need for universities to raise cultural awareness and appreciation through learning about diversity and for IFM to create groups to work together and support each other in the teaching journey. Recent evidence suggests that diversity can bring positive opportunities for Japanese students, faculty members, staff and IFM to widen their perspectives and benefit the IFM's development of intercultural awareness and career (Alhasnawi, 2022; Chen, 2022b). Furthermore, previous studies have found that for IFM to gain value in the experience, they should develop or upskill their intercultural skills by being involved in PLD opportunities (Adams et al., 2023; Coryell et al., 2022; Hammond & Radjai, 2022). Despite the various challenges in work, cultural and language factors IFM can bring many positive aspects to the university. For example, gaining a breadth of knowledge in educational pedagogy and practices, the enriched experience of diversity in the workplace (Boafo-Arthur & Tsevi, 2022), build global networks for further collaboration in research (Locke & Marini, 2021;

Roloff Rothman, 2020; Yoon & Hong, 2022), secure funding and grants from the government (Lin et al., 2022) and introduce a new perspective to knowledge, skills and teaching.

Chapter Summary

Overall, this literature review aimed to explore the literature regarding the various characteristics of PLD and the work and cultural factors that impede the involvement of IFM in Japanese universities. Research on PLD indicates that diverse features of PLD have positive outcomes for tertiary educators. For example, communication, collaboration, observation, feedback, and teacher inquiry can enhance tertiary educators' self-efficacy, confidence, sustained engagement in learning, and motivation to change their teaching practices. However, the literature states that PLD engagement may be new to tertiary educators as they are not often trained as teachers and possess limited knowledge of educational theory, pedagogy and practice. Additionally, literature states that PLD in Japanese universities is typically experienced through mandatory lectures and class observations. Although PLD is highly valued in education, studies highlight that the interpretation of PLD may differ for both tertiary educators and Japanese universities.

Moreover, the research on IFM highlights that insecurity of contracts, increased teaching and research loads, Japanese language proficiency, and outsider values impede IFM's involvement in Japanese universities. The literature states that these barriers limit IFM's involvement in broader university matters; they are reluctant to communicate with other colleagues and have limited professional opportunities (i.e., research collaborations, promotion). However, it remains uncertain whether the difficulties in integration also impact the IFM's engagement in PLD. Furthermore, much of the current literature pays particular attention to the significant integration of IFM into Japanese and US universities in terms of becoming integrated into the university organisation. Therefore, the current thesis aims to examine the integration of IFM from a teaching and learning perspective, delving into IFM's perceptions and experiences of PLD in Japanese universities.

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter will begin by revisiting the research aims and the relevant research question. Subsequently, this chapter will discuss the research design, data collection methods, sampling, ethical considerations and data analysis procedures. Finally, this chapter will conclude with a summary of the methods and themes identified in this chapter.

Research Aims and Question

This study aimed to investigate and explore the current position of PLD for IFM in Japanese universities. Therefore, the following research question guided this research:

- How do international faculty members (IFM) in Japanese universities perceive their Professional Learning and Development (PLD) experiences?

Research Design

Since there is minimal research literature on the PLD experiences of IFM in Japanese Universities, a research design was needed that would enable investigation of the experiences of participants from their perspectives. Furthermore, the design would need to encompass the natural setting of the university, and in particular, Japanese university settings. Case study design aligned with these requirements because it involves research in an authentic natural setting where a phenomenon can be investigated within a specific context and time frame, person, events, incidents or country (Alpi & Evans, 2019; Bhebhe et al., 2015; Punch & Oancea, 2014).

This study used a case study design with the qualitative method of one-on-one semi-structured interviews because this method poses open-ended questions to enable participants to respond from their own experiences and perspectives (Punch & Oancea, 2014). The participants were interviewed about their experiences (involvement in professional learning and development) within a specific setting (Japanese university), and this is an area that has not been comprehensively studied in the past. Furthermore, case studies in education can allow institutions to develop and implement new policies and provide teachers with insights into other teacher's experiences (Mills et al., 2010).

However, research raises concerns regarding generalisability in case studies as the research cannot draw assumptions from one case (Punch & Oancea, 2014). Merriam and Grenier (2019) state that generalisability derives from the positivist view that research findings can be generalised numerically (i.e., statistical data), which can be applied to the broader population. However, Punch and Oancea (2014) explain that for case studies, "it is not the main intention of such a study to generalise, but rather to understand this case in its complexity and its entirety, as well as in its context" (p. 151). A common concept in qualitative research regarding generalisation is transferability. This refers to the notion that future researchers can utilise and refer to the findings from this study in their own contexts or research (Merriam & Grenier, 2019; Schoch, 2020). To ensure that the findings from this research are transferrable, identifying and describing clear boundaries, objectives, research questions, data collection, and analysis procedures are essential for case study design (Merriam & Grenier, 2019; Mills et al., 2010; Punch & Oancea, 2014). Thus, these aspects will be stated in the upcoming sections.

At the initial planning stage, this study aimed to use a mixed methods design to gain a comprehensive understanding of IFM's perceptions of PLD and its relationship to Hofstede's National Six Dimensions of Culture (Power Distance, Individualism, Motivation towards Achievement and Success, Uncertainty Avoidance, Long Term Orientation and Indulgence) (Hofstede Insights, 2024) through individual interviews and surveys. A convergent parallel mixed methods design was planned, in which qualitative and quantitative data would be collected in parallel, analysed separately and then merged. Given the limited study regarding IFM's perceptions of PLD, a convergent parallel mixed methods design was planned to understand the current situation of IFM by utilising the strengths of both the qualitative and quantitative methods (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017). Qualitative data was planned to be collected through one-on-one interviews, and in the quantitative phase, an online survey using a 7-point Likert scale was planned to explore which cultural aspects influence the participation of PLD in Japanese universities based on Hofstede's National Dimensions of Culture. However, I could not pursue the mixed methods design due to challenges in locating contact information for IFM in Japanese universities and unanticipated implicit cultural barriers like gatekeeping

restrictions (evident in no response from the universities or organisations and limited response from participants).

Data Collection Methods

This case study was situated in universities across Japan and specifically focused on international faculty members (IFM). In Japan, there are 47 prefectures (the term 'prefecture' is similar to a 'state' in the United States). Each prefecture has a local public university and numerous other private universities (Huang & Chen, 2021). This study focused on public and private universities across Japan to comprehensively understand the PLD situation with IFM. A semi-structured one-on-one interview method was selected to better understand each participant's experiences within their context (Punch & Oancea, 2014). The participants were given the option to be interviewed either in Japanese or English through the information sheet. However, all participants requested to be interviewed in English.

Additionally, through a semi-structured interview, questions could be added or adapted depending on the interview context (the interview questions are available in Appendix C and can also be found in Table 3 later in this chapter). I also took notes during the interview to ask additional questions. All interviews were conducted via the Microsoft Teams online platform due to travel constraints and time efficiency for both the researcher and the participant. Follow-up questions were asked via email. The duration of the interview varied between 40 minutes to 1 hour and 30 minutes, depending on the participants. To ensure the accuracy of the interview data, all interviews were recorded and transcribed automatically using the Microsoft Word 'Transcribe' feature. The transcribed data was checked with the recording to ensure that there were no errors. Additionally, all interview participants were offered the option to check the transcript. Accordingly, two participants requested the check and confirmed their interviews were accurately transcribed.

Sampling

The criteria for selecting the participants were identified in reference to Chen's (2022a) study:

1. Full-time international faculty members
2. International faculty members who do not hold Japanese passports or citizenship
3. International faculty members who are educated at primary (elementary) and college (middle school to high school) outside of Japan
4. International faculty members currently residing in Japan
5. International faculty members' ability to communicate in English or Japanese

This study used various participant recruitment methods such as Facebook announcements, contacting the PLD Centres in Japanese universities to share the participant recruitment information sheet (contacted 24 universities in which contact details were available online), searching and contacting individual faculty members through J-Global: a researcher database site in Japan (contacted 200 potential participants) and snowball sampling by reaching out to a colleague and inviting them to pass on the participant information sheet. During the data collection process, to ensure that the study could recruit sufficient participants, the criteria were modified to include those participants who had previously worked as full-time faculty in Japanese universities and the criteria of 'international faculty members currently residing in Japan' was removed.

Table 1. Outline of participants

No.	Ethnic background	Total duration of residence in Japan	Teaching experience in Japanese universities
FM1	European	39 years	Yes
FM2	Asian	8 years	Yes
FM3	Middle Eastern/Latin American/African	13 years	Yes *From doctorate
FM4	European	25 years	Yes
FM5	Middle Eastern/Latin American/African	10 years	Yes *From doctorate
FM6	European	17 years	Yes
FM7	European	7 years	Yes *New to the profession
FM8	European	30 years	Yes

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with eight international faculty members from varying ethnic backgrounds (Asian, European and Middle Eastern/Latin American/African). Most participants initially started their jobs in Japan through the support of government initiatives (i.e., Japan Exchange and Teaching Programme (JET) or scholarships) and entered the university teaching profession after completion of the programme. Other participants came to Japan for other purposes, such as visas or securing a job in Japan. The length of time that participants had been living in Japan ranged from seven to 39 years. Additionally, the participants' teaching experience varied from those who entered the university teaching profession after their doctorate to those with prior experience teaching in schools. The smallness of the IFM community may allow for specific identification and therefore to ensure the confidentiality of the participants (Tolich & Davidson, 1999), all identifiable data (i.e., names of universities, participants' names, places) have been deleted from the interview and transcript data and all participants' names were replaced with a number (e.g., FM1) (Bhandari, 2022).

Ethical Considerations

This section will discuss the ethical concerns identified in this research and how each was addressed to ensure that the researcher is aware of the constraints and ethical implications of the current research (Punch & Oancea, 2014). The ethical concerns will be discussed in reference to the Massey University Code of Ethical Conduct (MUCEC) of Manākitanga (cultural and social responsibility), autonomy, beneficence and special relationships.

Manaakitanga (cultural and social responsibility) and Autonomy

This research was conducted in a Japanese context and addressed the IFM's perspectives and opinions of Japanese culture. Therefore, before proceeding with the research, there was a need to consider the following aspects: avoiding harm to the reputation of the culture, identifying the local protocols, and becoming culturally sensitive to recruitment and research methods. For example, one of the local protocols included understanding the high gatekeeping procedures in Japanese universities. Generally, in Japanese universities, obtaining consent to share the participant recruitment information sheet requires prior consent in written form. Thus a 'Request Form' to the Japanese university was created in Japanese and English (Appendix D).

Additionally, there was a need to ensure that the participants could participate freely at their own will, express their honest opinions and be able to contribute to the research safely. Given that the participants were primarily current working members of the Japanese university, all identifiable information was deleted to ensure that their perceptions and opinions did not reflect the opinion of the particular university. Therefore, measures were implemented to ensure the confidentiality of the participants' identities and the Japanese university (Punch & Oancea, 2014).

Benefit

This research aims to understand the current situation of PLD and build a foundation for supporting the IFM in Japanese universities to build their teaching pedagogy, methodology and other relevant teaching knowledge and skills. Although potential benefits are present without intending to elicit harm, for some participants, recalling their experiences and perspectives of PLD in Japanese universities may have psychologically influenced the participants.

Special Relationships

As an administrative officer at one of the Japanese universities, I had a special relationship with some participants. This may have influenced their decision to provide information that aligns with my expectations, and they may have felt obligated to assist me.

Addressing the Ethical Concerns

The ethical concerns of manaakitanga (cultural and social responsibility), autonomy, beneficence and special relationships were addressed by providing an information sheet to each participant. The information sheet outlined the purpose of the study, research design, risks and benefits of the study, data management, and participants' voluntary participation in the study (Appendix A). Additionally, it outlined that participants had the right to withdraw from the research at any time and could decline to answer specific interview questions if they felt uncomfortable. Each participant had a consent form to sign before the interviews commenced. Furthermore, to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants, the participants were informed that the interviews would not be held in the researcher’s or the participants’ workplace, all participants were provided with fake identifiers (e.g., FM1), and I committed to maintaining the

confidentiality of the participants by not disclosing information and data to third parties. Data was stored through the Massey University Microsoft OneDrive to ensure data storage safety. Per the Massey University Code of Responsible Research Conduct (Massey University, 2015), all recorded data were not stored on my computer. Additionally, in case I lacked knowledge of Japanese protocols, I consulted with my Japanese colleagues and asked for their advice. This thesis was reviewed and approved by the Massey University Ethics Committee (application number: OM3 23/34) through completing the full ethics application (Appendix B).

Data analysis

A thematic analysis approach was selected to analyse the interview data from eight participants. The thematic analysis aims to identify and analyse key patterns (themes) within the data set that can be analysed to gain an understanding of the underlying assumptions (Braun & Clark, 2006). The collected data were analysed using Braun and Clark's (2006) six phases of thematic analysis:

1. Engaging and immersing in the data
2. Creating initial codes
3. Creating potential themes
4. Refining themes
5. Defining and naming themes
6. Reporting the findings.

In the initial stage, the transcribed interviews were repeatedly read, responses relevant to the research question were highlighted, and initial thoughts about the responses were noted. In phase two, initial codes were generated for the highlighted responses. Each response was coded once or multiple times (Table 2). During this stage, 1268 initial codes were identified (Table 3).

Table 2. Example of coding in phase two

Interview question 3: Tell me about your experiences with Faculty Development (FD) in Japanese universities.				
No.	**Extract**	**Code 1**	**Code 2**	**Code 3**
FM1	In the first 20 years, there were no opportunities provided within the workplace, so that's why I began to look outside the workplace for my own personal development as a teacher.	PLD opportunities were not available in Japanese universities.	The teacher looked for PLD opportunities outside the Japanese university.	
FM2	It was very top-down.	Top-down PLD content decisions.		
FM3	The only thing is like you know, is it relevant or not relevant?	Relevancy of faculty meeting.		
FM4	I think in general it was forced upon you, but you weren't forced to be good at it.	Top-down PLD content decisions.		
FM5	PD, there was no coordinated response.	No systematic organisation of PLD.		
FM6	I think they have this budget. I don't remember from where you which they have every year selected number of faculty.	Budget provided by the university.	A limited amount of faculty members are selected to attend PLD.	
FM7	Focus on your studies and we have half research days.	University balances the teaching load.		
FM8	There are very few opportunities to tackle those really pressing issues that are not only concerned with what I do, but across the board. It's very limited whether that's a management issue or just a trend at universities given that people are so busy, I think each professor, they're so focused on what they're doing, they are in their own world.	Limited PLD opportunities.	Tendency for teachers to be isolated.	Believes that teacher change is necessary.

Table 3. Number of initial codes

Interview question	Number of codes
1. Tell me about how you came to Japan.	78
2. In general, how would you describe your teaching experience at a Japanese university?	173
3. Tell me about your experiences with Faculty Development (FD) in Japanese universities.	296
4. Do you remember an occasion when you experienced conflict between what you wanted to change and what was expected of the university?	189
5. What are your thoughts about suggesting new teaching methods to your colleagues?	66
6. Can you provide an example of a time when faculty members helped you by sharing their teaching and learning techniques?	136
7. What is your opinion about FD in Japanese universities?	175
8. Tell me about your experiences with the Japanese language. 9. Do you remember an occasion when the language affected your professional life (i.e., participating in FD)?	62
10. What do you believe is the main purpose of FD for you?	93
Total number of initial codes	1268

In phase three, a mind-map application called “MindNode” collated the 1268 initial codes to search for themes (Appendix E). Firstly, identical codes were grouped and then each group was assigned a number indicating how many identical codes were grouped (e.g., ‘identifying that constant change occurs in the classroom (2)’). Afterwards, codes with similar topics were combined, separated and refined to create a potential theme. All codes were considered to be potential themes; any code that did not fit was labelled 'miscellaneous’. The codes were tallied to demonstrate the frequency of the theme mentioned by participants. Subsequently, from the 1268 initial codes, 167 potential themes were identified.

In phase four, the 167 potential themes were further refined by combining similar themes and creating new themes to group those that do not fit in other existing themes. The codes in the miscellaneous themes were also placed into one of the potential themes (Table 4). I kept the initial codes and referred back to the transcript if necessary to ensure that the meaning did not get

lost in the merging procedure. Some potential themes were discarded from the analysis as they did not relate to the research question.

Table 4. Example of finding potential themes

Categories	Themes	Overarching themes	Frequency	Explanation
• Teachers must proactively and consciously find opportunities to participate and show initiative to plan PLD (53) • Importance of PLD design (19) • Importance of feedback and reflection (15) • Guidance for PLD is necessary (26) • Unclear instructions on peer observation (70) • Past Experience (90)	**Teachers have isolated and are unclear of the different features of PLD** • Importance of feedback and reflection • Identifies the specific points of PLD. • Teachers are unsure how, when and what points to give feedback. • Fear of being judged. • Understands that observation helps teachers to learn. • Feels that guidance for PLD is required.	**PLD Experiences**	273	Faculty members identified the importance of each feature of PLD (i.e., observation, feedback, reflection). Because there was no clear guidance, faculty members were unaware of the purpose of each PLD and how each feature is a learning cycle. Therefore, as the faculty members cannot visualise PLD, they may be unable to foresee the process. Faculty members' experience is compared to their previous PLD and teaching experience. From their experience faculty members believe that they learnt more from teaching in the classroom than through PLD and also perceive their experience as positive or negative.
	Past experience influences teacher's perception of PLD • Comparison of PLD from previous experience (positive or negative). • They have a preconceived notion of what to expect from PLD. • Believing that learning through doing helps the teacher learn more than participating in PLD. • Some teachers cannot imagine what PLD is for professors.			

As a result of the analysis, four overarching themes regarding the IFM's perceptions of PLD emerged from the 167 potential themes:

1. The different working contexts
2. PLD experiences
3. Significance of communication
4. Language barriers

Chapter Summary

This chapter discussed the research design, data collection methods, sampling, ethical considerations and data analysis procedures to investigate the research question 'How do international faculty members (IFM) in Japanese universities perceive their Professional Learning and Development (PLD) experiences?' A qualitative case study was employed to investigate further the PLD experiences and perceptions of IFM in Japanese universities. Semi-structured one-on-one interviews were conducted with eight participants through online methods. The interview data was transcribed and analysed using Braun and Clark's (2006) six phases of thematic analysis, which identified four key themes as stated in the previous section. The next chapter will discuss the results of the four overarching themes with supporting evidence from the interview data.

Results

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the findings of the four themes based on the research question of 'How do international faculty members (IFM) in Japanese universities perceive their Professional Learning and Development (PLD) experiences?' The four themes emerged through the thematic analysis from semi-structured interviews with international faculty members (IFM) with experience working in Japanese universities (refer to the interview questions in Table 3). The four themes that emerged were:

1. The different working contexts
2. PLD experiences
3. Significance of communication
4. Language barriers

Overview of Themes

The interview and the subsequent data analysis highlighted that the diverse working contexts, such as the Japanese university environment, influenced the IFM's perceptions and experiences of PLD. Additionally, IFM identified the various PLD opportunities experienced at Japanese universities and the necessity of effective communication between colleagues. Furthermore, IFM expressed their challenges in accessing information about PLD due to the Japanese language barrier. The themes, frequency of the codes and percentages were identified through thematic analysis (details of the coding and analysis procedures are outlined in the 'Methodology' section) and are presented in Table 5. The following section will expand on each theme by citing examples from participants' interviews.

Table 5. Summary of themes

Themes	Frequency	Percentage
1. The different working contexts	726	60.3%
2. PLD experiences	273	22.7%
3. Significance of communication	140	11.6%
4. Language barriers	64	5.3%
Total	1203	100%

The Different Working Contexts

When participants were asked about their professional learning and development (PLD) experiences in Japanese universities, a recurrent theme (726 codes) was a sense that there were PLD opportunities; however, the participants perceived that the Japanese universities did not provide meaningful PLD. For example, a common response amongst the participants was that attendance at most of the university PLD sessions was mandatory, and the PLD felt irrelevant to their needs (7 out of 8 participants). For example, one interviewee said:

> *They don't really want you to understand anything. They don't really want you to implement anything. They'll just talk at you because, bureaucratically, they're supposed to do it. They are doing it because they just want to fulfil a certain point somewhere*. (FM2)

Similarly, another participant said:

> *My university exists mainly through grants, so any activity that will attract the grant is given priority… so I tried to stay awake and alert, but it's mainly so that I can put a checkmark next to my name as I go into the room and be seen to be present.* (FM1)

Based on the above responses, it seems that the participants may feel that the Japanese universities *"are just imagining what the problems of the people who are teaching not [in the view of faculty members who are] actually living through those problems"* (FM6). In all cases, the participants reported that they feel that the universities are not considering their current PLD needs and that PLD exists to meet the grant requirements or have an objective for mandatory PLD implementation.

Another finding was that several participants were reluctant to suggest further ideas about teacher learning and development to the university because, as one interviewee put it:

> *One of the biggest problems with Japanese universities in general is [that] every time you suggest something, everybody will tell you, oh, this needs to go to the Ministry of Education; they need to approve it. And that's why there's like this long red tape process.* (FM2)

FM5 was also concerned that their suggestions would be neglected because "s*upposedly, if you had something that important, then you could maybe impress upon [the team leader] …[but] it's like that whisper a message game, you know? I guess they just go into the black hole or something".*

Additionally, another interview finding showed that the Japanese university's top-down decision can influence their views on decision-making related to PLD. For example,

> *[The English Medium Instruction courses] I think it was a little frustrating for us and it was frustrating, I'm sure, for the Japanese students. The thing was that all of us, all the international teachers who are the foreign teachers, we all knew a lot about Japan. We were very aware…But we were explicitly told by the institution; we were told [to] teach these courses the same way that you would teach them in your home country. I think most of us felt tension with that and we felt guilty.* (FM5)

Similarly, when asked in further detail about the assumptions students bring to the classroom, FM1 indicated that,

> *What [students] think should happen in and around the classroom, what they think would be expected of them and what expectations they might have of a teacher and a university learning experience…This has been an important discovery for me. I can understand when the expectations don't meet that it's a learning process on both sides*. (FM1)

Participants indicate that although the Japanese university mandated the international faculty members (IFM) to teach in the Western style, they acknowledged the difficulties and found them

to be ineffective in the classroom. However, participants indicated they could learn from these experiences and must adjust their teaching methods accordingly by *"[not] insist[ing] on using simply like the target language"* (FM5).

However, although most of the participants held a negative view of the Japanese universities' commitments to PLD, all participants stressed the importance of updating and developing their teaching knowledge and skills as well as their content knowledge. For example, FM2 expressed the significance of making changes to their classroom practice and updating knowledge because PLD is *"for the [development of a] quality lecture or a quality of a class for students*", and FM8 added, *"you know, [engagement], that's really important for me because I feel that if I'm bored, imagine how the students are feeling"*. This reflects that the participants understood the students' perceptions and were motivated to participate in PLD, which benefitted their teaching and brought positive outcomes for their students.

Further data analysis showed that some participants perceived that the organisational culture influenced their sustained participation and engagement in PLD. For example, one participant reported that *"there really was not a systematised faculty development… [because the] downside was [that] the foreign teachers who were there were all on temporary positions, contract positions… the job was essentially a dead-end job"* (FM5). Another participant indicated, *"at that time, they were really strict with contracts. We were told we were required to officially do a professional development portfolio [for our contract to be] renewed"* (FM4). Whilst for another participant, because the participant was studying while teaching at the same time, the university said to *"focus on your studies and have half research days"* (FM7). The participants' views suggest that the perception and importance of PLD can vary greatly among Japanese universities.

Additionally, some participants indicated that the Japanese universities provided the budget or funds for research.

- FM1: *"[The university] provides each teacher with a very limited research budget…But nobody objects if I buy a book or books for professional development using that budget"*.
- FM5: "*We were funded. We got like a $5000 [USD] a year from the university where we can really pretty much spend it in any way, we want it. So, like attending conferences"*.

- FM7: "*Yeah, we have a bit of a research budget… things like the iPad, things that I can use to do research".*
- FM8: *"So there's a research grant for every professor, and that is for every year for each academic year".*

The participants' views indicate that the Japanese university provides a research budget that can be freely used for other purposes, such as attending conferences and purchasing professional reading material. However, one participant is concerned about the decrease in the budget (i.e., participation fee, travel and accommodation) allocated to attend in-person conferences, workshops and other PLD opportunities. FM1 comments, *"I'm rather sad to see that we've gone back so suddenly to face to face. [The budget got] cut down"* (FM1). This suggests that for IFM to develop and update their knowledge and skills, they may first need to assess the availability of the budget before considering applying for PLD sessions.

FM8 further stated,

> *I think living in Japan, I think that definitely does affect the opportunity to freely exchange ideas… You're very wary of saying things or going outside of your shell. I think the foreign teachers pick up on that. They assimilate [to the Japanese culture]. Appropriateness? When in Rome, you do what the Romans do, and I think that's a big factor of it.* (FM8)

This comment reveals that the participant believes that IFM may become accustomed to Japanese culture and follow the protocols of Japan. This may have influenced the participant's further engagement in exchanging ideas with others. As one participant puts it, *"Working environments in Japan is that if I were to begin to talk about something that had happened in the classroom, good or bad, it would probably be seen by some of my colleagues as a cry for help"* (FM1).

Overall, these findings suggest that participants perceive their engagement in PLD as being influenced by the university context, such as through budget, mandatory PLD, and the working environment.

PLD Experiences

In the interview, participants indicated the various types of PLD experienced during their teaching career at Japanese universities. A common type of PLD that most participants experienced was peer observations (Table 6).

Table 6. Types of PLD experienced by participants in Japanese universities

Type of PLD experienced	Number of participants experienced (out of 8)
Peer observations	7
Attending conferences and meetings	4
Group discussions	3
Lectures and seminars	3
Information discussions	3
Teacher portfolio	3
Reading literature	2
Analysis of class evaluation	2
Committee member	2
External PLD	2

A number of participants were particularly critical of the peer observation experiences as it seems like *"feedback comes eight months later"* (FM2), feel as if when other participants come to observe, they are *"encroach[ing] their space and privacy"* (FM8), or feedback is *"just a brief; "Thank you"* (FM1). FM1 also comments that *"the colleague is supposed to submit a report to the office about what they've seen, but I have never had sight of those reports".* One participant commented that,

> *Faculty development design requires [us] to understand what is going on and a lot of faculties don't like to be evaluated. They hate it. They don't want others to come to their classes and see how they are. That's a no no. So, if you don't have knowledge [about how to give feedback on observations], then you cannot provide solutions and therefore doesn't work well.* (FM6)

These results suggest that feedback is late, some participants possess limited knowledge about what features to observe and provide effective feedback to their colleagues. The comment by FM6 also provides insight that peer observation is used to evaluate their teaching. Some participants also expressed their anxiety about being judged. Therefore, one participant expressed a desire for PLD *"sessions on how to do [observations] better"* (FM7).

Whilst there was a critical view of peer observations, many agreed that peer observations brought *"fresh eyes"* (FM3), the *"best way to [learn] is to watch each other"* (FM8) and *"when we see each other teach, you can actually pick up a thing or two even about really small things"* (FM2). To account for the lack of reinforcement of learning in their teaching, several teachers *"began to look outside the workplace for [their] own personal development as a teacher"* (FM1) and felt the need to proactively and consciously *"facilitate sessions"* (FM7) for learning.

Additionally, three participants commented that they perceived to have a lack of control or power and a sense of reluctance to self-initiate change within Japanese universities.

- FM4: *"I don't have any power to change it"*
- FM7: *"I'm not even gonna try… Like no, not even gonna bother"*.
- FM8: *"I mean that's a managerial sort of thing that's beyond my control"*

These findings suggest that the participants are discouraged and do not believe that suggesting new ideas at the departmental or university level will bring about change. However, when asked about the main purpose of PLD, a common response was that the purpose of PLD is to update content knowledge and teaching skills and adjust and adapt to change.

Table 7. Purpose of PLD

Purpose of PLD	Number of responses
Update content knowledge and teaching skills	4
Adjust and adapt to change	4
Improve oneself as an educator	3
Acquire new insights	3
Reflection	2
Understanding governmental policies	2
Empowers educators	1

FM5 commented, *"It keeps things fresh, but also, of course, education is a moving target. Circumstances change. Our very philosophies have changed in response to a number of things…students change…you know, in every job, if not for no other reason".* Additionally, FM3 commented, *"Keep yourself updated wave like new trends…we need to refresh our eyes and reflect about what we are doing".* These comments suggest that the participants recognise that teaching and learning changes with various policies and trends and that an update is needed.

Interestingly, one participant stated that PLD *"is something that I regret not taking more advantage of"* (FM4). This comment may suggest that the participant recognises the importance of PLD and regrets not engaging in the available PLD opportunities.

Additionally, the perceptions regarding the importance of PLD differed between participants who entered the university teaching profession after their doctorate degree (2 participants) and those who had previous exposure to educational theory, pedagogy and practice (6 participants). For example, two participants who entered after their doctorate degree commented that PLD is to *"develop like new tools and keep myself up to date based on my personal research"* (FM3) and *"need to keep up to date with the current news. Update knowledge. I do try to update that a bit. But yeah, that's as far as it goes"* (FM6).

In contrast, six participants commented:

- FM1: *"But those of us who have been trained as language teachers, we actually spend a good part of our professional life thinking about teaching and learning".*
- FM2: *"Constantly learn from each other… I always tell them any day, anytime. Just walk into my class [for observations]".*
- FM4: *"I'm really happy to share ideas with people. And if other people wanna try it, and if it works for them, that's fantastic".*
- FM5: "P*rofessional development, I think in any, it doesn't matter what job you're doing. But I think for teachers it is crucial".*
- FM7: *"Let's get people started maybe on a case study… constantly all the time we're working together, sharing ideas that".*
- FM8: "*I think the best way to do that is to watch each other… I mean, for me, watching people in the classroom is invaluable. It's sometimes fun".*

In summary, these findings indicate that each participant experienced diverse types of PLD. For example, participants experienced in total, 10 types of PLD, with peer observation and feedback emerging as the most common. Although there was a critical view of the peer observations, participants recognised the value of PLD. Furthermore, the perception of PLD appeared to vary among participants who transitioned into university teaching from a doctorate student.

Significance of Communication

When the participants were asked about their experiences with sharing and suggesting teaching ideas to their colleagues, many commented on the significance of communication 'to' and 'with' colleagues. The participants indicated that communication provides an opportunity to "*learn from each other"* (FM1, FM2, FM5, FM7, FM8) and to obtain information about concerning students (FM4, FM5, FM8), sharing teaching ideas (FM1, FM7, FM8) and provides a *"sense of belonging and purpose"* (FM8). One participant further expressed that *"peer support that's good…In that open environment, there's plenty of opportunities for like, hey, I'm kind of stuck [or] like I don't like this activity in this textbook or like what did you do this unit?"* (FM6).

While most participants agreed that working together is helpful, six participants identified two challenges: they felt isolated and needed more time to meet. Regarding the lack of time, one participant mentioned that,

> *Faculty members teach at different times…So usually, the people who [are in the same department are] the people you cannot meet because when you are teaching something, they are not teaching it. Getting together in the first place is challenging".* (FM6)

This point reflects that participants teaching in the same department tend to teach at different times, limiting opportunities for IFM to meet during teaching hours. Similarly, another interviewee mentioned that *"all of us [teach] like 9 to 10 lectures a week… you're teaching 100 minutes in the class, you have to give homework, which would be equivalent to 400 minutes"* (FM2). The views of the two participants indicate that due to the heavy teaching and administrative workload and timetabling issues, investing time and effort into PLD may be difficult to accomplish.

Another concern expressed by participants was isolation. FM8 states, "At the moment, we are all in our little pods, and you know, *we're just basically doing what we what we're doing, and there's no interaction…I think it doesn't exist, which I think is very unhealthy"* (FM8). The view from this participant reflects that the lack of interaction may lead to feeling disconnected and lonely. For example, one participant said, *"I was very lonely there…in most cases, people have to do it on their own*" (FM4). However, FM1 and FM6 had a different experience.

> *A group of language teachers we got together, and we decided that we would like a non-threatening opportunity to learn from each other. We were dealing basically with the same kinds of student, and we wanted to know what solutions we found to problems that were posed by students. So, we set up by ourselves. We set up a once a year occasion where we could spend a whole day listening to explanations.*
> (FM1)

> *My office is pretty supportive and I work together in and like kind of our English education department, which is pretty diverse…We kinda have this like open office thing. So there's lots of opportunities to collaborate and work together, and we often design materials and assessments and things together.* (FM6)

Together these results provide valuable insights into the participants' perceptions of communication and collaboration. Participants recognised the importance aspects of sharing and learning with each other. Although concerns such as timetabling conflicts and potential isolation were raised, some participants proactively established learning groups or found themselves in a supportive environment.

Language Barriers

Some participants seemed to face a language barrier that hindered their participation in PLD opportunities provided by Japanese universities. Five out of eight participants expressed that they were not fluent in Japanese. For example, FM7 commented, *"So, I get [a notification] saying like, oh, there's this seminar about mental health, and it's entirely in Japanese. So, we're like, no, not doing that one".* Additionally, FM2 indicated that "*Most of the faculty developments, 99.99% of them happen every single month. But they're all in Japanese*". Therefore, low Japanese language proficiency limited participants' access to PLD information and opportunities. FM4 and FM5 commented:

> *As for the question about language being an issue in faculty development, the answer is definitely, yes, it was an issue… probably [the university] had a whole other layer of opportunities in Japanese that I did not know about or participate in because I simply never knew about them, and/or couldn't easily access them.* (FM4)

> *I think definitely it would be a barrier, yes. I think a lot of foreign [faculty members] would be unable to attend professional development programs within the greater university campus.* (FM8)

Therefore, one participant commented on the necessity of learning Japanese when working in Japanese universities.

> *Of course it's the language of the University, of course. I mean, if we cannot hire someone without a high level of proficiency in Japanese because we would spend all our time explaining stuff to the new person instead of the very limited time we have to actually get things done. Time is very, very scarce.* (FM1)

FM1 expresses that IFM are expected to learn and communicate in the workplace language and expresses that with sufficient time for induction, conveying necessary information and supporting the new IFM in English may become easier.

Furthermore, one participant expressed their frustration with the ambiguity of the Japanese language as it led to miscommunication.

> *And then I actually had a really disappointing English miscommunication that I was so angry about. He basically made a small English mistake, which led to ambiguity, he came up to me and said, oh, so sorry about that… I was pretty furious.* (FM4)

However, because the *"[institution] is predominantly in English sort of environment"* (FM8), the above participants may not feel the need to learn the Japanese language to attend further PLD activities. For example, other participants add that,

- FM3: *"I always had the chance to have English speaking people around me".*
- FM4: *"had so many English [PLD] opportunities"*.
- FM5: *"[committees] were run in English, mostly English".*
- FM7: *"Japanese study [could be] kind of pushed further down on my priority list… we have so much English support*".

Additionally, two participants from non-Western backgrounds commented on the challenges students encounter in comprehending their English accents. FM2 commented, "*I constantly have to make sure that I am more open when I speak to people here, which I've done for myself*

because I know that if I speak in a completely Indian accent, they will not understand me". FM3 adds that *"sometimes it's like with everything, students need to take some time to absorb your accent… So instead, I basically write on the whiteboards to make myself understood very often"*. These perspectives of the two participants suggest that IFM from non-Western backgrounds encounter difficulties not only with the Japanese language but also with the English accent, prompting them to make concerted efforts to ensure that students comprehend their accents.

In summary, these findings suggest that the Japanese language was a barrier to participants' engagement in PLD, as many did not find the need to learn Japanese given that they were in an English-speaking working environment. Additionally, it appears that IFM from non-Western backgrounds recognised that their English accent posed challenges and prompted them to seek measure to enhance their clarity for communication in teaching.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has outlined and discussed the findings of the four themes that emerged from the thematic analysis. These themes include the different working contexts, the significance of communication, PLD experiences and language barriers. The findings suggest that participants perceived the barriers to engaging in PLD opportunities stem from varying university contexts, mandatory PLD, contract limitations and Japanese language. Despite the challenges, participants had opportunities to access PLD such as peer observation, feedback and conferences. Furthermore, all participants recognised the value of PLD and expressed the necessity for further involvement. The next chapter will discuss the findings in light of the existing research literature.

Discussion

Introduction

This thesis aimed to contribute to the gap in the literature around Professional Learning and Development (PLD) for international faculty members (IFM) teaching in Japanese universities. As little was known about this area, this study sought to explore the current PLD environment by listening to the experiences of IFM in Japanese universities. As such, this thesis investigated the research question, 'How do international faculty members (IFM) in Japanese universities perceive their Professional Learning and Development (PLD) experiences?' The current thesis identified four implications from the IFM's perception of PLD in Japanese universities: 1. Top-down management; 2. Communication barriers; 3. Work-related factors; 4. From doctoral student to university teacher. The chapter now turns to discuss these findings in relation to the research literature.

Top-down Management

The results of this study indicate that participants believe the cultural context of Japan and the university's approach impede their further involvement in PLD. Participants stated that the top-down requirements of PLD and their unfamiliarity with the Japanese organisational culture inhibited their meaningful participation. These findings are consistent with those of the National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE) (2014) and Ozeki et al. (2023), who stated that as per the policies of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Japan (MEXT) require Japanese universities to implement mandatory PLD as a part of the higher education reform schemes. It is evident from the participant's interviews that top-down mandatory PLD opportunities do not align with IFM's current teaching and learning priorities. Participants feel that universities are not considering the needs of the IFM and, as a result, feel that they are not empowered to suggest new learning or ideas to the management level (Kern & Graber, 2018; Pischetola et al., 2023).

Additionally, in Japan, to improve the educational environment and system at the micro level (e.g., faculty members), MEXT requires universities to implement class observations and feedback for faculty members to improve their class and teaching methods (Yamada, 2015). According to MEXT (2021), approximately 52% (403 out of 763 universities) implemented class

observations and feedback in 2019. This statistical result aligns with the participants' experiences, as peer observation and feedback were the most experienced PLD in Japanese universities. However, participants expressed their negative experiences of peer observation in which the feedback was late, and both the observer and the observed lacked knowledge on how to observe and provide effective feedback. This finding is consistent with Hammersley and Orsmond (2004), who state that feedback sessions should be held promptly after the observation session to ensure that feedback is given while it is still fresh in the mind. Additionally, as participants were unaware of the purpose of peer observations or their effectiveness, they may have felt that observation can *"intimidate people"* (FM1) or feel that their lessons are *"completely [being] imitated"* (FM4).

A possible explanation for this might be due to the hierarchical system in Japanese organisations and the collectivist approach to problem-solving and decision-making. Firstly, many Japanese universities tend to implement government-led initiatives and top-down projects. However, there appears to be a discrepancy between the understanding and interpretation of the internationalisation objectives within Japanese universities and the IFM (Nishikawa, 2020). As a result, IFM may lack comprehension regarding the rationale behind various top-down implemented PLD and adhere to the university's instructions. Additionally, Japanese universities may implement top-down projects as governmental grants are awarded to encourage further implementation of PLD (Roloff Rothman, 2020). Secondly, in the Western context, an individual is usually praised for their initiative and when the individual takes responsibility for solving issues (Butch, 2024). However, this is different in Japan. Any member who is working for an organisation (i.e., universities) is expected to "report, communicate and consult" (Himeno, 2021, para. 1). Additionally, it seems possible because Japan frequently experiences natural disasters such as earthquakes, tsunamis and typhoons, the Japanese are always prepared for any uncertain situations (including every aspect of society) (Hofstede Insights, 2024). In organisations, it is common to invest time and effort to consider all risks to ensure the safe implementation of the proposed innovative and new ideas. As a result, changes may take time and be difficult in Japan (Hofstede Insights, 2024).

Therefore, IFM may find it difficult in Japanese universities to voice their concerns about the current PLD or request to attend PLD as the faculty head must approve it. IFM may feel that the procedure is slow (FM2) because the suggestion must go through reporting to the head, keeping everyone in the loop and consulting all risk factors before acting (Hofstede Insights, 2024). IFM may also feel that when proposing new PLD ideas that would benefit the university, participants may feel that there is a significant barrier between the university goals and the individual teacher, which can further undermine their motivation and perseverance (Butch, 2024). One participant also commented that the reluctance to share and suggest new teaching ideas may stem from IFM becoming accustomed to Japanese culture. FM8 commented, *"You're very way of saying things. I think the foreign teachers pick up on that. They assimilate [to the Japanese culture]. When in Rome, you do what the Romans do".* A possible explanation is Japanese organisations' strong emphasis on peace and harmony (Nocos, 2023). To maintain peace in the organisation, the IFM may encounter resistance from the university if IFM proposes any change that deviates from the status quo (Francisco, 2012). Therefore, IFM may tend to adjust how they speak or behave and their perception of self to 'fit in' to the working environment and the Japanese cultural context (Moran & Abramson, 2017).

Despite the criticism of the Japanese universities' top-down approaches to PLD, there was a common consensus among IFM from the current study. At the individual or classroom level, the IFM recognised the significance of proactively taking the initiative to seek learning activities, share information, suggest new ideas, attend conferences, and engage in peer observation, feedback, and other learning activities. Consistent with the literature, the IFM acknowledge the need to develop themselves, understand that learning occurs through various experiences and recognise that IFM should take ownership of their learning (Cole, 2012; Poskitt, 2014; Steinert et al., 2016). Interestingly, one interviewee commented, *"basically, faculty development is decided by the university…but also there are like [a] couple of mandatory Faculty Development [to help us] get familiar with what's going on"* (FM3). Other participants also commented that PLD is valuable for updating one's knowledge, enhancing teaching practices, and being empowered as an educator. These findings are important as these perceptions of the IFM state that the participants have the motivation to learn, the desire to attend PLD sessions and improve their knowledge in educational knowledge and skills. Overall, these results reveal that with a

systematic and supportive approach to PLD in Japanese universities, IFM can increase their confidence in teaching, develop a positive mindset toward learning and believe in the potential for change (Chester, 2012; Hussey et al., 2011; Sotardi & Brogt, 2023).

Communication Barriers

Another important finding was that although IFM understood the significance of communication with colleagues, some IFM perceived that their colleagues tended to isolate themselves and needed more time to engage in meaningful communication. Several factors could explain this observation. Firstly, the Japanese language may become a barrier to further involvement in communication, committees and workshops and appraisal and promotion (Chen, 2022b; Green, 2022). As a result, IFM may tend to confine themselves in private spaces to protect themselves from being judged by the Japanese university and focus on teaching and research responsibilities (Chen, 2022b). However, Brotherhood et al. (2020) state that IFM who held high positions in Japanese universities had a high level of Japanese ability. This may suggest that if IFM improves their Japanese language ability, they will likely engage with the Japanese university and gain access to PLD information, resources, and opportunities.

However, the participants' comments suggest that because they were hired to teach in English and work in a predominantly English environment, they may not have felt the need to learn Japanese (FM4, FM7, FM8). These findings are likely related to the increasing implementation of English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) courses in Japanese universities (Brown, 2019). Japanese universities are providing EMI courses taught in English for Japanese students to gain exposure to the language through everyday learning and to attract international students from overseas to meet governmental goals (Brown, 2019; Kakuchi, 2023). In addition, the IFM are hired to drive internationalisation initiatives such as the "Grand Design for Higher Education toward 2040", which indicates that IFM are hired to share their insights, knowledge and skills from overseas to create a new learner-centred environment for Japanese universities (Ozeki et al., 2023, p. 2). Together, it seems possible that learning Japanese can be of low priority due to the English teaching environment.

Additionally, an interesting discovery emerged from this research. Previous studies (Chen, 2022a; Chen, 2022b; Huang, 2018) reported that the Japanese language posed a barrier to integration in Japanese universities. However, the findings in this study identified that the English accent of the two participants presented a challenge for teaching as they recognised that the accent was difficult for the students to understand. This interesting finding could be due to the IFM teaching in an English environment (Brown, 2019), and the two participants may have received direct feedback from students. This result is consistent with the findings in US universities wherein IFM received negative student evaluation results due to their accents (Liang, 2022). Nishikawa (2020) explains that while English is prevalent worldwide (especially in Asian countries such as Japan, China, South Korea), Japanese universities should acknowledge the diverse varieties of English spoken worldwide. This is an important finding of this study, given the absence of prior studies on English accents for IFM teaching in Japanese universities.

Work-related Factors

As most IFM are contracted for short or fixed-term employment (Brotherhood et al., 2020), they may prioritise maintaining the job position rather than engaging with PLD to enhance their knowledge and practices about teaching and learning. For example, FM5 commented, *"The job was essentially a dead-end job so there was never any reason to prep for a subsequent position"*. This result reflects the study of Nishikawa (2020) in which IFM are perceived as temporary visitors. FM1 also commented that the long-term curriculum plan did not go according to plan because *"one of the part-time teachers changed their schedule, and the whole thing collapsed. We never tried again because it was so difficult to set it up, and we never [knew what would happen] in the second year".* It seems possible that IFM are avoiding forming deeper relationships with their colleagues and reluctant to engage in further learning due to their short-term contracts and eventual departure from the university.

Moreover, IFM may believe that their practice is current and, therefore, feel no necessity to participate in PLD offered by Japanese universities (Eppolite & Burford, 2022). This may be because the main objectives of hiring IFM involve conveying Western knowledge in educational theory and practice, which is perceived to represent global standards. Additionally, many of the PLD opportunities offered by Japanese universities are covered by internal resources due to the

need for more funding and grants by the government (Nishikawa, 2020; Ozeki et al., 2023). As a result, there is a possibility that IFM have limited exposure to other perspectives, ideas and experiences of teaching and learning.

Lastly, IFM indicated the difficulties in meeting with colleagues to discuss classroom concerns or share ideas without temporal constraints. Previous research states that IFM teaches 7.5 hours per week with one research day in Japanese universities, which is more than in the United States (Watanabe, 2011). However, the findings of the current research identified that IFM taught *"12 hours of teaching per week"* (FM5) or 16 hours per week (FM2). These findings may help us to understand that even with flexible methods (i.e., online videos with in-person support), participants may lack time to invest time in PLD (Al-Naabi et al., 2021), and they may not have sufficient capacity to be involved in other matters other than completing their daily teaching and administrative tasks (Chen, 2022a). One interesting finding was that there was also an issue with timetabling. Timetables seem to be built based on students' curriculum pathways; therefore, IFM in the same department rarely meet each other (FM6). This may mean that careful planning is necessary to ensure that IFM are not burdened with PLD.

From Doctoral Student to University Teacher

The results of this study indicate that participants' perceptions of PLD varied depending on whether they viewed themselves as teachers or researchers. Among the eight participants, two entered the university teaching position directly after completing their doctorate degree, while the remaining six had previous teaching experience in schools or exposure to teaching pedagogy, methodology and practice in the past. The two participants perceived PLD as 'training', involving the development of content knowledge through reading articles, staying updated with current affairs and adjusting class content or syllabus. Whereas the eight participants with prior exposure to educational theory, pedagogy and practice perceived PLD as collaborative, engaging in team planning, open to peer observation and critical feedback and often sharing stories about their lessons or students. The present finding is consistent with Hughes et al. (2022) and Maurice-Takerei and Anderson (2013), who state that tertiary educators who graduate after completing their doctorate degree have limited knowledge about teaching and learning theories, pedagogy and methodology.

A possible explanation for this result might be that many doctoral programmes focus predominantly on research and do not adequately prepare future tertiary educators with knowledge and skills in teaching (Kinder et al., 2024). McLoughlin et al. (2019) add that there is a discrepancy between doctoral training and their actual expectations as a faculty member in a university. Although doctorate students are provided with opportunities to experience teaching in the field by becoming teaching assistants, they still need exposure to the full breadth of the teaching experience. This explanation is also evident in the findings where one participant commented, *"No one really taught me how to teach… because I was mainly interacting with PhD and master students [teaching focused on how to write research papers]"* (FM3). As the participant did not receive formal education in teaching theory, pedagogy and methodology, they may be "ill-equipped to embark on the demands of teaching and the complexity of this educational environment" (Duignan et al., 2016, pp. 9-10). Hence, it is probable that the perception of the IFM with limited exposure to teaching possesses different interpretations of PLD. However, due to the small sample size of the research, further research is necessary to explore this area with a wider population of IFM.

Chapter Summary

Overall, the present findings are significant in two major respects. Firstly, the literature regarding their impediments to involvement in Japanese universities aligns with the aspects hindering their engagement with PLD. Examples include the mandated top-down implementation of PLD, communication barriers and work-related factors (Brotherhood et al., 2020; Chen, 2022a; Nishikawa, 2020). Additionally, many aspects of effective PLD based on Western findings suggest that these aspects still need to be implemented in Japanese universities as per the Western ideal (e.g., in Japan, group work is to report the current situation) (Roloff Rothman, 2020). Secondly, a significant finding was that despite the language and work-related barriers in Japanese universities, IFM recognised the importance and necessity of professional learning, prompting IFM to engage in various PLD opportunities proactively and consciously in the classroom or externally. Additionally, this research provides new insight specifically regarding the IFM perceptions of PLD who enter the teaching field after completing their doctorate degree and of IFM's concerns with the English accent in teaching.

These findings have important and positive implications for developing a systematic plan supporting the IFM's involvement in professional learning. For example, establishing an accessible support system for IFM to address their concerns regarding teaching and learning or offering PLD opportunities to enhance their understanding of Japanese culture and language. However, given the challenges in approaching Japanese universities, further consideration is necessary on how to engage with them effectively. These difficulties may arise from the 'insider and outsider' values, where Japanese universities may be reluctant to disclose information or seek support from individuals outside the university. Additionally, further studies need to be done with a large sample size to establish whether IFM are marginalised or prevented from PLD opportunities (Brown, 2019).

However, this thesis has been unable to identify the prevention or marginalisation of IFM in the PLD sessions or opportunities, as noted by Brotherhood et al. (2020) and Brown (2019). It seems possible that the experience of IFM varies depending on their Japanese language proficiency, traits and the particular Japanese university or the department they are working at. For example, one participant mentioned that they could create authentic and relevant PLD at a previous university, whereas at the current university, the participant only had opportunities to attend mandatory lecture-style PLD (FM1). Another participant mentioned that at their current university, the IFM are provided opportunities to collaborate lessons and attend external conferences (FM7). Therefore, further research is needed to identify and examine whether marginalisation is also evident for IFM participating in PLD.

Limitations

This thesis is subject to three limitations: 1. low response rate for recruitment; 2. need for knowledge of the cultural factors when recruiting participants; 3. the interviewer having a presumption that all participants understood the meaning of PLD. Firstly, the low number of participants in this study must be acknowledged. Although the interview findings provided valuable and insightful knowledge on the current situation of PLD in Japanese universities for IFM, it is unclear if the experiences of all IFM can be represented by the small sample size (8). Secondly, concerning the low response rate, the methodological choices were constrained by the

need for more understanding of the gatekeeping procedures in Japanese universities. Therefore, it is vital for future studies to identify and plan how to approach Japanese universities. Lastly, as a novice researcher, the researcher assumed that all participants shared a common understanding of PLD and needed to clarify the definition at the start of the interview. For example, the researcher could identify a difference in understanding between the IFM who had teaching experience and those who entered the teaching field with their doctorate degree. It is possible that each participant, as well as the researcher, had a different understanding of PLD when conducting the interviews. Despite this assumption, since the thesis aimed to understand the IFM's perceptions of PLD, this study presented a valuable opportunity to gain insight into the participant's interpretations or experiences of PLD.

Conclusion

This thesis set out to better understand the current situation of international faculty members' (IFM) engagement in professional learning and development (PLD) in Japanese universities based on one-on-one semi-structured interviews. The literature on PLD has highlighted the key characteristics of effective PLD: learning should be teacher-centred and relevant, communication, collaboration, trust, respect, peer observation and feedback. However, for tertiary educators, most features may be unfamiliar as they enter the teaching profession directly after completing their doctorate degree (Hughes et al., 2022). While there is extensive literature on the value of PLD, research specifically addressing IFM's involvement in PLD could not be found. Instead, current literature focused on the impediments to IFM's integration into Japanese universities. Studies state that many IFM encounter challenges related to work and cultural factors such as fixed-term contracts, increased teaching load, presented as a symbolic representation of the internationalisation initiatives, Japanese language difficulties, outsider values and differences in teaching values. However, overall, neither the literature on PLD nor the literature on barriers to IFM's involvement in Japanese universities could identify IFM's perceptions of PLD.

As a result of the research, the investigation of this study identified that the barriers, such as work and cultural factors that impeded the integration of IFM into Japanese universities, were also evident in the hindrance to PLD involvement. For example, short-term contracts, language difficulties, differences in the meaning of group work, insider-outsider values and the mandated PLD implemented by Japanese universities. Despite the challenges and time constraints in PLD, a significant finding was that IFM recognised the importance of engaging in professional learning. IFM identified that PLD is necessary for updating one's knowledge, enhancing knowledge of educational theory, pedagogy and practice and acquiring new ideas. Additionally, this research extends our knowledge of the IFM's perception of PLD, specifically regarding the perceptions of IFM who enter the teaching field after completing their doctorate degree and their concerns with the English accent.

While the small sample size cannot reflect all the IFM's perceptions of PLD experiences in Japanese universities, the key strength of this study is that it could serve as a base for future

studies as it is one of the first studies that investigated the IFM's perception of PLD in Japanese universities. Additionally, further study could investigate IFM in other East Asian countries, delve into specific aspects of PLD, such as peer observations or investigate the perceptions regarding gender disparities in PLD involvement. Based on these findings, various stakeholders in Japan and Japanese universities should consider the necessity of PLD for IFM and consider effective approaches to facilitate the integration of IFM through PLD opportunities such as mentoring or induction programmes.

References

Adams, B., Thomas, L., Moens, M., & Valcke, M. (2023). University teachers as versatile masters: Evaluating the effectiveness of a professional development programme on student-centred teaching competencies. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 77,* N.PAG. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2023.101260

Alberts, H., & Hazen, H. (2022). Supporting international faculty in adaption to new academic environments. In C. Glass., K. Bista & X. Lin (Eds.), *The experiences of international faculty in institutions of higher education* (pp. 174-1186). Routledge.

Alhasnawi, S. (2022). A Facebook-based debate through English as a Lingua Franca: A move toward intercultural awareness for a world of differences. *Journal of Intercultural Communication, 22*(1), 39-68. https://doi.org/10.36923/jicc.v22i1.27

Al-Naabi, I., Kelder, J.-A., & Carr, A. (2021). Preparing teachers for emergency remote teaching: A professional development framework for teachers in higher education. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice, 18*(5), 4-20. https://doi.org/10.53761/1.18.5.4

Alpi, K. M., & Evans, J. J. (2019). Distinguishing case study as a research method from case reports as a publication type. *Journal of the Medical Library Association, 107*(1), 1-5. https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2019.615

Amano, I., & Poole, G. S. (2005). The Japanese university in crisis. *Higher Education, 50,* 685-711.

Amos, Y. T. (2022). Paradoxical treatment of East Asian women international faculty members' accented English in an era of internationalization of higher education. In C. Glass., K. Bista & X. Lin (Eds.), *The experiences of international faculty in institutions of higher education* (pp. 88-100). Routledge.

Barton, E. (2016). *Why you don't give praise in Japan.* *https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20160822-why-you-dont-give-praise-in-japan*

Bell, M., & Cooper, P. (2013). Peer observation of teaching in university departments: A framework for implementation. *International Journal for Academic Development, 18*(1), 60-73. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2011.633753

Berry, B. (2015). The dynamic duo of professional learning = collaboration and technology. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 97*(4), 51-55.

Bhandari, P. (2022). *Ethical considerations in research: types & examples*. Scribbr. https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/research-ethics/

Bhebhe, S., Runhare, T., & Monobe, R. J. (2015). Training music teachers through distance learning: The case of teaching practice mentoring at one primary school teacher training college in Zimbabwe. *British Journal of Music Education, 32*(3), 259-271. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051715000339

Boafo-Arthur, S., & Tsevi, L. (2022). Experiences of Black African international faculty at American higher education institutions. In C. Glass., K. Bista & X. Lin (Eds.), *The experiences of international faculty in institutions of higher education* (pp. 19-33). Routledge.

Bolyanatz, A. H. (2017). *Please Don't Call Me a "Teacher"*. https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2017/02/07/professor-explains-why-he-asks-not-be-called-teacher-essay

Braun, V., & Clark, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brotherhood, T., Hammond. C. D., & Kim, Y. (2020). Towards an actor-centered typology of internationalization: a study of junior international faculty in Japanese universities. *Higher Education, 79*, 497-514. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00420-5

Brown, C. A. (2019). Foreign faculty tokenism, English, and "internationalization" in a Japanese university. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 39*(3), 404-416. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2019.1598850

Butch, Y. T. (2024). *Japanese work culture: how to succeed working in Japan*. https://www.ejable.com/japan-corner/working-in-japan/japanese-work-culture/#Factors_Which_Influenced_Work_Culture_in_Japan

Cabiles, B. M. (2021). Towards a pedagogy of discomfort in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. *International Education Journal, 20*(2), 23-38.

Casinder, N. (2014). *Culture, transnational education and thinking: Case studies in global schooling*. Routledge.

Castañeda-Londoño, A. (2017). Exploring English teachers' perceptions about peer-coaching as a professional development activity of knowledge construction. *HOW: A Colombian Journal for Teachers of English, 24*(2), 80-101. https://doi.org/10.19183/how.24.2.345

Chaharbashloo, H., Talebzadeh, H., Largani, M. H., & Amirian, S. (2024). A systematic review of online teaching competencies in higher education context: a multilevel model for professional development. *Research & Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning, 19*, 1-43. https://doi.org/10.58459/rptel.2024.19014

Chen, L. (2022a). Key issues impeding the integration of international faculty at Japanese universities. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 23*, 475-488. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-022-09764-7

Chen, L. (2022b). How do international faculty at Japanese universities view their integration? *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education Research*, *84*(4), 845-862. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-00803-7

Chen, L. (2023). *It's tough to be a foreign academic in Japan. Here's why. https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20231031141840512#:~:text=Meanwhile%2C%20governmental%20policies%20and%20institutional,1983%20to%205.10%25%20in%202022*.

Chester, A. (2012). Peer partnerships in teaching: Evaluation of a voluntary model of professional development in tertiary education. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 12*(2), 94-108.

Cirkony, C., Rickinson, M., Walsh, L., Gleeson, J., Salisbury, M., Cutler, B., Berry, M., & Smith, K. (2024). Beyond effective approaches: A rapid review response to designing professional learning. *Professional Development in Education, 50*(1), 24-45. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2021.1973075

Clayton, C., & Kilbane, J. (2016). Learning in tandem: professional development for teachers and students as inquirers. *Professional Development in Education, 42*(3), 458-481. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2014.997397

Colby, G., & Hill, M. F. (2016). Teacher inquiry through impact projects: one school's journey. *Set: Research Information for Teachers*.

Cole, P. (2012). *Linking effective professional learning with effective teaching practice.* Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership.

Coryell, J. E., Lapina Salazar, A., Cinque, M., Fedeli, M., & Tino, C. (2022). University teaching in global times: Perspectives of Italian university faculty on teaching international graduate students. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 26*(3), 369-389. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315321990749

Crasborn, F., Hennissen, P., Brouwer, N., Korthagen, F., & Bergen, T. (2008). Promoting versatility in mentor teachers' use of supervisory skills. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(3), 499-514. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.05.001

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Davila, G. (2022). Japanese school administrator's experiences after the implementation of the Top Global University Project language policy. *SN Social Sciences, 2*(19), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-022-00318-7

DeVaney, J., Shimshon, G., Rascoff, M., & Maggioncalda, J. (2020). Higher ed needs a long-term plan for virtual learning. *Harvard Business Review Digital Articles*, 2-5.

Dreher, A., Lindmeier, A., Feltes, P., Wang, T.-Y., & Hsieh, F.-J. (2021). Do cultural norms influence how teacher noticing is studied in different cultural contexts? A focus on expert norms of responding to students' mathematical thinking. *ZDM - Mathematics Education, 53*(1), 165-179. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-020-01197-z

Duignan, G., Hitchcock, J., Casley, S., Fraser, C., Haggerty, C., Hardy, M., Lovegrove, C., Sewell, S., Singh, L., Stewart, D., & Walke, J. (2016). *Designing professional development for experienced teachers in tertiary vocational education.* Ako Aotearoa National Centre for Tertiary Teaching Excellence.

Easton, L. B. (2008). From professional development to professional learning. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 89*(10), 755-761.

Eaude, T. (2020). I*dentity, culture and belonging: Educating young children for a changing world*. Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.

Eppolite, M., & Burford, J. (2022). Teaching "like you do at home" or "like you're in a different place?" Two prominent stances on teaching across borders expressed by academic migrants in Thailand. In C. Glass., K. Bista & X. Lin (Eds.), *The experiences of international faculty in institutions of higher education* (pp. 75-87). Routledge.

Erdman, K. M. (2017). An *analysis of Geert Hofstede's Culture's consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutes and organizations across nations*. Routledge.

Fenwick, T., & Tennant, M. (2004). Understanding adult learners. In G. Foley (Ed.), *Dimensions of adult learning: Adult education and training in a global era* (pp. 55-73). Routledge.

Francisco, A. (2012). *The nail that sticks up…conformity in Japan.* https://www.tofugu.com/japan/conformity-in-japan/

Frost, J. H., Coomes, J., & Lindebald, K. K. (2009). Collaborating to improve student's transitions from high school mathematics to college: characteristics and outcomes of a cross sector professional development project. *NASSP Bulletin, 93*(4), 227-240.

Gast, I., Schildkamp, K., & van der Veen, J. T. (2017). Team-based professional development interventions in higher education: A systematic review. *Review of Educational Research, 87*(4), 736-767.

Ghasemi, S., Bazrafkan, L., Shojaei, A., Rakhshani, T., & Shokrpour, N. (2023). Faculty development strategies to empower university teachers by their educational role: A qualitative study on the faculty members and students' experiences at Iranian universities of medical sciences. *BMC Medical Education, 23*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-023-04209-0

Gillis, E., & Mitton-Kükner, J. (2019). Exploring teachers' experiences of participating in teacher inquiry as professional learning. *In Education, 25*(1), 19-33.

Glass, C. R., Bista, K., & Lin X. (2022). Introduction. In C. Glass., K. Bista & X. Lin (Eds.), *The experiences of international faculty in institutions of higher education* (pp. 1-16). Routledge.

Gonzales, P., Muellar, B., Merry, K., Jones, C., & Kelder, J. A. (2021). Changing teaching practice: The evolving purpose of the teacher in higher education. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice, 18*(6), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.53761/1.18.6.1

Graham, B. R. (2022). *On a common culture: The idea of a shared national culture*. Zero Books.

Gravani, M. N. (2012). Adult learning principles in designing activities for teacher development. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 31*(4), 419-432. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2012.663804

Green, D. (2022). Uchi or Soto? Internationalization and foreign faculty employment at Japanese universities. In C. Glass., K. Bista & X. Lin (Eds.), *The experiences of international faculty in institutions of higher education* (pp. 135-147). Routledge.

Guskey, T. R., & Yoon, K. S. (2009). What works in professional development? *The Phi Delta Kappan, 90*(7), 495-500.

Hammersley, F. *, L., & Orsmond, P. (2004). Evaluating our peers: is peer observation a meaningful process? *Studies in Higher Education, 29*(4), 489-503. https://doi.org/10.1080103075070420002363 80

Hammond, C. D., & Radjai, L. (2022). Internationalization of curriculum in Japanese higher education: Blockers and enablers in English-medium instruction classrooms in the era of COVID-19. *Higher Education Forum, 19*, 87-107.

Hargreaves, A. (2005). Educational change takes ages: Life, career and generational factors in teachers' emotional responses to educational change. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(8), 967-983.

Hargreaves, A. (2019). Teacher collaboration: 30 years of research on its nature, forms, limitations and effects. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 25*(5), 603-621. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2019.1639499

Harlen, W. (2012). On the relationship between assessment for formative and summative purposes. In J. Gardner (Ed.), *Assessment and Learning* (pp. 87-102). Sage.

Harlen, W., & Crick, R. D. (2003). Testing and motivation for learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 10*(2), 169-207.

Harris, A. & Jones, M. S., (2017). Professional learning communities: A strategy for school and system improvement? *Wales Journal of Education, 19*(1), 16-38. https://doi.org/10.16922/wje.19.1.2

Hendry, G. D., & Oliver, G. R. (2012). Seeing is believing: The benefits of peer observation. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice, 9*(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.53761/1.9.1.7

Hidi, S., & Harackiewicz, J, M. (2000). Motivating the academically unmotivated: a critical issue for the 21st century. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(2), 151-179.

Himeno, E. (2021). *What is HORENSO?* https://jobsinjapan.com/working-in-japan/what-is-horenso/

Hofstede Insights. (2024). *Country Comparison Tool*. https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison-tool?countries=japan

Hornyak, T. (2017). *Kyoto University is branching out in tough times. https://www.nature.com/nature-index/news/kyoto-university-is-branching-out-in-tough-times*

Hu, R., & Chen, X. (2022). Challenges and potentials of international faculty in U.S. higher education. In C. Glass., K. Bista & X. Lin (Eds.), *The experiences of international faculty in institutions of higher education* (pp. 57-72). Routledge.

Huang, F. (2018). International faculty at Japanese universities: their demographic characteristics and work roles. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 19*, 263-272. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-018-9536-7

Huang, F. (2021). *More understanding needed for international faculty*. https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20211012101103981

Huang, F., & Chen, L. (2021). Chinese faculty members at Japanese universities: Who are they and why do they work in Japan? *ECNU Review of Education, 4*(4), 743-763. https://doi.org/10.1177/2096531120985877

Huang, F., Daizen, T., & Kim, Y. (2019). Challenges facing international faculty at Japanese universities: Main findings from the 2017 national survey. *International Journal of Educational Development, 71*, 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2019.102103

Hughes, J. A., Ofstad, W., & Fuentes, D. G. (2022). Changing the foundations of faculty development by developing a quality learning environment. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching & Learning, 14*(1), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2021.11.003

Hussey, J., Holden, M. T., Foley, A., & Lynch, P. (2011). Enhancing professionalism through the continuing education of micro and small tourism enterprises: A model for programme development. *Irish Journal of Management, 31*(1), 77-99.

Kakuchi, S. (2023). *New internationalisation target aims for 400,000 foreign students.* https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20230411135129522

Kansai University of International Studies. (2024). *History of "Student support IR".* https://www.kuins.ac.jp/en/about/info/ir/frontlines/about.html

Kern, B. D., & Graber, K. C. (2018). Understanding teacher change: A national survey of U.S. physical educators. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 89*(1), 80-90.

Kinder, C. J., Richards, K. A. R., Woods, A. M., Shiver, V. N., & Cushing, C. L. (2024). Learning on the fly: Transitioning from doctoral student to physical education teacher educator. *European Physical Education Review, 30*(1), 19-35. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X231177978

Koellner, K., Seago, N., Riske, A., Placa, N., & Carlson, D. (2024). Teachers' perceptions and uptake of professional development overtime. *International Journal of Educational Research Open, 6.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2023.100308

Lassegard, J. P. (2016). Educational diversification strategies: Japanese universities' efforts to attract international students. In C. C. Ng., R. Fox & M. Nakano (Eds.), *Reforming learning and teaching in Asia-Pacific universities* (pp. 47-75). Springer.

Lee, T. (2022). Integration of foreign-born faculty in US higher education. In C. Glass., K. Bista & X. Lin (Eds.), *The experiences of international faculty in institutions of higher education* (pp. 163-173). Routledge.

Liang, M. (2022). Asian women faculty in the transnational context: cases in the United Arab Emirates. In C. Glass., K. Bista & X. Lin (Eds.), *The experiences of international faculty in institutions of higher education* (pp. 44-56). Routledge.

Lin, X., Bista, K., & Glass, C. R. (2022). Epilogue: the future of international faculty mobility and lessons learned. In C. Glass., K. Bista & X. Lin (Eds.), *The experiences of international faculty in institutions of higher education* (pp. 199-201). Routledge.

Locke W., & Marini G. (2021). The rapid increase in faculty from the European Union in UK higher education institutions and the possible impact of Brexit. In F. Huang., & A. R. Welch (Eds.), *International Faculty in Asia in Comparative Global Perspective* (pp. 185-202). Springer.

Manzi, C., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2022). Multiple identities juggling game: types of identity integration and their outcomes. *Self & Identity,* 21(5), 501-505. https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2022.2067222

Maskit, D. (2011). Teachers' attitudes toward pedagogical changes during various stages of professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(5), 851-860.

Massey University. (2015). *Code of responsible research conduct.* https://www.massey.ac.nz/research/ethics/responsible-research-conduct/#:~:text=The%20Code%20of%20Responsible%20Research%20Conduct%20(RRC)%20applies%20to%20all,participants%20(humans%20or%20animals).

Massey University. (2017). *Code of ethical conduct for research, teaching and evaluations involving human participants. Revised code.* https://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/research/research-ethics/human-ethics/code-ethical-conduct.cfm

Maurice-Takerei, L., & Anderson, H. (2013). Discipline-based teaching and identity expansion: Teacher education and the tertiary vocational educator in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work, 10*(2), 260-272.

McDaniel, C. E., Singh, A. T., Beck, J. B., Birnie, K., Fromme, H. B., Ginwalla, C. F., Griego, E., King, M., Maniscalco, J., Nazif, J., Patra, K. P., Seelbach, E., Walker, J. M., & Bhansali, P. (2019). Current practices and perspectives on peer observation and feedback: A national survey. *Academic Pediatrics, 19*(6), 691-697. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2019.03.005

McLoughlin, G. M., Richards, K. A. R., & Ivy, V. N. (2019). A longitudinal study of the transition from doctoral student to faculty member in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 90*(4), 699-711. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2019.1645940

Merkin, R. S. (2018). *Saving face in business: Managing cross-cultural interactions*. Palgrave Macmillan US.

Merriam, S. B., & Grenier, R. S. (2019). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Mills, A. J., Durepos, G., & Wiebe, E. (2010). Case study research in education. *In Encyclopedia of Case Study Research* (pp. 100-103). SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412957397

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Japan (MEXT). (2003). *Definition of FD.* https://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo4/003/gijiroku/06102415/006/003.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Japan (MEXT). (2013). *Basic school survey / 2013 institutions of higher education 《Aggregate Report》 (school survey universities and graduate schools)*. https://www.e-stat.go.jp/stat-search/files?stat_infid=000023610163

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Japan (MEXT). (2018). *Special feature 1: Grand design for higher education toward 2040.* https://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/hakusho/html/hpab201801/detail/1420041_00004.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Japan (MEXT). (2021). *Summary of the reform of educational content etc., in universities in the 2019 academic year*. https://www.mext.go.jp/content/20211104-mxt_daigakuc03-000018152_1.pdf

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Japan (MEXT). (2023). *Basic school survey / 2023 higher education institutions school survey school questionnaire (universities and graduate schools)*. https://www.e-stat.go.jp/stat-search/files?stat_infid=000040128631

Moran, R.T., & Abramson, N.R. (2017). *Managing cultural differences: Global leadership for the 21st Century (10th ed.).* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315403984

Nakano, M., Ng, C. C., & Ueda, N. (2016). The development of quality assurance practice in Japanese universities. In C. C. Ng., R. Fox & M. Nakano (Eds.), R*eforming learning and teaching in Asia-Pacific universities* (pp. 365-380). Springer.

Nakata, Y. (2014). *Uchi soto and Japanese group culture*. https://blog.gaijinpot.com/uchi-soto-japanese-culture/

National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE). (2014). *Overview: Quality assurance system in higher education, Japan*. https://www.niad.ac.jp/consolidation/international/info/japan.html

National Institution for Academic Degrees and Quality Enhancement of Higher Education. (2021). *Glossary of quality assurance in Japanese higher education*. https://niadqe.jp/glossary/5202/

Negishi, C. (2018). Daigaku kyouin wo mezasu daigakuinsei wo taishou to shita sougojugyoukansatsu puroguramu no shikou to hyouka [The peer observation of teaching practices for graduate student through preparing future faculty program: focusing on change in the graduate students' image of teaching], *The Annual Bulletin of the Japanese Society for the Study on Teacher Education, 27,* 146-156. https://doi.org/10.32292/jsste.27.0_146

Ngubane, N. I., & Gumede, S. C. (2017). Peer observation of teaching for professional development in higher education: experiences of two novice lecturers across two disciplines. *International Journal of Education and Research, 5*(2), 245-260.

Nishikawa, T. (2020). *The internationalization of Japanese universities: A case study on the integration of foreign faculty* [Doctor of Education thesis, University of Liverpool]. The University of Liverpool repository. https://livrepository.liverpool.ac.uk/3118952/

Nocos, E. (2023). *Japanese corporate culture. https://scalingyourcompany.com/japanese-corporate-culture/*

Ota, H. (2018). Internationalization of higher education: Global trends and Japan's challenges. *Educational Studies in Japan: International Yearbook, 12*, 91-105.

Ozeki, S., Hayashi, T., Fukano, M., Yamazaki, S., Beach, A. L., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2023). Examining the key components of faculty development to advance Japanese higher education: A qualitative study. *International Journal of Institutional Research and Management, 7*(1), 1-16.

Perera, D. M., & Greenidge, W. (2022). Issues, concerns and strategies for the success of foreign-born faculty. In C. Glass., K. Bista & X. Lin (Eds.), *The experiences of international faculty in institutions of higher education* (pp. 187-198). Routledge.

Pischetola, M., Møller, J. K., & Malmborg, L. (2023). Enhancing teacher collaboration in higher education: the potential of activity-oriented design for professional development. *Education and Information Technologies: The Official Journal of the IFIP Technical Committee on Education, 28*(6), 7571-7600. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11490-x

Poskitt, J. (2014). Transforming professional learning and practice in assessment for learning. *Curriculum Journal,* 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2014.981557

Poskitt, J., & Taylor, K. (2008). Sustaining professional development: Rhetoric or reality? *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 43*(1), 21-32.

Punch, K. F. & Oancea, A. (2014). *Introduction to research methods in education* (2nd ed.). SAGE.

Rix, J., & Paige-Smith, A. (2011). Exploring barriers to reflection and learning - developing a perspective lens. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 11*(1), 30-41. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2010.01185.x

Roloff Rothman, J. R. (2020). Faculty development in Japan: MEXT expectations and the reality at internationalizing universities. *Journal of Kanda University of International Studies, 32*, 301-321. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341496265_Faculty_Development_in_Japan_MEXT_Expectations_and_the_Reality_at_Internationalizing_Universities

Russell, P. (2013). Peer observation helping professional development. *The Language Teacher, 37*(5), 22-24. https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTTLT37.5-7

Saunders, R. (2012). The role of teacher emotions in change: Experiences, patterns and implications for professional development. *Journal of Educational Change, 14*(3), 303-333.

Schoch, K. (2020). Case study research. In K. A. Cox., L. M. Crawford., G. J. Burkholder., & J. H. Hitchcock (Eds.), *Research design and methods: An applied guide for the scholar-practitioner* (pp. 245-258). SAGE.

Scott, J., Pryce, J., Reinke, N. B., Parkinson, A. L., Li, D., Shuker, M.-A., Singleton, R., & Tsai, A. (2023). Towards a 'community for practice': A narrative analysis of the evolution of higher education scholars. *Education Sciences, 13*(12). https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13121239

Sherin, M.G., Richards, J., & Altshuler, M. (2021). *Learning from recording video of your own classroom*. https://kappanonline.org/learning-from-recording-video-of-your-own-classroom/

Shortland, S. (2004). Peer observation: a tool for staff development or compliance? *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 28*(2), 219-228. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877042000206778

Shrestha, I. M., & Khanal, S. K. (2016). Indegenization of higher education: reflections from Nepal. In J. Xing., & P. Ng (Eds.), *Indegenous Culture, Education and Globalization* (pp. 137-158). Springer.

Simko, C., & Olick, J. K. (2021). What we talk about when we talk about culture: a multi-facet approach. *American Journal of Cultural Sociology, 9*(4), 431-459. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41290-019-00094-7

Sotardi, V. A., & Brogt, E. (2023). Supporting tertiary educators: Insights from the COVID-19 shift to online teaching and learning and the role of senior management. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 58*(2), 417-439. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40841-023-00299-y

Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Anderson, B., Barnett, B. M., Centeno, A., Naismith, L., Prideaux, D., Spencer, J., Tullo, E., Viggiano, T., Ward, H., & Dolmans, D. (2016). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to enhance teaching effectiveness: A 10-year update: BEME Guide No. 40. *Medical Teacher, 38*(8), 769-786. https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2016.1181851

Stone, J. (2010). Moving interprofessional learning forward through formal assessment. *Medical Education, 44*(4), 396-403. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2009.03607.x

Suzuki, K. (2013). *University faculty development in Japanese context.* An invited keynote address at the international conference on faculty/educational development, Qingdao, China.

The University of Tokyo. (2021). *Shedding the "men's university" mantle*. https://www.u-tokyo.ac.jp/focus/en/features/z1304_00162.html

Timperley, H. (2008). *Teacher professional learning and development.* International Bureau of Education.

Tolich, M., & Davidson, C. (1999). Ethics: Taking the role of the other. In M. Tolich & C. Davidson (Eds.), *Starting fieldwork: An introduction to qualitative research in New Zealand* (pp. 69-87). Oxford University Press.

Torabian, J. E. (2022). *Wealth, values, culture & education: reviving the essentials for equality and sustainability*. Springer.

Tripp, T. R., & Rich, P. J. (2012). The influence of video analysis on the process of teacher change. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*(5), 728-739.

University of Minnesota. (2016). *Sociology*. https://open.lib.umn.edu/sociology/chapter/3-1-culture-and-the-sociological-perspective/

Vaughn, L. (2019). *Psychology and culture: thinking, feeling, and behaving in global contexts* (Second edition). Routledge.

Watanabe, S. P. (2011). Impacts of university education reform on faculty perceptions of workload. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 31*(4), 407-420. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2011.621602

Whitworth, B. A., & Chiu, J. L. (2015). Professional development and teacher change: The missing leadership link. *Journal of Science Education, 26*(2), 121-137. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-014-9411-2

Williams, L. (2019). *Working at a Japanese university: An attractive option for international humanities PhDs?* https://www.tokyohumanities.org/internationalphds.html#part6

Yamada, A. (2022). Globalization and internationalization of higher education reform in Japan: Pre and post Covid-19. In J. Zajda & W. J. Jacob (Eds.), *Discourses of Globalisation and Higher Education Reforms: Emerging Paradigms* (pp. 93-112). Springer.

Yamada, M. (2015). *Sougojugyousankan to jikojugyoukansatsu ni yoru jugyoukaizen no kentou senmonshoku daigakuin ni okeru jireikenkyu [Practice study of improving teaching methods through mutual classroom visitations and self-observations: a case study at a professional graduate school]*. http://kyoiku-u.jp/assets/files/documents/Journal/08-01.pdf

Yamada, R. (2016). The development process of IR in the United States: analysis of the function of IR in the framework of higher education policy and the issue of professionalism. *Japanese Journal of Higher Education Research, 19*, 25-47. https://doi.org/10.32116/jaher.19.0_25

Yonezawa, A. (2020). Challenges of the Japanese higher education amidst population decline and globalization, *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 18*(1), 43-52. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2019.1690085

Yoon, H., & Hong, J. E. (2022). Transnationalism of Asian female scholars in US higher education institutions. In C. Glass., K. Bista & X. Lin (Eds.), *The experiences of international faculty in institutions of higher education* (pp. 34-43). Routledge.

Appendices

Appendix A: Information Sheet

Information Sheet

International teachers' perceived Professional Learning and Development (PLD) experiences at a Japanese university and the relationship between the Dimensions of National Culture.

About the Researcher

My name is Lucia Ju and I am a Master of Education student with an endorsement in Teaching and Learning at Massey University, New Zealand. My thesis supervisors are Associate Professor Jenny Poskitt and Dr Philippa Butler. My research interests are in Professional Learning and Development (PLD) for tertiary sectors and this research aims to specifically focus on PLD in Japanese universities for international teachers.

Purpose and Invitation to the Study

As a part of the globalisation schemes, we can now see an increasing number of international teachers in Japanese universities in recent years. However, research states that international teachers often face difficulty integrating into Japanese universities due to cultural factors. Despite this, no studies have shown how cultural factors can influence international teachers' teaching. This research investigates the perceptions and experiences of PLD in Japanese universities and how cultural factors impact international teachers to develop their teaching practices further.

Please make sure that you read and understand the information sheet. If you have any questions or concerns about any part of this information sheet please feel free to ask me. If you need an explanation in other languages, I can speak English, Japanese and Korean.

Voluntary participation

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time and you have the freedom to decline to answer any specific question in the interview or survey. Additionally, you do not have to give a reason if you do not wish to participate. If you decide to withdraw or decline, you will not be disadvantaged in any way. After you withdraw from the study, we will no longer collect your information and all information collected will be discarded immediately.

If you would like to participate please complete the informed consent form at the end of this information sheet. You will be provided with a copy of this information sheet and the consent form to keep.

Institute of Education
Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand
06 3569099 | massey.ac.nz

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
TE KUNENGA KI PŪREHUROA
UNIVERSITY OF NEW ZEALAND

Participant Recruitment

Participants will be identified through the below criteria:

1. Full-time international teachers
2. International teachers who do not hold Japanese passports or citizenship
3. International teachers who are educated at primary (elementary) and college (middle school to high school) outside of Japan
4. Currently residing in Japan
5. Ability to communicate in English or Japanese

If you feel that approval from your university is necessary, please let me know and I will take the necessary procedures at your university. During this procedure, your identity may become known to the university. If you feel uncomfortable, you can freely withdraw from participation.

Research Design

This research will involve two types of data collection which will occur at the same time. Your participation will either involve an interview or an online survey. For both types, you will be asked for demographic information such as ethnicity, gender, teaching experience and how many years you have lived in Japan. Please note that all participants will be provided with a numeric identifier and your identity will not be made known within the research.

Interview

The venue of the interview will be a rental office or a private room in the library. I will pay the rental fee. If you are eligible but not residing in Eastern Japan, the interview will be held on an online platform such as Zoom. Each interview will take no more than 45 minutes and will be recorded. I will obtain your permission to record before the interview begins. All interviews will be transcribed through the Microsoft Transcribe function for analysis.

Interview date and time:

- Weekdays: After 6 p.m. (I cannot travel to your area). *Only available on Zoom.
- Weekends: Any time after 10 a.m. (I can travel to your area if you are residing in Eastern Japan).

If you can participate in the interview please contact me at [redacted]

Survey

The survey will be through Microsoft Forms, open from 11th September 2023 to 25th September 2023, and take approximately 15-30 minutes. The survey has in total 37 questions. This survey consists of seven demographic questions and 30 questions, categorised into six sections following the Dimensions of National Culture by Geert Hofstede. All questions are based on the 7-point Likert Scale (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree).

- Survey link: https://forms.office.com/r/c8McZLFww4

Institute of Education
Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand
06 3569099 | massey.ac.nz

Possible Risks of the Study

This research will consist of your involvement in sharing your perceptions and experiences of PLD in Japanese universities and its relevance to cultural factors. Due to the topic's sensitivity, if you feel discomfort before, during and after the interview or the survey, please let me know.

If you feel severe psychological discomfort from the research, please refer to the below contact:

- International Mental Health Professionals Japan (https://www.imhpj.org/all-members/)
- TELL (https://telljp.com)

Additionally, although I will endeavour to ensure that you will not become identifiable, absolute confidentiality of your identity cannot be guaranteed. Even if the data is coded and anonymous, there may be a chance you could be identifiable.

Possible Benefits of the Study

Your participation will help the researcher and the universities in Japan to understand the current situation with PLDs. This will serve as a starting point for extending additional assistance for international teachers becoming involved in PLD, development and implementation of teaching and learning strategies etc., in Japanese universities.

Data Management

During this study, I will record information about you. This study will not collect, store or disclose information to third parties that will identify you. This includes your date of birth, address, name of the university, identification numbers and photos. Your email address will be made known to the researcher only to arrange a time, and venue for the interview and to send the final summary report of my research. The researcher may also contact you through your email address if you wish to check the transcribed interview text.

Confidential information

All participants will be coded with a number to ensure that you are not identifiable or become known through the information you provide me. For the interview only, during the research, I will keep a list of codes with your name so that you can be identified if needed. This data will be stored on the Massey University OneDrive and discarded one year after the submission of the thesis (end of November 2024).

Institute of Education
Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand
06 3569099 | massey.ac.nz

Sharing of information

The information that you provide me may be shared with my supervisors to gain advice on my interpretation of the data. When sharing the information only the coded files will be provided and I will password-protect all files to ensure that your personal information is kept safe. Additionally, in accordance with the Personal Data Protection Law in Japan, I will not disclose any of your personal information and share my research situation on Social Networking Sites (SNS), Blogs, Twitter, Line and Facebook.

Security and storage of information

Your interview transcript, survey answers and recorded audio files will be stored in the Massey University OneDrive and will only be accessible to me. Any recorded data on my phone will be deleted immediately after transferring the data to OneDrive. Furthermore, I will password-protect all files that include your data. Any identifiable data (i.e., interview transcript, survey data, consent forms etc.) and non-identifiable data (i.e., survey responses) will be deleted from the OneDrive one year after the submission of the thesis (end of November 2024).

Right to access information

All participants have the right to request access to your information. You are free to decide which information to share and not disclose. You also have the right to access the audio transcript to verify that the information is accurate. Please ask me or email me to request access to the audio transcript.

Results of the Study

At the end of this study, you will be provided with a summary report either in English or Japanese.

Contact Information

If you have any questions, concerns or comments about the study you are able to reach us through below.

Researcher
Name: Lucia Ju Email address: [redacted]

Supervisors
Name: Jenny Poskitt Email address: [redacted]

Name: Philippa Butler Email address: [redacted]

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Ohu Matatika 3, Application OM3 23/34. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact the Chairperson, Massey University Human Ethics Ohu Matatika 3, email humanethics3@massey.ac.nz

Appendix B: Ethics Documentation

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
TE KUNENGA KI PŪREHUROA
UNIVERSITY OF NEW ZEALAND

11/09/2023

Dear: Lucia Ju

Re: Ethics Application - OM3 23/34 - International teachers' perceived Professional Learning and Development (PLD) experiences at a Japanese university and the relationship between the Dimensions of National Culture.

Thank you for the above application that was considered by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee:

Ohu Matatika 3 at their meeting held on **Thursday, 13 July 2023**

On behalf of the Committee I am pleased to advise you that the ethics of your application are approved.

Approval is for three years. If this project has not been completed within three years from the date of this letter, reapproval must be requested.

If the nature, content, location, procedures or personnel of your approved application change, please advise the Secretary of the Committee.

Yours sincerely

Professor Craig Johnson
Chair, Human Ethics Chairs' Committee and Director (Research Ethics)

Research Ethics Office, Research and Enterprise
Massey University, Private Bag 11 222, Palmerston North, 4442, New Zealand T 06 951 6841; 06 95106840
E humanethics@massey.ac.nz; animalethics@massey.ac.nz; gtc@massey.ac.nz

Appendix C: Interview Questions

Interview guide (semi-structured)

How do international faculty perceive their experiences of Professional Learning and Development (PLD) in Japanese universities?

In this interview, the term Professional Learning and Development (PLD) will be replaced with a more commonly used term in Japanese universities: Faculty Development (FD).

Timing	Interview questions/comments
Beginning of the interview (5 minutes)	- Briefing the participant. o Introduce myself. o Explain the purpose of the interview. o Seek permission for recording. o Any questions from the participant.
Interview (30 minutes)	1. Tell me about how you came to Japan. 2. In general, how would you describe your teaching experience at a Japanese university? 3. Tell me about your experiences with Faculty Development (FD) in Japanese universities. o Do you attend mandatory FD? o What types of FD have you experienced? o Do you have opportunities to apply new teaching methods in the classroom? 4. Do you remember an occasion when you experienced conflict between what you wanted to change and what was expected of the university? (Power Distance) 5. What are your thoughts about suggesting new teaching methods to your colleagues? (Individualism, Uncertainty Avoidance, Indulgence) 6. Can you provide an example of a time when faculty members helped you by sharing their teaching and learning techniques? (Long-Term Orientation, Masculinity) 7. What is your opinion about FD in Japanese universities? 8. Tell me about your experiences with the Japanese language. 9. Do you remember an occasion when the language affected your professional life (i.e., participating in FD)? 10. What do you believe is the main purpose of FD for you?
Debrief (5 minutes)	- Debrief the participant. o Turn the recorder off. o Ask if the participant has any other comments or questions before I finish the interview.

Appendix D: Request Letter (English Translation)

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
TE KUNENGA KI PŪREHUROA
UNIVERSITY OF NEW ZEALAND

Request Letter for Research

Research title: International Teachers' perceived Professional Learning and Development (PLD) experiences at a Japanese university and the relationship between the Dimensions of National Culture.

Hello, my name is Lucia Ju and I am currently researching Professional Learning and Development at Massey University. We would like to request the support of international teachers affiliated with your university. We kindly ask for their cooperation in participating in an interview and/or questionnaire for our research.

The purpose of this study is to understand the thoughts and experiences of international teachers at Japanese universities regarding PLD. Additionally, we will identify cultural factors that affect international teachers to improve their teaching methods. This research will be presented as a master's thesis. We will ask sensitive questions with consideration for your situation, but if we need to discuss a specific case, we will make it anonymous (for example, Hospital Z or Facility X). You are not obligated to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable, and you may withdraw from the study at any time without any disadvantage. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact us at the address provided, and the researcher will respond to you.

Participants

Participants will be identified through the below criteria:

1. Full-time international faculty
2. International faculty who do not hold Japanese passports or citizenship
3. International faculty who are educated at primary (elementary) and college (middle school to high school) outside of Japan
4. Currently residing in Japan
5. Ability to communicate in English or Japanese

Data collection method

1. In-person interview or online interview
2. Online questionnaire

Duration

1. The interview will take approximately 30 to 45 minutes.
2. The survey will take approximately 15 to 30 minutes.

Institute of Education
Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand
06 3569099 | massey.ac.nz

Protection of Personal Information

We will prioritize protecting the personal information of international faculty members by securing all audio and text files with a password. Third-party access to the data will not be permitted, and we will ensure that all data is deleted once the research is finished.

Contact Information

If you have any questions, concerns or comments about the study, you are able to reach us through below.

Researcher
Name: Lucia Ju Email address: [redacted]

Supervisors
Name: Jenny Poskitt Email address: [redacted]

Name: Philippa Butler Email address: [redacted]

Appendix E: MindNode Brainstorming Example