Japanese Studies in the United States:

The View from 2012

Japanese Studies Series XXXX

2013

THE JAPAN FOUNDATION

Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 2

Chapter 3

Chapter 4

Chapter 5

Chapter 6

Chapter 7

Preface

The Japan Foundation, since its establishment in 1972, has been supporting Japanese studies all over the world, and has implemented surveys on the state of Japanese studies in main countries. In cooperation with the Association for Asian Studies, the Japanese Studies Association of Canada, and later the University of Hawaii, surveys were conducted for North America in 1989, 1995 and 2005. The results were published as multi-volume sets; *Directory of Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada*, which was published in three editions, *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s, Japanese Studies in Canada: The 1990s,* and *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*. In 2010, the Japan Foundation once again initiated a survey on the state of Japanese studies in the United States and Canada which would succeed the above surveys. With cooperation from the University of Hawaii again, the survey is now complete. Unlike the previous volumes, the survey results, data, and information are only available online. You may find them at http://japandirectory.socialsciences.hawaii.edu/.

Since the publication of the last survey, domestic and international circumstances in Japan have dramatically changed. In March 2011, northeastern Japan was devastated by the massive earthquake and tsunami disaster, while the financial crisis continues to put stress on the world's economy. These changes should also have no little impact on scholars and institutions of Japanese studies. Therefore, we believe that this new survey, in the midst of such change in Japan as well as the world will provide not only a picture of the current state of Japanese studies but also as a marker or landmark for the future of Japanese studies. It is our hope that it will be useful in promoting collaborative efforts and networking among those who are engaged in activities related in Japan, not only in North America, but the rest of the world.

We wish to extend our deepest gratitude to Professor Patricia G. Steinhoff of the University of Hawaii, whose devotion and diligence directed the entirety of this project. Our sincere thanks also go to Professor Julian Dierkes of the University of British Columbia for his constant cooperation and dedication to the project. We finally wish to acknowledge the University of Hawaii for undertaking the planning, data-gathering, and compilation of this project.

Eiji Taguchi
Executive Vice-President
The Japan Foundation

January 2013

Editor's Introduction

This analysis of the state of Japanese Studies in the United States is a companion volume to the fourth edition of the *Directory of Japan Specialists and Japanese Studies Institutions in the United States and Canada.* It updates the U.S. portion of the analysis published in 2007 entitled *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities.* Because of continuing increases in the cost of publishing print volumes, we combined the analysis of both countries into one volume last time. However, this time we are only producing a fully formatted pdf file and not printing at all, so we have the luxury of once again doing a full volume of analysis on the United States alone and a separate volume for Canada.

The project as a whole is part of a continuing series of country studies that have been sponsored and underwritten by The Japan Foundation around the world. For the United States and Canada, these have included a 1984 questionnaire study of Japanese Studies in the United States, a 1988 report on Japanese Studies in Canada containing a report and directory, a 1988 volume of essays on Japanese Studies in the United States, directories of the United States and Canada published in 1989, 1995, and 2007, a 1996 monograph on Japanese Studies in the United States in the 1990s and its companion volume for Canada, the 2007 monograph on Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada, and the just-completed directory of Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada. For the newest directory, we have produced three pdf volumes and have also made the directory information available on a searchable website at http://japandirectory.socialsciences.hawaii.edu. The full directory pdf volumes are also available for download on the website.

As with the two previous studies, we have combined the collection of data for the directory and for the study of the state of the field, since much of the same information needs to be collected for both purposes. This is my third monograph analyzing the state of Japanese Studies in the United States based on the extensive survey data collected with the wonderful cooperation of Japan specialists and Japanese Studies institutions in North America. Although a fair number of Japan specialists who currently live outside the United States and Canada also appear in the new edition of the directory, they are included in the directory because they remain firmly attached to the intellectual communities of Japan specialists in North America. However, we exclude them from this analysis of the state of Japanese Studies in the United States except for a brief analysis of the globalization of Japanese Studies and its impact on the field in the United States.

The Japan Foundation study differs from other information resources about Japan Studies in its goal of comprehensive rather than selective coverage and its inclusion of both people and institutions engaged in the study of Japan. Japanese Studies as field of specialization points to a growing body of knowledge about Japan that some individuals learn, extend, challenge,

and share with others. In this volume I explore what it takes to learn, create, extend, maintain, and transmit that body of knowledge about Japan. I look at the human and material resources involved in this enterprise, and try to place it in historical context.

Because only six years have passed since the last analysis, I have treated this analysis as an update of that study rather than starting anew. When I write these analyses I am constantly reminded that I am following in the footsteps of others who have carried out similar tasks in previous decades, and my own studies now extend across the past three decades. In the last two monographs I have carefully extracted whatever data was available from earlier studies in order to examine the patterns of continuity and change in the field. This time also I began by updating the many tables in the last study to add the new numbers we have just collected. Then I have tried to understand what the numbers signify for the current state of Japanese Studies in the United States, and where it seems to be headed in the near future. I have revised and updated the text as needed to reflect my best sense of the current situation. I look both forward and backward, and often see things I missed earlier but can now see clearly with the benefit of hindsight. This time I have taken the liberty of not rewriting methodological details and earlier analyses, but I have extended and amplified them as needed.

I hope that this analysis of the state of Japanese Studies in the United States will be useful to those involved in guiding and developing the field, and will also be a resource in the future for those who want to know how Japanese Studies has developed over time.

Patricia G. Steinhoff
March, 2013

Acknowledgments

This study, like its predecessors, has come about through the goodwill and generosity of many organizations and individuals. I want to thank particularly The Japan Foundation, the Association for Asian Studies, and the University of Hawaii, which have all been generous, flexible, and patient in their support of the project.

At The Japan Foundation Tokyo Headquarters, three individuals have been centrally involved in the project this time: Mr. Tadashi Ogawa, who twisted my arm mightily to get me to do it again, Mr. Hideki Hara, who oversaw it until his transfer in fall 2012, and Ms. Masayo Shiozawa, who has handled the final stages with Ms. Marie Suzuki. Unlike the previous projects, this one was not managed out of the New York office of the Japan Foundation, but directors and staff there graciously invited Professor Julian Dierkes and me to meet with the American Advisory Committee in January 2011 to launch the project, and then invited me to the AAC meeting in January 2013 to receive the first report of the project's findings.

Although the Association for Asian Studies was less involved in the project this time, its Executive Director Michael Paschal, had worked closely with the 1995 study as a staff member at The Japan Foundation New York office and he has generously facilitated our relations with the AAS for the two most recent studies. Julian Dierkes has been a joy to work with, always ready to do whatever he can for the project despite being involved from a distance most of the time. At the University of Hawaii, the project could not have been carried out without the cheerful and competent support of the College of Social Sciences Systems Manager, Harry Partika, who spent many hours setting up, maintaining, and troubleshooting the servers for the project. The sociology department's administrative assistant Cherry Lou Rojo provided front-line fiscal support, and also worked closely with our fiscal officer, David Matsuda and his assistant Lea Nohara. Luanne Nakamura of the Office of Research Support helpline held my hand and patiently assisted me when the university switched to a complex new grants management system that required principal investigators to do all sorts of complex online transactions themselves, using a very unfriendly system. The sociology department Chair, Professor Valli Kalei Kanuha, generously bailed us out when we lost track of our spending amid an impenetrable new fiscal system. I thank them all warmly for their support and patience with the project's complex fiscal arrangements.

The project has depended mightily on the expertise of programmers Skol Watanawongskul and Trang Phan Tu, who programmed both the data website and the final searchable display website, and desktop publishing specialist Wanda China, who not only handled the desktop publishing end, but handled all the complex interfaces between Access, the Adobe programs, and the SQL server databases. A whole host of very competent and reliable University of Hawaii graduate students made the project happen on a daily basis, with cheerful dedication.

Closely involved in the project at various times were graduate students Kristyn Martin, Shinji Kojima, Yoko Wang, Mike Dziesinski, San Tun Aung, Jon Jarvis, Gita Neupane, Noriko Shiratori, Hiroki Igarashi, Hye Won Um, and undergraduate Liane Kobayashi. Joahna Rocchio, another graduate student who is also a professional web designer, provided very helpful advice on the final design of the directory's display website.

At the end of the 2007 acknowledgments I thanked my husband and wrote that I had promised never to do this project again. He sighed patiently when I broke that promise and has been as supportive as always. We both hope there won't be a next time!

Patricia G. Steinhoff
March, 2013

1

An Overview of Japanese Studies in the United States

Over the past several years I have repeatedly heard anxious comments about the state of Japanese Studies in the United States. People look at me with a grave expression and say, "I hear that Japanese Studies is really declining, and everyone is going into Chinese Studies." Sometimes they assert confidently, "I understand that Japanese Studies is losing students and Chinese Studies is booming." Others comment, "Everybody seems to be switching from Japanese to Chinese these days. What will happen to Japanese Studies?" We have all heard some version of this comment, which has taken on the status of an urban legend. Notice that it is almost always couched as a comparative statement about the relative strength of Chinese Studies and Japanese Studies. It clearly reflects the fact of China's rising economic strength that seems to portend some decline for both the United States and Japan. Whether the rise of China has a direct or indirect effect on Japanese Studies in the United States is a separate question that must be answered with empirical evidence.

People seek me out to make this comment because they know that I have been studying Japanese Studies in the United States for a long time, and they seem to expect that I will reinforce their impression with some data. Now I do have the data and can firmly refute the urban legend. The numbers are unequivocal: Japanese Studies is alive and well in the United States, regardless of what is happening in Chinese Studies. We will examine those numbers in subsequent chapters. I do not have any comparative data for China, and no one has undertaken for China the sort of studies that the Japan Foundation has so generously funded for Japan over the past several decades. However, I can offer some insight into the question of why the myth persists, through an analysis of the current state of Japanese Studies in the United States and the factors that underlie its continuing health.

This study looks at Japanese Studies in the United States early in the second decade of the twenty-first century, in the context of what has gone on before. Japanese Studies in the United States today reflects the life experiences and academic training of the people who identify themselves as Japan specialists, and the structures that have been created to house and nurture the study of Japan since the beginning of the postwar era. Our study therefore encompasses both Japan specialists as individuals and Japanese Studies institutions with their collective resources. The following chapters present the data collected from our recent surveys of Japan specialists, Japanese Studies programs, and Japanese librarians with a great many tables of

numbers. I then try to interpret these data through comparisons with similar findings from earlier studies of Japanese Studies in the United States, and by considering the findings within the broader American academic context.

In this introduction I will first discuss what is distinctive about that American context, then introduce these earlier studies briefly, and present a general interpretive framework of three broad paradigms that have shaped Japanese Studies in the United States: the language and area studies paradigm; the economic competition paradigm; and the cultural studies paradigm. I believe these three paradigms characterize the underlying assumptions and organization of Japanese Studies in the United States during particular time periods, and consequently have a profound effect on the nature of the field today. The earlier studies themselves reflect the paradigms within which they were conducted, even if that was not apparent at the time.

My hope is that this broad conceptual framework will help us see more general patterns in the mass of detailed quantitative material that comprises the current study's findings and their relation to the previous studies. Each paradigm has implications for the kinds of people who are attracted into Japanese Studies, the organization of the programs in which they study and later teach, and the kinds of knowledge they study and then extend through their own research and teaching. However, the paradigms themselves are also affected very fundamentally by general characteristics of American higher education, so that is where we will begin.

What is Distinctive about Japanese Studies in the United States?

Although Japanese Studies is thoroughly globalized and there are Japan specialists and Japanese Studies programs in countries all over the world, Japanese Studies in the United States remains distinctive. Japanese Studies in the United States is as much about America as it is about Japan. It is profoundly affected by political and economic structures, and social and intellectual currents within the United States, which are only partially related to changing American perceptions of Japan itself. These American structures and preoccupations affect four very practical and observable aspects of Japanese Studies.

First, American organizational structures and assumptions affect how the study of Japan is organized and carried out within academic institutions, and what kind of support it receives, both internal and external. Academic programs develop and then replicate standard models that respond to their own institutional and national needs. These do not necessarily bear any intrinsic relation to the subject matter being studied. While there is considerable variability within and between institutions, as well as change over time, there are still larger institutional and structural constraints in American academics that limit that variability to a few recognizable patterns. These structures and assumptions are distinctively different from the way the study of Japan is organized and carried out in Japan or in most European countries.

Second, American concerns and perceptions of Japan affect who comes into Japanese Studies. As the image and meaning of Japan and Japanese Studies changes within American society over time, different types of students may be attracted to it for different reasons and their commitment to the field may vary accordingly. We therefore need to ask who is attracted to the study of Japan and why, and what is the nature of their commitment to it. Yet to the extent that these people remain in Japanese Studies once they have entered it, they experience and respond to subsequent changes in the larger national and international context as their individual lives and careers continue.

Third, American ideas and conditions affect what kinds of research American Japan specialists choose to do, first as doctoral students and later as mature scholars. These choices in

turn affect the economic support they can obtain to do the research, where they can publish the results, and the ramifications of the research on their subsequent careers. The choices made by individual Japan specialists are shaped by academic committees that guide graduate students, dispense research funding, review manuscripts, and hire faculty, providing the dynamism that both reproduces and changes the field of Japanese Studies over time.

Fourth, the nature of the expertise that Japan specialists develop through their own training and research affects the courses and programs they will offer to their students; however, their impact is also filtered through broader institutional requirements and assumptions about how programs and courses are supposed to be organized. American academic institutions give individual programs and faculty members considerable leeway to innovate within their own courses and to create new courses, but changing the overall curriculum or the organization of a program takes more time and collaborative effort. Such curricular changes in turn may respond to changes in the student body, or they may be intended to attract new kinds of students to Japanese Studies, bringing us full circle back to the first and second factors.

Let us first examine this distinctively style of American Japanese Studies in a bit more detail, to see how the four components fit together. Higher education in the United States is organized somewhat differently from its organization in Japan or Europe. The dominant structure is the disciplinary department, which is much smaller and narrower in scope than the Japanese or German faculty, and also does not have the same relationship with students. There also seem to be some differences in the relationship to students between American disciplinary departments and disciplinary courses of study in the British system.

Although in the history of higher education many of the academic disciplines we recognize today are of fairly recent origin, the have become firmly entrenched as the basic organizational units within American colleges and universities, particularly within the arts and sciences that encompass most Japanese Studies activity. Disciplinary departments may fall under an arts and sciences administration as a whole; at large institutions there may be an intermediate layer in which they report to a dean of humanities, social sciences, or natural sciences. However, these disciplinary departments have a great deal of independence, and they are not integrated tightly into "faculties" to which students belong and within which they receive nearly all their training.

There is also some resistance to the dominance of disciplinary departments in American higher education, and interdisciplinary programs are often created to cut across disciplinary boundaries. Precisely because disciplinary departments are not bundled into a structure of very separate faculties to which students are admitted, interdisciplinary programs can encompass faculty and courses across a very wide range of disciplines. They can and do involve faculty who are housed in, affiliated with, and must respond to different organizational units and lines of authority. Hence they create certain tensions between disciplinary departments, which may be felt by faculty and students who try to straddle disciplinary lines.

This distinctive structure based on disciplinary departments shapes the nature of graduate training in the United States. It has a strong impact on doctoral training in Japanese Studies in certain fields, particularly in the social sciences. Most doctoral students in Japanese Studies in the United States study within a disciplinary department and receive a doctorate in that discipline. While there are many master's level interdisciplinary programs in Japanese Studies and East Asian Studies, there are very few such degrees awarded at the doctoral level, although there are now a few PhD degrees in Japanese or East Asian Languages and Cultures or Languages and Civilization.

The overwhelming majority of doctoral degrees concerning Japan or East Asia are award-

ed as degrees in language, literature, history, or some other discipline; they are awarded by disciplinary departments with similar names. Except for degrees in Japanese literature and language (including linguistics and language pedagogy), virtually all of these degrees are offered by departments that have at most two or three Japan specialists on their faculty. Moreover, American doctoral programs generally have departmental course requirements, examinations, and writing requirements prior to the dissertation. In some programs basic course requirements are handled at the MA level, but there still are general program requirements before the student is allowed to proceed to the dissertation. This is radically different from the practice in some other countries, where students admitted to a doctoral program are only required to submit a dissertation for faculty approval.

It is also customary for doctoral students in American institutions to have a doctoral committee of several persons, who conduct the major evaluations and decisions about the student's progress. Although a student may have chosen a particular department in order to study with a particular scholar, that person may have little to do with the student's admission to the program, and does not control the student's program requirements. Consequently, a student's doctoral committee will have members who are not Japan specialists, and the orientation of the degree program itself is not specifically focused on Japan or East Asia (although in some cases there might be a special East Asia track within the program). Doctoral training in a discipline is designed to prepare the student to teach in that discipline, so the course and examination requirements are likely to include study of certain subfields in the discipline, which often do not correspond to specific geographic areas of the world. At the dissertation level, the student's committee will understand the topic as a contribution to the discipline, using a study of Japan to explore the issue. The dissertation topic itself will be designed to address an issue that is of current relevance in the discipline, and the student will have to defend it in those terms, rather than as a contribution to Japanese Studies.

This disciplinary structure also affects undergraduate education, and is very much related to the American ideal of an undergraduate liberal education, in which students must take a range of courses in different disciplines to meet general education requirements during their first two years (which may include a foreign language requirement), and then choose a major to specialize in during the last two years. The major is usually in a discipline but could also be an established interdisciplinary program. This is quite different from systems in which students are admitted to a particular faculty or course of study as freshmen and remain within it for their full undergraduate program. While critics may argue that this structure of higher education reflects the fact that American students do not have as rigorous a secondary education as students in other countries, the result is a distinctively different pattern of undergraduate education.

In this system, students generally have a great deal of freedom to choose courses that meet a menu of requirements, rather than following a predetermined sequence of courses that lead to the degree. Some courses may be required for a particular degree program, but there remains considerable latitude for students to explore different topics and follow their own interests. The American undergraduate program is based on course credits, which are the basic units for general education requirements, requirements of the major, and other elective courses that students may take. Typically, the major comprises far less than half of the overall number of credits required to graduate. Because of this loose, credit-based structure and a principle of accepting credits earned elsewhere, it is easy for students to transfer between institutions, or to begin at an inexpensive public two-year community college and then transfer to a four year institution to complete their degree.

Both public and private higher educational institutions in the United States face serious long-term economic issues, and the current neo-liberal economic climate has definitely penetrated the ivory tower. At public colleges and universities, and increasingly at many private institutions as well, economic decisions are heavily based on student demand for both courses and majors. Even if an institution has made the commitment to develop a Japanese Studies program, the size of that program and its potential for growth and access to resources will depend to a considerable extent on student enrollments over which it has limited control, since the students choose what courses they take within general guidelines. Moreover, courses related to Japan that are offered in different departments will impact the status and resources of those disciplinary departments, and will also figure into their hiring decisions. Hence to understand the state of Japanese Studies in the United States, we have to consider both what the Japan Foundation and most outsiders would consider "programs" that offer degrees, and also the individual courses that are offered for credit at the undergraduate and graduate levels. More generally, many features of Japanese Studies in the United States only become comprehensible within the overall nature and structure of American higher education.

Three Paradigms of Japanese Studies in the United States

In this section I present an overview of the postwar history of Japanese Studies in the United States based on a model of three different paradigms that I believe have profoundly shaped the development of the field. In the process I also present the major studies that have been conducted about the field, as the basis for understanding the series of data tables that underpin the analysis in subsequent chapters. The discussion of the early studies of the field is based heavily on the account presented in the 1996 monograph *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s*.

Japanese Studies as a recognized academic enterprise is primarily a postwar phenomenon in the United States, although there were a few individual scholars and language programs before the war. The first known study specifically on Japan[1] was a survey carried out in 1933 by Yasaka Takagi of Tokyo Imperial University, covering individuals who were engaged in or "interested in" Japanese Studies, and academic institutions offering courses related to Japan. It was commissioned by the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, which published it in 1935.[2] Conducted by a sympathetic and knowledgeable observer who hoped to increase American understanding of Japan, the survey revealed starkly how limited the resources for the study of Japan were in the United States prior to the war. While the U.S. government may have carried out some surveys in conjunction with the creation of Japanese language training programs during the war, none are known to be in the public record. There also do not seem to be any surveys from the first two postwar decades, when returning veterans went to graduate school on the G.I. Bill as the first postwar cohort of American-trained Japan specialists.[3]

---

1 Jansen discusses a 1928 survey of all accredited academic institutions in the United States by the Institute for Pacific Relations, which asked about any course coverage of China and Japan, but the Takagi survey seems to be the first devoted entirely to Japan. Marius B. Jansen, "History: General Survey," in The Japan Foundation, *Japanese Studies in the United States: Part I, History and Present Condition,* Japanese Studies Series XVII, ed. by Marius B. Jansen (Ann Arbor: Association for Asian Studies, 1988), pp. 11–13.

2 Yasaka Takagi, *Japanese Studies in the Universities and Colleges of the United States* (Institute of Pacific Relations, 1935), pamphlet, 50 pp.

3 The Japan Foundation, *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* p. 3.

As I see it, there have been three overlapping paradigms within which Japanese Studies has been carried out in the United States since the late 1950s. To some extent they reflect changes within Japan itself, but they also constitute changes in the intellectual environment of the United States that intersect and interact with what has been happening in Japan. I understand them as American phenomena that underlie and shape the way Japanese Studies is practiced in the United States. I refer to them as the language and area studies paradigm, the economic competition paradigm, and the cultural studies paradigm.

The entire time span of postwar Japanese Studies in the United States is brief enough that more than half of the field's current participants have experienced all three paradigms. Social change is rarely sudden, revolutionary, and visible from the top down. Most often it appears first as small scale conflicts, alternatives, and innovations in local contexts or on the periphery, which only gradually come to displace the dominant pattern at the center. It is not always clear what is happening as someone lives through it, even if one can see and experience some of the elements. The full scope of the transformation from one paradigm to another can generally only be comprehended in hindsight with a long historical view. Sociologists may have more tools for looking at the present, but they cannot always see the full picture when it is just emerging. I identified these three paradigms from the vantage point of late 2006**,** and their differences have become even clearer since then.

The Language and Area Studies Paradigm

This paradigm was indeed a product of the Cold War, as its critics have charged. It was instituted and funded by the US government in 1958 because of a perceived national need to have a reserve of specialists trained in certain less commonly taught languages and their associated cultures. The programs were developed for many different languages and world areas, generally at a small number of academic institutions that already had some infrastructure in the form of faculty and library facilities. Although they supported the addition of more faculty who would teach some undergraduate courses, the programs were established at top-ranked doctoral training institutions. They provided fellowships to attract small numbers of graduate students to study languages including Japanese and Chinese. Such languages were thought to require special incentives because they were difficult and there was little immediate economic benefit to learning them.

The model was that the institution should offer language training plus area courses that surveyed history, literature, and a few other disciplines such as political science, anthropology, sociology and economics. Interdisciplinary master's degrees would be offered, but at the doctoral level students would generally concentrate in an academic discipline with a language and research focus on Japan. Columbia University and Indiana University developed separate language and culture or language and civilization departments that housed both the language program and a range of humanities specialists including historians. Most others such as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and the University of Michigan separated language and literature from the other disciplines. Some programs combined their area studies into an East Asia program, while others created separate programs for Japanese and Chinese Studies, but the language and area paradigm applied in either case. Aside from a small number of positions in government, the primary career possibility for persons with this training was to go into academics and expand the language and area studies model to more institutions.

Initially, the Japanese language and area programs attracted individuals who already had some personal exposure or connection to Japan, such as returning servicemen. By the early 1960s they also began to attract a relatively small number of students who did not have any

prior connection to Japan, but came to the study of Japanese language and culture out of intellectual curiosity or a search for something different, despite its perceived difficulty. Because of the language and area studies model, these students took a sampling of courses in different academic disciplines. Some programs covered East Asia, while others concentrated solely on Japan. There was usually only one survey course available per discipline, with perhaps two each in history and literature divided by time period. With relatively little material available in English about Japan, everyone read all of the material across all the disciplines. Students developed a common interdisciplinary framework for understanding Japan at the MA level before moving into a discipline for doctoral study.

In the early 1960s, the nine largest Japanese Studies programs in the United States, together with the University of British Columbia in Canada, established a small specialized school in Japan to provide one year of full-time advanced Japanese language study for their students. Its aim was to prepare students to conduct academic research in Japan, using Japanese language sources and proper spoken Japanese. The Inter-University Center for Japanese Language Studies was staffed by well-qualified Japanese language teachers under a rotating American academic director, and was run by a consortium with representation from the ten participating institutions. Most of the students were American graduate students supported by fellowships from the federal program, but a few of the schools also sent advanced undergraduates for a year of study abroad, since at the time there were few other study abroad programs suitable for American undergraduates with two or three years of Japanese language training.[4]

The development of the language and area studies paradigm coincided with the ascendance of modernization theory and functionalist social science ideas in American academics. The intellectual model was of a unified national culture with institutions based on common values that were widely shared and were taught to each new generation. These values and institutions could be transformed from traditional ones to modern ones along a trajectory that was presumed to be fairly uniform across societies. Japan under the American Occupation and after became an intriguing case for investigating the process of modernization, and much of the research on Japan during this period pursued questions drawn from modernization theory. The notion of a single national culture with common values and institutions meant that a study done anywhere in Japan was presumed to be representative of this commonality, and Japan was presented to American students as a homogeneous collectivity with a traditional past and a modern future. By the 1970s modernization theory and its functionalist underpinnings were being widely questioned by younger American scholars, and more critical approaches slowly worked their way into Japanese Studies.

I have chosen to call this first paradigm language and area studies rather than modernization, because the organizational model for the study of Japan through language and area studies was retained long after modernization theory per se had gone out of style in the United States. As more students were trained in Japanese language and area studies and went on to obtain doctorates in specific disciplines, Japanese Studies as an academic enterprise in the United States expanded in two ways. First, the existing programs added more disciplines so that they could offer broader area studies training, and sometimes added more specialists in literature and history to represent different historical periods and disciplinary genres. Second, new programs were developed at additional academic institutions. They generally started with

4 When the Japanese government wanted to promote Japanese Studies in the United States in the 1970s, it gave an endowment of one million dollars to each of the academic institutions that participated in the Inter-University consortium.

language, literature, and history, and then expanded to religion, political science, and other social science and humanities disciplines. Although there are still MA programs built on the interdisciplinary language and areas studies model of Japanese Studies at many academic institutions in the United States today, the paradigm faced new challenges in the 1980s and came under direct attack in the early 1990s.

During this early phase of Japanese Studies guided by the language and area studies paradigm, three major studies surveyed Japanese Studies in the United States. The first postwar study of the field was carried out in 1968–69 and published in 1970 by the newly formed Social Science Research Council-American Council of Learned Societies Joint Committee on Japanese Studies. The formation of the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies itself was intended to provide national-level coordination and oversight to the developing field. The Japan committee was housed at the Social Science Research Council, while a counterpart committee for Chinese Studies was housed at the American Council of Learned Societies.

The fact that it was a joint committee of the national academic organizations of the humanities and the social sciences underscores the broad interdisciplinary language and area studies conception of the field. This first postwar study included a survey of Japan specialists, a compilation of data on Japanese Studies resources from various sources, and a series of narrative reports on the state of Japanese Studies in particular disciplines.[5] The assessment was intended to assist the Japanese Studies community in finding new funding sources after the major supporters of the field in the immediate postwar period had begun to turn their attention elsewhere. It is the first study whose findings we will use for comparative purposes in this report, and we will refer to it subsequently as the 1970 SSRC-ACLS report.

This first postwar report on Japanese Studies was followed just a few years later by another major study that has provided the baseline data and evaluation criteria for many of the comparisons in subsequent surveys. The second postwar study, carried out by Elizabeth T. Massey and Joseph A. Massey for the Subcommittee on Japanese Studies of the U.S.-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange (CULCON) and published in 1977, supplemented the 1970 report with a survey of Japanese Studies programs at academic institutions.[6] This study was carried out as part of a collaborative effort to assess the institutional base for Japanese Studies in the United States and American Studies in Japan, through the newly established institution of CULCON, a joint creation of the two governments whose mission was to improve cultural and educational interchange. We will use this study's criteria for some evaluations of program strength, and will refer to it subsequently as the 1977 CULCON report.

The third study was conducted a few years later, when conditions in the United States and Japan, as well as the relationship between the two countries, were beginning to change. By the 1980s the Japan Foundation had become a major source of support for Japanese Studies in the United States. As part of an initiative to survey the state of Japanese Studies throughout the world, the Foundation commissioned several different kinds of research on Japanese Studies in the United States. In other countries and regions these various kinds of research were combined into a single package because the scale of Japanese Studies was so small, but by

5 SSRC-ACLS Joint Committee on Japanese Studies, *Japanese Studies in the United States: A Report on the State of the Field, Current Resources and Future Needs,* (New York, February, 1970, mimeographed), 369 pp.

6 Elizabeth T. Massey and Joseph A. Massy, *CULCON Report on Japanese Studies at Colleges and Universities in the United States in the Mid-70s,* prepared for the Subcommittee on Japanese Studies, U.S.-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange, (New York: The Japan Society, Inc., March, 1977).

that time Japanese Studies in the United States had become sufficiently large and complex that each component became a separate study. The Japan Foundation first commissioned a survey of both specialists and academic institutions through the SSRC-ACLS Joint Committee. The Joint Committee in turn hired a commercial survey firm to do the study in 1982 and it was published by the Japan Foundation in 1984.[7] We will refer subsequently to this study as the 1984 Japan Foundation report. This study was still carried out firmly under the language and area studies paradigm, but its findings hinted at the changes that would later lead to the emergence of the economic competition paradigm.

The Economic Competition Paradigm

The economic competition paradigm arose in the late 1980s when Japan emerged onto the international scene as a key economic competitor of the United States and as a potential market for American products. The study of Japan and Japanese language shifted from being an obscure academic interest and to become knowledge that had economic value. Japan specialists were suddenly in demand to explain basic features of Japanese society to American businessmen who were being sent to Japan to work in multinational corporations, and new sectors of the American economy discovered that they needed specialized kinds of expertise on Japan. The new demands were very focused and impatient: major economic actors in the United States wanted useful knowledge to equip people quickly for economically productive work related to Japan, and they did not want to waste time on anything that was not immediately and directly relevant. This placed new strains on academic programs designed to produce scholars who could do research in Japanese sources by training them deeply and broadly over a period of many years. The standard rule of thumb at the time was that it took ten years to produce a fully-qualified Japan specialist; that was simply too long to wait to meet urgent economic needs.

The solution was to create new programs to produce professionals with the requisite specialized Japanese knowledge. New fellowships and academic programs were created to train economists who understood the Japanese economy and could work with Japanese economic materials, and lawyers who understood Japanese law and could advise American business clients (even though they could not formally practice law in Japan). Business schools throughout the United States hired Japan specialist social scientists to teach their students how to do business in Japan. Specialized Japanese language programs were developed to teach business Japanese along with Japanese business etiquette, and at a higher level, to teach law students with a basic knowledge of Japanese how to read Japanese legal documents. More broadly, the economic competition paradigm brought a new appreciation of Japan's place in the modern world, which led scholars to make new comparisons between Japan and European countries and to incorporate Japan into contemporary social science research with an international focus. Japan's dramatic postwar development, following a different strategy than the old modernization concept had envisioned, led to comparative studies of the "flying geese" Asian development model, with Japan as the "lead goose."

The next two studies of Japanese Studies in the United States, which I conducted for the Japan Foundation, coincided with the development of the economic competition paradigm although I did not yet recognize it for what it was. The first study, in the late 1980s, was a survey that was used to produce a directory of Japan specialists and Japanese Studies programs,

7 The Japan Foundation, *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1980's*, (Tokyo: The Japan Foundation, 1984).

as part of the Japan Foundation's worldwide series of such surveys. The survey and directory covered both the United States and Canada, and we have followed the same pattern in the three subsequent studies. The 1989 directory included a long introduction providing a basic sociological analysis of the data.[8] That study also included the production of a separate volume of essays by prominent Japan specialists assessing the state of Japanese Studies in different disciplines, which in retrospect can be seen as marking the end of the language and area studies paradigm as the dominant model for Japanese Studies in the United States.[9]

A few years later, the Japan Foundation asked me to produce another directory, and also to write a monograph analyzing the state of Japanese Studies in the United States. The questionnaire for this second project included not only the material destined to appear in the directory, but also a more detailed set of survey questions. I asked how Japan specialists did their work and what conditions were like for both specialists and Japanese Studies programs in the early 1990s. These questions reflected both my general training as a sociologist and my long personal involvement in the field of Japanese Studies. For the analysis I used not only my own two surveys, but also data from the previous surveys of Japanese Studies in the United States that had been conducted in the 1970s and early 1980s, in order to see how Japanese Studies had been developing and changing over time.

The economic competition paradigm brought new people into Japanese Studies for reasons that were more instrumental and opportunistic. In the early 1990s when we were collecting data for the 1995 study, we cast a wide net by asking all four year academic institutions if they had any faculty doing work on Japan. Many faculty members who did notread or speak Japanese were doing comparative research on Japan at that time and therefore were included in our study. At the student level, the economic competition paradigm attracted new students into Japanese Studies for instrumental reasons. Knowledge of contemporary Japan was suddenly the ticket to a good career in the professions or the social sciences. The payoff was great enough to be worth the extra effort, especially if there were fellowships to support the language learning and special programs focused on learning only what was needed for specific professional purposes. Some of these students did go into the social sciences and professional fields as academics, but many of them did not intend to become academics; they were acquiring knowledge of Japan in order to build professional careers in the American economy and the emerging global economy.

I analyzed the state of Japanese Studies in 1995 in terms of five themes: growth, differentiation, specialization, normalization, and internationalization. Growth was fueling the other four processes.[10] I identified the engine of that growth as a change in American attitudes toward Japan, and wrote about that phenomenon elsewhere as well,[11] but at the time I did not yet understand it as a different paradigm for Japanese Studies. From about the mid-1980s Japan had suddenly penetrated the general American consciousness because of its rising economic

8 P. G. Steinhoff, "Editor's Introduction" in The Japan Foundation, *Directory of Japan Specialists and Japanese Studies Institutions in the United States and Canada.* Ann Arbor: Association for Asian Studies, 1989 (2 vols., 1168 pp)

9 The Japan Foundation, *Japanese Studies in the United States: Part I, History and Present Condition.* Japanese Studies Series XVII, ed. by Marius B. Jansen. Ann Arbor: Association for Asian Studies, 1988.

10 The Japan Foundation, *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s.* Ann Arbor: Association for Asian Studies, 1996.

11 P. G. Steinhoff, "Japanese Studies in the Postwar United States: The Loss of Irrelevance" *IHJ Bulletin* Winter, 1993. (Also published as Steinhoff, P. G., "Sengō no Amerika ni okeru Nihon Kenkyü: hikanrensei no sōshitsu" *Kaihō* Winter, 1993. in the Japanese edition of IHJ Bulletin)

power. A string of popular books suggested Japan had found better ways to do a lot of things that Americans always assumed they did better than anyone else. Japan specialists who had previously toiled in obscurity on a subject that was only of narrow academic interest were suddenly thrust into the limelight as the purveyors of rare, economically valuable knowledge; our relatives marveled at our presumed foresight for having studied Japanese when nobody else was interested. While there was clearly new external demand for Japanese Studies and Japanese language, growth could only occur to the extent that there were Japan specialists available to meet that demand; our surveys documented that increase in supply and its distribution.

There was a dramatic increase in the number of persons identified as specialists on Japan (1,224 in 1989 and 1,552 in 1995) and the number of doctoral students in American universities who were doing research related to Japan (412 in 1989 and 803 in 1995). This growth in the supply of Japan specialists and doctoral students studying Japan was attributable to two factors that were specific to the American context. First, since Japanese Studies was primarily a postwar phenomenon in the U.S., virtually all of the Japan specialists who had ever lived were still alive in the 1990s. Although the study documented that many of them had recently retired, they were still active in the field. As a result of this demographic anomaly, everyone who was coming into Japanese Studies was adding to the total, rather than replacing people who were leaving the field through retirement and death. Second, under the language and area studies paradigm there had been fellowship programs in place since the 1960s designed to attract small numbers of graduate students to the study of Japanese as a difficult and understudied language that had no immediate economic value. However, by the late 1980s and early 1990s, students were flocking to Japanese language classes precisely because it was perceived as economically useful. The changed American perception of Japan was motivating more students to go into the field at younger ages and without specialized fellowship support, although some students were also getting new fellowships for specialized language training oriented to the professions.

The surveys also documented the dramatic spread of Japanese Studies programs and language offerings to a wider range of academic institutions, from 108 in 1989 to 247 in 1995. We supplemented these counts of Japanese Studies program entries by listing other academic institutions that had a resident Japan specialist, based on the institutional affiliations of the Japan specialists who had entries in the directories. This brought the counts to 286 for 1989 and 440 for 1995. Although some of the change in this short time period was a result of more thorough canvassing of academic institutions for the 1995 study, the numbers are based on real, verified entries in the directories. Expansion on this scale meant that Japanese Studies and Japan specialists were moving from elite graduate institutions into two and four-year colleges, and spreading to nearly every state in the U.S. Thus the growing supply of Japan specialists was supporting an expansion of academic courses and programs on Japan, which in turn were being created to meet the growing external demand for knowledge about Japan.

This expansion into more and more academic institutions gave rise to a major problem that Japanese Studies in the United States faced in the mid-1990s: how to support the research and teaching needs of Japan specialists who were based in institutions without a Japanese Studies library collection or a librarian who could help locate Japanese materials. Most of the Japan specialists in the United States had received their doctoral training at a relatively small number of major academic centers of Japanese Studies, which had Japan specialists in several disciplines and substantial Japanese language library collections. However, many of these new PhDs were now dispersed geographically and employed at institutions that lacked any Japanese Studies infrastructure. Some doctoral students were also being trained at institutions with less-developed infrastructure for Japanese Studies.

As noted above, rapid growth and the domestic impetus for it produced other changes in Japanese Studies. By the late 1980s and early 1990s, the transformation of the study of Japan into something of economic value meant that there was a demand for different types of training than the traditional language and area studies curriculum, which had been designed to produce academics. I used the sociological concept of differentiation to refer to this phenomenon. In addition to business, law, and economics, engineers were studying Japanese industrial processes and being listed on the rosters of Japanese Studies programs. Since the aim of this new interest in Japan was to produce experts who would work outside of academics, they concentrated on specialized forms of knowledge that most academic Japan specialists and Japanese Studies courses could not provide, and they demanded a pace that the standard academic curriculum for Japanese Studies could not accommodate. The result was the creation of separate programs to train people in professional fields that were differentiated from the standard academic tracks of Japanese Studies.

I used the term normalization to point to three phenomena that related directly to conditions in the United States and to the American perception of the significance of Japan to its interests. First, normalization characterized the way that the study of Japan was moving from an obscure academic topic for specialists toward being a normal part of the knowledge of an educated American. The presence of courses on Japan in a wider range of institutions and the reported enrollments in these courses demonstrated that many students were taking courses on Japan, or studying Japanese language who did not intend to become Japanese majors or to pursue academic careers in Japanese Studies. Second, normalization referred to the growing tendency for Japan specialists to find employment in the regular institutions of American society rather than only in academics. In the 1995 study, a quarter of the Japan specialists were employed outside of traditional academic faculty positions. Some of them were employed as librarians, museum curators, and in academic administrative positions, as might be expected. The surprise was that so many were employed in government and the private sector, in places like banks, law offices, businesses, newspapers, magazines, think tanks, and government agencies.

The third aspect of normalization was the growing body of English language material about Japan. Academic material produced by American and other English-speaking Japan specialists, supplemented by translations of literary works and other basic documents, had become so extensive that it was possible to produce secondary academic studies on Japan without using Japanese sources. It was not simply that there were plenty of materials available for student term papers about Japan; American academics who did not know any Japanese were starting to produce studies based on English-language materials, augmented in some cases with material acquired from Japanese colleagues, students, translators, or readily available data sources. Particularly in social science fields such as economics and sociology, studies could be done with an appropriate data set, supplemented by some secondary research in the English language materials available in the library. Many popular books and articles about Japan were also being published by journalists and businessmen. While these aspects of normalization could be regarded as successes of Japanese Studies in the United States, they also suggested that in the future it might become such a normal part of American life that it would lose its distinctiveness and become invisible.

The traditional integrated language and area studies approach to the study of Japan was also under attack in the United States in the early 1990s because it was perceived to be a relic of the Cold War, not appropriate to the post-Cold War world. This objection to language and

area studies had a political cast, but it came primarily from social science disciplines that regarded culture, and even language, as not really necessary. Non-Japan specialists in those disciplines felt their students could study Japanese politics and the Japanese economy using quantitative datasets and the standard tools of the disciplines, and did not need the excess baggage of language and area studies. However, the impact of these attitudes on the field of Japanese Studies was obscured in the early 1990s because of the high political and economic salience of Japan in the United States, which drew students to precisely these disciplines. Students were still attracted to those social science disciplines because of their interest in Japan, but they faced great pressure to do particular kinds of research and not to waste their time on language and area studies.

I saw this phenomenon in 1995 as part of a larger trend toward specialization, the tendency of academic Japan specialists to focus on narrower and narrower topics, and to concentrate on specialized areas of knowledge defined by their disciplines, rather than on the broader, interdisciplinary approach that had characterized Japanese Studies in earlier decades. This was partly a function of the greatly increased body of knowledge about Japan that was already available in English, and upon which younger American Japan specialists were being trained to build their own careers. It was no longer sufficient for young scholars to produce a very general study drawn largely from the readily available secondary literature in Japanese; increasingly, American scholars of Japan were expected to do original research in Japanese sources, and to relate it to earlier work in both Japanese and English. This pushed them into smaller, more manageable topics.

In both directory surveys we had presented respondents with a very large list of subject specializations that was based on the category system used for the *Bibliography of Asian Studies* published by the Association for Asian Studies. In 1989, respondents had written in a large number of new subject specializations, which I used to analyze new developments in the field. These specializations were added to the list we presented to specialists in the second survey, and again they added a large number of new categories. As I analyzed these new categories and also the topics of dissertations in progress, it became apparent that the subjects of current Japanese Studies research reflected the emergent trends in American academics in general, rather than the issues concerning Japan that scholars Japanese might have pursued.

This was particularly true in the social sciences, where the structure of American graduate education meant that most doctoral students would have a supervising committee consisting of perhaps one Japan specialist and several specialists in their discipline who knew nothing about Japan. The pressure was, and still is, to produce work that is relevant to the concerns of the discipline in an American academic context, even if it happens to be about Japan. In some disciplines, work could not be solely about Japan, and graduate students were pushed into doing comparative studies that watered down their focus on Japan. More broadly, this disciplinary pressure has meant that doctoral students and young scholars select research topics based on the hot issues and current theories in the United States, rather than what might be the most intellectually compelling issues for the study of Japan itself.

To take the most obvious examples, the feminist movement and feminist scholarship had brought more women into graduate level Japanese Studies, and that in turn had prompted new studies of women and gender issues in Japan. In addition, the study of minority groups looms large in multi-ethnic, multi-racial American society, so young scholars of Japan produced a number of studies of Japan's much smaller minority populations because those were the sorts of questions they were trained to ask in their disciplines.

I believe this has been a very useful development for Japanese Studies and for Japan, in that foreign scholars and foreign-trained Japanese scholars have been able to pursue topics that were more difficult to do within the Japanese academic environment. However, the point to be underscored here is that the driving force behind these studies has been American, not Japanese, academic preoccupations. The current concerns of American academic disciplines get projected onto Japanese Studies, because the results of these studies are going to be evaluated for their relevance in the context of American academic publishing venues and job opportunities. In the mid-1990s, I saw this phenomenon simply as a new degree of specialization within Japanese Studies. In retrospect, by 2006 I also perceived these particular topics as reflecting the beginnings of the new cultural studies paradigm which will be discussed below.

The final characteristic I described in the 1995 study was internationalization, which I soon regretted not having called globalization. The surveys revealed not only the sort of two-way movement between Japan and the United States that one might expect in Japanese Studies, but also a multi-directional, multi-national flow of people. There were American Japan specialists teaching in Japan and in various other English-speaking countries, and there were doctoral students from all over the world studying Japanese Studies in the United States. Although I thought it would seem odd to the Japan Foundation that doctoral students from other countries would come to the United States to study Japan instead of going to Japan itself, the situation was quite understandable given the scale of academic Japanese Studies in the United States and the growing availability of academic studies of Japan in English. For young scholars who would be teaching Japanese Studies courses in English when they returned to their home countries, knowing the English language literature on Japan could be just as important as being able to do research in Japanese.

A further aspect of the internationalization of Japanese Studies in the United States in the 1990s was the internationalization of its subject matter. Many studies involved cross-national comparisons, and these were no longer limited to US-Japan comparisons, or to comparisons among Asian societies. Increasingly, Japan was being analyzed in the context of other industrialized societies in Europe, rather than in an East Asian cultural context. Japanese literature and film were being discussed in relation to literature and film from all over the world. There were also studies that reflected the internationalization or globalization of Japan itself—including both the internal internationalization of the growing foreign worker population in Japan, and the presence of Japanese nationals and Japanese business interests in other parts of the world. In short, within American Japanese Studies, Japan was increasingly being viewed as a part of the contemporary world that could be studied like any other place, nation, or culture, and not as an exotic "other" that was totally different from one's own life experience in the United States.

Thus, the themes of growth, differentiation, specialization, normalization, and internationalization allowed me to draw together a mass of disparate findings about the state of Japanese Studies in the United States in the 1990s, and to relate them to the larger American cultural context of the time. In each of these thematic areas, the state of Japanese Studies was heavily determined by the domestic context in the US. Sometimes this was a refraction of the economic power of Japan and the state of Japan-US relations, but in other cases it really had little to do with Japan at all, but was simply a function of other conditions within American society and particularly within American academics. The shape and characteristics of Japanese Studies in the United States were as much about American society as they were about the study of Japan.

In retrospect, this period marked the rise of an economic competition paradigm for Japa-

nese Studies in the United States, in which Japan was viewed as both an economic competitor and a potential market. This new view of Japan demanded different forms of knowledge for economic purposes, which the language and area atudies paradigm could not deliver effectively. So while the language and area studies paradigm persisted as an academic model despite attacks against it from hostile disciplines, a completely separate system of specialized professional training was developed to meet the needs of the new economically motivated Japan specialists. Those people intended to move into positions in the regular economy of the United States rather than becoming academic Japan specialists. It is also now clear that many people identified themselves as Japan specialists during that boom period for Japan because of their current research or professional interests, but they did not necessarily have a long-term commitment to Japanese Studies. Others may well still be utilizing their knowledge of Japan professionally, but because they are part of the regular economy of the United States and are not identified as academics or Japan specialists, we are no longer able to follow and count them.

This analysis of the economic competition paradigm and its impact on Japanese Studies in the United States during the 1990s also may suggest a different way of thinking about what some perceive as the current competition between Japanese Studies and Chinese Studies. I would argue that in the second decade of the 21st century, Chinese Studies is under the sway of an economic competition paradigm. Today it is China that is perceived as an economic competitor and also an economic market for the United States. The same economic forces that drove new interest in Japanese Studies in the 1990s are making similar demands of Chinese Studies today, bringing students who look to Chinese Studies as a source of economic opportunity. Examining what has happened in Japanese Studies in the United States since the economic competition boom of the early 1990s may help to put the current interest in Chinese Studies into better perspective and allay the fears of a zero-sum competition between Chinese and Japanese Studies.

The Cultural Studies Paradigm

A decade after the 1995 study, the Japan Foundation requested that I do a third edition of the directory, and a new monograph analyzing the state of Japanese Studies in the United States in the early 21st century. The survey itself reflected the tremendous technological changes over the intervening decade, as it was conducted largely online using a web-based data collection system, and nearly all communication with specialists and institutions was conducted by e-mail. I began the analysis by adding the new data to the series of earlier studies, generally by simply adding a new 2005 column to the data tables that I had produced for the 1995 study. I then tried to understand what had happened in the past ten years. In some cases this also meant re-interpreting things that were starting to happen in the early 1990s, but whose impact was not yet apparent to me at the time. It was through this process that I realized that a new cultural studies paradigm had emerged.

In contrast to the social science and professional school focus of the economic competition paradigm, the cultural studies paradigm marks a resurgence of interest in the humanities and the cultural side of Japanese Studies. However, cultural studies as an academic endeavor is emphatically not the same as language and area studies. Although there are many specific theories and variants encompassed by the term, I am using cultural studies loosely to refer to intellectual currents that first arose in the humanities as an interest in the construction of meaning, and then entered the social sciences through critical neo-Marxism, structuralism and post-structuralism, postmodernism, feminism, and the Birmingham School's interest in

subcultures, media, and language. It is certainly not American in origin, but has been filtering from its European origins into American academics since the 1980s.[12]

I identified the following characteristics of a cultural studies approach that can be seen in contemporary American Japanese Studies:

a) a sense that culture and political economy are intertwined and mutually embedded, so that each needs to be studied in relation to the other;

b) a conception of culture as something that is actively constructed and maintained by human actions, but also constantly changing;

c) a conviction that culture is not monolithic at the national level despite attempts to make it so, but rather can be found in a distinct form within many different subcultures and subgroups that occupy different positions in a society and therefore have different experiences and perspectives;

d) a deep interest in the transformations that have occurred over the past two centuries, particularly in how people have experienced them and how they have represented those experiences in cultural products, coupled with a strong conviction that these transformations cannot be reduced to simple binaries such as traditional and modern and applied predictively to any society, but rather must be understood from within each case;

e) the assumption that all cultural representations, including high and low culture, all forms of popular culture, and mass and micro-media, are significant as objects of study and as sources of data;

f) an understanding that meaning is not independent and absolute, but is "intertextual" and derived from its relation to other cultural representations; hence anything cultural must be studied in its context;

g) an ethical commitment that the position of the person studying also has to be taken into consideration in the production of research, so all research must be consciously self-reflexive.

These ideas about culture differ radically from the functionalist ideas underlying modernization theory. They also undermine the assumptions about the nature of the subject to be studied in Japanese Studies that were found in the language and area studies paradigm. This new paradigm encourages an exploration of the widest possible range of cultural representations, past and present, and of all sorts of subgroups, minorities, social movements, and social groups, rather than assuming one monolithic "Japanese" culture and finding evidence for it everywhere. These approaches also suggest new ways of looking at the cultural aspects of larger economic and political relationships such as imperialism and colonialism, as well as the economic and political aspects of domestic cultural products. The cultural studies approach requires high levels of language skill and often visual skills as well. It demands close attention to context, and moves freely across disciplinary lines. Yet it does not presuppose or even seek the sort of formal interdisciplinary training that characterizes the language and area studies approach.

From the vantage point midway through the first decade of the twenty-first century, it was apparent that cultural studies approaches were already visible in Japanese Studies in the early 1990s in the research topics of humanities scholars and to a lesser extent in courses, but at the

12 See Howard S. Becker and Michal M. McCall, eds. *Symbolic Interaction and Cultural Studies.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990, and Ellis Cashmore and Chris Rojek, ed., *Dictionary of Cultural Theorists.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1999 for two efforts to introduce the concepts into sociology. My description is taken loosely from Becker and McCall, p. 4 and is somewhat narrower than Cashmore and Rojek's scope.

time they were somewhat overshadowed by the focus on the economic competition paradigm. By the 2005 study the influence of the economic competition paradigm was waning and the cultural studies paradigm was becoming dominant in the United States. The first and most obvious finding of the 2005 study was that the dramatic growth in Japanese Studies during the 1990s had leveled off and even declined. The 2005 numbers for Japan specialists (1,284), Japanese Studies programs (184), and current doctoral candidates (565) were all lower than they had been in 1995, but higher than in 1989. One could say that the bubble economy of Japan was refracted into a bubble in American Japanese Studies in the 1990s. However, our Japanese Studies bubble did not burst in the same way; it simply lost some of its excess air. Japanese Studies was still alive and well in the United States in 2005, and had changed in some very interesting ways.

By 2005 we had lost most of the first generation of Japan specialists in the United States, who entered the field during World War II and shortly after, to retirement and death. The population of Japan specialists had a much more normal demographic distribution, as young scholars replaced those who had retired and left the field. There was still a big bulge of Japan specialists in their fifties, but that reflected the impact of the famous American postwar baby-boom generation, which is huge overall and has shaped the parts of the society it touched in every decade since the 1950s. It was clear that there would be another drop in the numbers of Japan specialists over the next two decades as the baby boom generation leaves the field. Yet there were still plenty of new young people coming into Japanese Studies in the early 21st century to keep the field vibrant for the foreseeable future. In short, the sheer size of the field in 1995 appeared in retrospect to have been somewhat of a demographic anomaly, rather than a level that would be sustained indefinitely. There was no great cause for alarm if we simply drew the curve from 1989 instead of 1995.

The other strong characteristic of the pool of Japan specialists in 2005 was that it is more academic, because a higher proportion of the lawyers, economists, and businessmen of the 1990s were missing, along with some academics who were only temporarily caught up in the Japan boom and had moved on to other areas and other topics. Some of these erstwhile Japan specialists, especially those working outside of academics, may still be using their Japan expertise professionally, but we had lost track of them. However, the committed academic Japan specialists were still present in solid numbers. It was primarily those who were newcomers to the field in 1995 who had disappeared.

Yet Japan remains one of the largest trading partners of the United States (after Canada, China, and Mexico), so it is not as if the basis for the Economic Competition paradigm had evaporated. What seems more likely is that those who need the sort of specialized professional training on Japan that was developed in the 1980s and 1990s as an alternative to the language and area studies model are still getting it through programs that are now well-established at several major universities with strong Japanese Studies programs. However, they are not being viewed as Japan specialists. They gain the language proficiency they need, which at some levels may be in a special track designed for them, and they take other specialized courses within their discipline or profession. Then they get jobs in the normal parts of the American economy, or perhaps work overseas for multinational corporations. Their employers may value and utilize their Japan expertise, but may also move them to other positions from time to time according to the needs of the employer and as part of their normal career development. In this "normalized" state that I saw emerging in 1995, Japan expertise becomes just one part of a highly trained professional's skill set, on the same level as knowing French or Spanish and being able to work effectively in those cultural environments.

As I have reviewed the data from our new 2012 survey and tried to make sense of the patterns, it seems clear that Japanese Studies in the United States is now fully engaged in the cultural studies paradigm. Younger scholars embrace it, teach it, and build their research upon it. Yet because at any time the field contains people who came to Japanese Studies at different times and reflect the dominant ideas of those times, there are still many traces of both the language and area studies paradigm and the economic competition paradigm embodied in Japan Studies programs and individual Japan specialists. As we work through the data in the chapters that follow, I will point out those traces from time to time along with the mounting evidence of the dominance of the cultural studies paradigm.

Chapter 2 will introduce the general parameters of Japanese Studies at the end of 2012, taking a demographic look at the people who now constitute our sample of Japan specialists in the United States and comparing their characteristics to those of their predecessors in previous studies. There is also a fair amount of boring methodological detail in this chapter, because for a small part of the audience (as well as for whoever tries to replicate this work in the future) it is important to establish the logic and procedures underlying the data. We also include basic information about doctoral candidates in Japanese Studies as future Japan specialists who are just entering the field.

In Chapter 3 we continue to look at Japan specialists, this time examining their credentials, skills, and areas of expertise. We also ask how they maintain their skills and expertise, which requires a closer look at what they do as professionals in this field. Because the time for completion of this monograph has been limited, I am unable to make use of all the survey data we collected about Japan specialists' professional activities, and hope to write about it elsewhere later on. I have included the most basic information needed to show what conditions are necessary in order for professional Japan specialists to keep up with their ever-changing field, so that we can refer back to it later when we look at other aspects of Japanese Studies. The technological transformations of the information society over the past two decades plays a key role here, as Japan specialists use new technology both to keep up with kinds of materials that barely existed two decades ago, and as they study cultural phenomena that also have been deeply influenced by the availability of new technologies.

Chapter 4 shifts the focus to Japanese Studies at academic institutions. Using the widest possible measures available, I attempt to locate the presence of Japanese Studies within the overall map of American higher education. To do this I rely on a separate dataset of all accredited institutions of higher education in the United States, and also trace the growth and movement of Japanese Studies through all the previous studies. The aim in this chapter is to situate Japanese Studies in a broader context, rather than to look inside the programs, but we also begin to examine the scale of Japanese Studies programs through staff sizes.

We begin to look inside the academic institutions in Chapter 5, by examining Japanese Studies courses. As noted earlier in this chapter, course credits provide the basic metric for academic study in the United States, faculty have considerable latitude to offer courses based on their expertise, and students have considerable freedom to take individual courses out of personal interest or to meet various degree requirements, regardless of whether they are enrolled in a specific degree program related to Japan. This approach allows us to examine the growth of Japanese Studies through the expansion of both language and area courses and to begin to understand what sustains the current enrollments in these courses. It also will demonstrate both the increased depth of Japanese language course offerings and the disciplinary breadth of courses about Japan, whether they are solely about Japan or include Japan content in some broader course offering. We also look briefly at teaching conditions in Japanese Studies.

Chapter 6 examines the formal academic programs in Japanese Studies at academic institutions, using criteria developed in the 1970s to categorize different levels of undergraduate and graduate programs. We examine the overlap between undergraduate and graduate programs and their growth over time. This chapter also examines continuity and change in the institutions that have been the major producers of new doctorates in Japanese Studies since the 1970s. We employ a number of measures to assess the current conditions of Japanese Studies programs.

Chapter 7 examines the infrastructure for Japanese Studies in the United States, ranging from a closer look at staffing of Japanese Studies at academic institutions, through library and museum collections and the other organizations that participate in or provide support to Japanese Studies. We include in this chapter Japan specialists' perceptions of funding conditions and their preferences for how support for Japanese Studies should be allocated, using questions the Japan Foundation has been asking for several decades.

In Chapter 8 we provide an overview of the main findings of the study, draw some conclusions about the near future, and reevaluate our list of challenges and recommendations for the Japan Foundation.

2

A Demographic Profile of Japan Specialists

How Many Japan Specialists Are There?

This chapter updates the extensive methodological discussion of how we obtain the numbers on which we base our analysis of the demographics of Japanese Studies in the United States. After incorporating the new data into the tables, we analyze these most recent developments in light of the long-term trends. Those who have no interest in the methodological niceties are welcome to skip down to the Age and Gender subheading to see the results.

Japanese Studies is surely one of the most-studied fields in American academics. Periodic studies dating back to 1970 have tried to count how many Japan specialists there were in the United States, identify their areas of expertise, and plot their geographic and institutional distribution. This study is the latest in the series, and in addition to reporting the current answers to those three questions, it builds upon its predecessors to analyze how the field has been changing over time. We are particularly fortunate in that the previous three studies and the current one have used very similar methods and their results may be compared with some confidence.

The study of Japan is primarily a post-war phenomenon in the United States, and until fairly recently, virtually all of the Japan specialists who had ever been active in the United States were still alive. The pattern of change was primarily about growth, as new Japan specialists completed their degrees and entered the field to work alongside their elders. At the end of the seventh decade since the end of World War II, that is no longer the case. The field is now taking on a more normal demographic pattern, in which older specialists leave through retirement and death and are replaced by a new generation. Our analysis of the current numbers, as well as the comparison with previous studies, must keep this basic fact in mind.

The starting point for this sort of demographic analysis is to identify the parameters of the overall population, use a systematic method to reach the members of that population and ask them some questions. We then analyze the results, taking into consideration the gap between the sample that actually answered the questions and the overall population they represent imperfectly. None of these steps is as straightforward as it might appear to be.

We can define our population of interest as Japan specialists, meaning persons with expertise in the study of Japan who use that expertise in a professional capacity, and the limits of our interest as those currently residing and working in the United States. This study aims

to be comprehensive and inclusive, so it tries to reach all known Japan specialists rather than a systematic sample. Yet every element of this definition gets pretty blurry around the edges.

First there is the question of who has expertise about Japan and uses it in a professional capacity. We generally define the level of expertise as possession of a doctoral degree with evidence of specialization on Japan, presumably with a fair level of Japanese language capability. This works as a device for screening out graduate students, but there have always been members of the Japanese Studies community who do not have a doctorate and do not necessarily work in academic institutions that would require one. Therefore, we also recognize and try to include persons in government and in the public and private sectors outside of academia, who hold the requisite credentials for their work and are clearly utilizing their expertise on Japan professionally, but who do not have a PhD in some discipline related to Japanese Studies. We blur the edges even further by occasionally including people who are working toward a PhD, and thus technically doctoral students, but who are already working professionally as Japan specialists or contributing to the field through publication.

Since the 1980s, Japan specialists have been moving in and out of the United States quite regularly. Although for a current "snapshot" of the field we consider only those in the United States at the time of the survey, excluding such people from the mailing list and the survey itself would make it extremely difficult for us to track and analyze the movement of Japanese specialists over time. We therefore have chosen to keep known Japan specialists on our lists even if they reside outside the United States, and to collect data from them even though we may exclude it from the analysis. Individuals residing outside the U.S. are generally included in the published directory, but not in this analysis of the current state of Japanese Studies in the United States.

To complicate matters further, for purposes of creating a directory of Japanese Studies, this survey and the previous three have chosen to define their universe as both the United States and Canada, and to collect data from this wider sphere. This decision was initially made because we were well aware of a substantial overlap between Japan specialists in the United States and Canada: Canadians work in the US; Americans work in Canada; and they all belong to intellectual networks that span the border. For purposes of data analysis we try to separate the two groups and produce separate reports. However, we do count Canadian citizens working in the United States, along with nationals from any other country, as part of our US sample. Our boundary is geographic, not based on citizenship or residency. To reiterate, for the main data analysis to follow, we exclude specialists who are not currently in the United States, even if they appear in the directory and are otherwise part of the US Japanese Studies community.

Using these definitions or any others, Japan specialists in the United States constitute just a few thousand people in a population of nearly 300 million: the proverbial needle in a haystack. So how do we find them to send them a survey questionnaire? The earliest studies focused on academics, so they identified the relatively small number of academic institutions that offered courses and programs related to Japan, and asked them to identify their Japan specialists. Moreover, when the field comprised only a few hundred Japan specialists, they pretty much all knew each other anyway. They had all received their advanced training at the same institutions and they participated in the same small intellectual networks. By the 1980s the number of identified specialists, or possible specialists, was growing rapidly. Academic staff lists no longer provided a reliable way to reach the target population, so their lists were supplemented with those of relevant organizations such as the Association for Asian Studies.

Every study prior to the previous one in 2005 has used mailed questionnaires. This one

and its predecessor have relied very heavily on the Internet, using institutional websites as a primary source of information about programs, e-mail as a means of communication with potential respondents, and our own website as an online data collection system. Hence for this study we needed not mailing addresses, but e-mail addresses. As the 2005 study proceeded, we realized the extent of the digital divide even in our highly educated target population. We had to resort to multiple methods to try to reach those who did not respond to e-mail invitations to participate, or for whom we could not find a working e-mail address. For the current study we did not face the same problem and we did not supplement either e-mail communication or online data entry with any alternative methods.

The 1970 and 1984 studies were simple mailed questionnaires sent to Japan specialists. The 1989 study was a mailed questionnaire used for the production of the first *Directory of Japan Specialists and Japanese Studies Institutions in the United States and Canada;* the data collection was limited to what would appear in the published directory. The 1995 and 2005 studies were also used to collect data for a new edition of the directory, but added survey sections for specialists, institutions, and Japanese Studies librarians, in order to produce a deeper and more extensive analysis of the state of the field. The current study follows the same pattern of collecting data both for the fourth edition of the directory and for a more extensive survey of the current state of the field. The addition of a survey component to the directory questionnaire has complicated the issue of sampling even further, since some respondents complete only the directory portion, or do not respond to all of the survey questions. As in the previous studies, we treat the full sample of directory respondents as the study sample, but provide the smaller actual numbers when we report data from the survey portion.

Table 2.1 gives the basic range and number of Japan specialists counted in the six major surveys of the field conducted from 1970 to 2012. The purpose of the mailing list is to cast a wide net, and it should not be regarded as an estimate of the actual number of Japan specialists in the United States. It was understood that the 1989 and 1995 mailing lists were heavily inflated with people who probably were not Japan specialists, and our lists for the 2005 and 2012 studies contained the same inflation factors. Even though the Association for Asian Studies mailing list was only the source for about half of the final directory samples in each of the last several studies, it accounts for a much higher proportion of the initial mailing lists. The AAS regional category of Northeast Asia and country category of Japan both encompass a wide range of AAS members who do not fit the more restrictive criteria for the Japan directory. Our database includes participation information for the past four studies, and there is a certain amount of movement in and out between surveys. Some people are in one directory, lost for the next one, and turn up in the third. In addition, a person who is ineligible in one year might well become eligible at a later time. For the current study, we had usable e-mail addresses for 4,127 potential Japan specialists with addresses in the United States.

The number of Japan specialists in the 2012 directory shows an 11.8% increase over the number in the 2005 directory, while the staff list shows an 8.3% increase. Only in the past two studies has the number reported on staff lists exceeded the number of Japan specialists in the directory. There is no direct correspondence between the staff and specialist numbers, since a fair number of specialists listed in the directory are not affiliated with the institutions that report staff lists, and the staff lists also include a substantial number of professional staff members who are not eligible for a directory listing. They are best understood as two different ways of estimating the number of professional Japanese Studies personnel in the United States.

Although we do not know how many Japan specialists were never included in our lists, we can do some evaluation of why people who were known to be Japan specialists did not

Table 2.1. Range and Number of Japan Specialists in the United States, by Source, as Counted in Five Major Surveys of the Field, 1970–2012*

Year	Range of Specialists Included	Mailing List	Academic Staff Lists**	Survey Sample
1970	Academics	597	416	332
1984	Academics	1,535	781	841
1989	Academics and non-academics	4,009	936	1,224
1995	Academics and non-academics	4,442	1,452	[1,552] ***1,638
2005	Academics and non-academics	4,199	1,607	[1,284] ***1,324
2012	Academics and non-academics	4,127	1,789	[1,434] ***1,526

* 1970 information from 1970 SSRC-ACLS Report, Appendix 3, p. 107; 1984 information from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Appendix 1, pp. 89-93; 1989 information from 1989 *Directory of Japan Specialists and Japanese Studies Institutions in the United States and Canada*, vol. 1, pp. ix-xi. 1995 information and table format from *Japanese Studies in the United States, The 1990s*, p. 19.

** The 1970 SSRC-ACLS report contained a roster of individuals at specific institutions. The 1984 Japan Foundation report gave the number of positions at each institution, calculating part-time positions as 1/2. We assume that the half positions were mostly occupied by different individuals. Although we could not account for any half positions concealed in the whole numbers within one institution's total, we did compensate for 56 identified fractional totals by counting each as one additional person. The 1989 and 1995 figures are based on a count of names on staff lists reported for institutional directory entries. They undercount language instructors, who were not listed by some large institutions in their directory entries. For 2005 this is the count of current staff as it appears in the institutional entries; it includes both language instructors and other Asian specialists listed by the institutions, who would not be included in the regular directory entries.

*** Two sample numbers are given for 1995, 2005, and 2012 to account for specialists currently residing outside the United States. The number currently in the US is given in brackets. The larger number is the best comparison to data for the earlier years, but the number in brackets is the number we use for the analysis.

end up in the directory sample, by examining the carryover of entrants from one study to the next, and tracking those who drop out. The 1995 study was conducted just five years after its predecessor, and within that relatively brief time span we were able to trace 94 percent of those who had appeared in the 1989 directory, although a smaller number (84.9%) were included in the 1995 directory. The others we tracked were deceased, no longer active, or no longer in the United States by 1995. This was an absolutely remarkable rate of follow-up as surveys go, and reflects several aspects of the study that differ from ordinary surveys: the cooperation of staff at Japanese Studies programs, our ability to cross-check between institutional staff lists and our lists of individual Japan specialists, the networks within the field, and the strong support the study has had from Japan specialists.

Trying to figure out what has happened to the field from one study to the next is a slippery business, since some people leave the field through death or retirement from Japanese Studies activity and new people enter the field, but our study captures an imperfect measure of either. Table 2.2 tries to summarize these movements with two different but related measures. From the perspective of one study, we can measure how many people also participate in the next one (the carryover rate, expressed as the percentage of those in the first study who also appeared in the second). Within each study, we can calculate how many persons in that study are repeat participants and how many are new to that study.

Reading down in the %carryover column, 84.9% of those in the 1989 directory study

Table 2.2. Turnover Table of Japan Specialists Between Studies*

Year	% Carryover	% Repeat	% New	% Not Quite New**	Total	Outside the US
1989	–	–	–		(1,224) 100%	
1995	84.9%	(1,039) 66.9%	(513) 33.1%	–	(1,552) 100%	86
2005	48.3%	(749) 58.3%	(509) 39.6%	(26) 2.1%	(1,284) 100%	40
2012	79.0%	(1,015) 70.8%	(397) 27.7%	(22) 1.5%	(1,434) 100%	92

* Figures for 1989, 1995, and 2005 recalculated from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*.
** In 2005 and 2012 we were able to distinguish between true "new" participants who had not previously been in our database, and a small number of persons who were known previously but were either ineligible, declined to participate, or were lost between studies.

were also in the 1995 study, but that carryover rate dropped to 48.3% for the 2005 study. It has bounced back to 79.0% in the present 2012 study. In 2005 this carryover drop, and the overall decrease in the number of specialists, was attributed to a combination of three factors. The first was generational turnover. Through 1995 most persons who had ever been Japan specialists in the United States were still active, but a decade later retirement and death had reduced the numbers of the first postwar generation of Japan specialists. The second and third factors stemmed from the Japanese Bubble economy and the ensuing economic competition paradigm in Japanese Studies in the United States. The heightened interest in Japan and the need for professionals with Japan expertise had brought many new people into Japanese Studies in 1995. By 2005 some of them had moved on to some other field and were no longer working on Japan. Others had been trained in Japanese economics, law, or business during the economic competition paradigm and were employed in the mainstream economy outside of academics. Although they participated in the 1995 study and were probably still using their Japan expertise professionally, a decade later they were no longer traceable if they had changed employers or were no longer connected to the academic networks through which the study locates participants. The current study still contains some of these professionals, who retain their ties to the Japanese Studies community.

The fact that the carryover rate rebounded between the 2005 and 2012 studies suggests that Japanese Studies has stabilized with a balance between normal generational turnover and the influx of new specialists. Looking at the internal division in each study between repeat participants and new entrants further reinforces this picture, but the length of time between studies also may play a role. The current study's rate of 70.8% repeat participants is just slightly higher than the 66.9% repeat rate for 1995, when there was a similar length of time between two studies.

The far right column in Table 2.2 gives the number of Japan specialists who are American citizens working outside the United States. The numbers for 1995 and 2012 are very similar, while in 2005 there were only half as many who participated in the study but were living outside the United States. Nearly half of these global American Japan specialists are in Japan (46.7%), followed by Canada (32.3%). The rest are in Europe (8.9%), with smaller percentages

in Korea (4.4%), Australia and New Zealand (3.3%), China and Hong Kong (3.3%) and the Philippines (1.1%). Nearly all of them are affiliated with academic institutions in these countries, with a few in Japan at national research institutes and a small number with non-academic positions or no affiliation. These people have been included in the directory, and those residing in Canada have been included in the Canadian volume of the study. They are all excluded from this analysis of Japan specialists in the United States.

We can offer some indirect answers to our first question: how many Japan specialists are there in the United States? First, the true number of active Japan specialists in the United States in 2012 may still be lower than it was in 1995, but it has grown substantially just since 2005. Second, although the elusive actual number of active Japan specialists in the United States is undoubtedly larger than our survey sample, we can be confident that a fairly high percentage of them, probably over half, are represented in the present study. This is certainly a high enough percentage to provide a reliable picture of conditions in the field; in fact, it is so high a percentage of the unknown actual population that statistical measures of significance are irrelevant. Any differences we find are quite real, and highly unlikely to have come about by chance. We therefore can look primarily at comparisons of simple percentages and take them at face value. With that assurance about the nature of the study sample, we can proceed to examine the data more closely.

Age and Gender

We know that in the past, the overall age distribution of Japan specialists in the United States was skewed by the fact that virtually everyone who had ever been a professional Japan specialist in the United States was still alive and active. This was just beginning to change at the end of the twentieth century, but the effects are now quite pronounced. Table 2.3 gives the Age Distribution of Japan Specialists in 1970, 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012. To facilitate

Table 2.3. Age Distribution of Japan Specialists in 1970, 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

Age	1970 %	1984 %	1995 %	2005 %	2012 %
21–30	11	2	0.9	0.6	0.6
31–40	38	25	11.3	14.6	11.2
41–50	32	34	31.1	19.1	24.1
51–60	15	26	25.3	27.9	21.5
61–70	4	12	20.7	20.0	25.6
71+	–	–	10.7	12.5	16.9
	332	841	1,552	1,216	1,292

* Data for 1970 from 1970 SSRC-ACLS Report, Appendix 3, p. 108; for 1984 from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table 1, p. 13; for 1995 from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s*, p. 23, Table 2.2. Data for 2005 adapted from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*, p. 21, Table 2.2. Data for 2012 separates those who were included in the 1995 directory and those who are new to the study in 2012. When date of birth was not reported, we estimated age from the first academic degree, but sometimes these dates were also omitted, so 68 persons (9 from 1995 and 59 new entrants) are omitted from the 2005 figures and 143 were omitted from 2012 (41 from 2005 and 102 new ones)

** Because some persons who were not in the 2005 study had been in the 1995 study, they have been treated as having been in 2005 so that the "New in 2012" column represents people who are completely new to the study and therefore likely to be new entrants into Japanese Studies.

comparison, Table 2.3 utilizes the same age categories as the earlier studies, although it is a somewhat awkward distribution.

The effects of the generational shift are quite clear. In 1970, 11 percent of Japan specialists were under 30 and only 4 percent were over 60. The great majority (70%) were in their 30s and 40s, and less than 20 percent were over 50. In 1984 the overall sample had more than doubled, but very few were in their 20s. More than half were in their 30s and 40s, but over a third were over 50. The 1995 sample had again almost doubled. The age distribution had shifted upward again, with more than half the field over 50 and less than one percent under 30. Actually, in 1995 the percentage of Japan specialists in their fifties was stable, and the real increase was in those over sixty. We also added another decade because a tenth of the respondents were in their seventies. In 2005 the overall sample was about 20 percent smaller than the big 1995 sample. The percentage in their 30s had increased slightly, but those in their 40s had shrunk by about 60 percent. Slightly more were in their fifties. A stable 20 percent were in their 60s, but more than one in eight were over 70. By 2012 the percent in their thirties was about the same as in 1995, while about a quarter of the sample was in their forties. The rest of the sample reflected the gradual aging of the same group of people who remained in the field. The percentage in their 50s had declined to about a fifth of the sample, while those in their 60s now took up the slack, and the percentage in their 70s and beyond continued to grow.

The other noteworthy feature of the age distribution comparisons is the virtual absence of professional Japan specialists under the age of 30. In the 1960s when the first large crop of Japan specialists were trained with heavy infusions of federal support for area studies and less commonly taught languages, universities were expanding to meet the demands of the baby boom generation. At that time, young faculty members often had completed their doctorates before the age of 30, or were hired before they had finished their dissertations. In the decades since, graduate training has lengthened and virtually no Japan specialists are eligible for inclusion in the directory before the age of 30. The few people in that age category are generally persons with qualifications other than a doctorate.

For further analysis of the age distribution of the sample, we will use a different set of age categories, as shown in Table 2.4. These correspond more closely to the ages at which Japan specialists enter and leave professional employment. Japan specialists generally reach professional status in their early 30s, and 65 is the traditional retirement age, although it is clear that many Japan specialists today remain active much longer. We can see more precisely how the field is changing by comparing the old and new directory entrants in the 2005 study and the current one using more appropriate age categories.

The mean age of Japan specialists overall is only slightly higher (55.8) in the current study than it has been in the past two studies (54.9 and 54.0). The average age of persons new to each study has been about the same in 2005 (44.4) and 2012 (45.5), both of which are lower than the average age of new entrants in 1995 (48.8). The latter figure once again points to the unusual characteristics of those who were new to the study in 1995, many of whom were moving into the study of Japan from other professions in which they were already working, or were making lateral moves as academics.

The age gap between old and new entrants in 2005 and 2012 may be obfuscated somewhat by the growing number of persons for whom we could not even estimate a birth year because they had also concealed the dates of earlier academic degrees. Yet it seems probable that those who wish to conceal their age are not in the youngest age groups. Comparing the new entrants in the three studies, those in 2005 and 2012 are more heavily concentrated in the two youngest age groups. Comparing the holdover entrants in the three studies, the percentage 65 or older is

Table 2.4. Comparison of New and Repeat Entrants by Age, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

Study / Age Groups	1995 Study			2005 Study			2012 Study		
	In 1989 %	New 1995 %	1995 All %	In 1995 %	New 2005 %	2005 All %	In** 2005 %	New 2012 %	2012 All %
Under 35	0.1	9.7	3.3	0.1	17.0	7.2	0.1	11.2	2.9
35-44	13.6	33.3	20.1	4.8	40.9	19.8	11.4	33.8	17.6
45-54	32.1	27.7	30.6	27.3	17.6	23.3	21.2	17.0	19.6
55-64	26.0	16.0	22.7	39.1	9.5	26.8	29.1	8.8	22.7
65 or older	26.7	9.9	21.1	27.5	3.9	17.7	33.9	7.3	27.2
Not stated	1.6	3.3	2.2	1.2	11.0	5.3	4.2	21.9	10.0
Total %	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.0
Total N	1,039	513	1,552	750	535	1,285	970	465	1,435
Mean Age	57.3	48.8	54.9	61.7	44.4	54.0	59.9	45.5	55.8

* 1995 data from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s*, Table 2.3; 2005 data from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities* Percents may not total to 100% because of rounding.
** Because some people were not in 2005 but had been in the 1995 study, this number was recalculated to include all persons who had been in either study, so that the "New in 2012" column reports only those who have not been in the study before.

Table 2.5. Japan Specialists by Gender and Age, 2012

	Female		Male		Total	
Age	#	%	#	%	#	%
Under 35	22	42.3	30	57.7	52	100.0
35-44	119	44.7	147	55.3	266	100.0
45-54	132	46.5	152	53.5	284	100.0
55-64	128	40.0	192	60.0	320	100.0
65 or older	93	25.7	269	74.3	362	100.0
Not stated	64	44.4	80	55.5	144	100.0
Total	558	39.1	870	60.9	1428	100.0

now a third of the holdovers. Although this group of Japan specialists will no doubt remain active well beyond age 65, within another decade the age distribution of Japan specialists should show a much better overall balance across age groups, with a more regular flow of people in and out of the field by age.

The gender balance in Japanese Studies has been improving steadily. The 1970 study consistently referred to Japan specialists as "men" although over 10 percent of those included were women. Things have improved substantially since then. In 1995 the overall sample was almost 30 percent female, and 37.6 percent of the new entrants were women. Moreover the gender ratio was more balanced with each successively younger age cohort. As Table 2.5 shows, the gender ratio seems to have stabilized at roughly 45:55 for the three younger age cohorts, with the percent female dropping in the two older age categories.

Interestingly, the gender ratio is also roughly 45:55 among those who did not wish to re-

port their age and for whom it could not be estimated from education. This suggests that the issue for them is more likely fear of age discrimination in employment, rather than feminine coyness about revealing their age. They were primarily individuals with quite recent PhDs, who may well have come to graduate school later in life rather than in a direct progression through educational levels.

Occupations and Disciplines

Although specialization on Japan began and has remained primarily oriented to academic careers, our previous studies found a number of Japan specialists employed outside of academics. The most basic occupational division we need to examine is therefore the proportion of the study sample that is employed as academic faculty. Following the practice established in the 1995 study, "independent scholars" are also included in this category. In all three studies, the analysis is based on the primary occupation listed, although a number of people with another primary occupation list faculty as their secondary occupation. As shown in Table 2.6, our sample remains predominantly academic faculty, with the percentage increasing from two-thirds in 1995 to three-quarters in the past two studies. The proportion employed in other occupations has shrunk correspondingly from a quarter of the 1995 sample to the current 15.6%.

All three studies contained a substantial number of persons who were retired or not employed. Not surprisingly, two thirds of those who were retired or not employed were 65 or older. There is very little difference by age group between those employed as faculty and those in other occupations. Table 2.7 provides a closer look at the occupational distribution of those who are not employed as faculty. The data demonstrate once again how different the 1995 study sample was from the two twenty-first century study samples. In 1995, persons in business and librarians were tied as the top two categories, followed by those in government service (including diplomatic service, government service, and military service combined), research staff, lawyers, and educational administrators.

The 2005 and 2012 distribution is substantially different, with business dropping to seventh place and those non-faculty occupations that are most closely related to academic Japanese Studies and its support (librarian, educational administrator, and museum curator) taking the top three slots. This is a clue to the strengthening of academic Japanese Studies that we will explore in more detail in subsequent chapters. They are followed in ranks 4, 5, and 6 by foundation staff, government, and research staff. The biggest decreases since 1995 have been in business and law. We do not know whether these professionals have moved on to positions that do not include the study of Japan, or if they are still using their Japan expertise although we have lost track of them. In the 1995 study, I pointed to the increase in Japan specialists working outside

Table 2.6 Faculty and Non-Faculty Distribution of Japan Specialists, 1995, 2005, 2012*

Year \ Type	Faculty	Non-Faculty	Retired, not Employed	Total	# of Respondents
1995	65.5%	25.1%	9.3%	99.9%	1,544
2005	74.1%	18.1%	7.8%	100%	1,236
2012	75.4%	15.6%	9.0%	100%	1,427

*1995 data from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* p. 26; 2005 data from Japanese Studies in the *United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*, pp. 24-25. Percents may not total to 100% because of rounding.

Table 2.7. Percent Distribution of Major Non-Faculty Occupations, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	1995			2005			2012		
Occupation	%	N	Rank	%	N	Rank	%	N	Rank
Business	14.0	(55)	**1**	5.6	(13)	**7**	4.1	(8)	**7**
Librarian	14.0	(55)	**2**	18.1	(42)	**1**	21.1	(41)	**1**
Government	10.7	(42)	**3**	7.8	(18)	**4**	5.7	(11)	**5**
Research Staff	8.7	(34)	**4**	6.5	(15)	**5**	4.6	(9)	**6**
Lawyer	7.6	(30)	**5**	4.3	(10)	**9**	3.1	(6)	**9**
Educ. Administration	7.6	(30)	**6**	12.5	(29)	**2**	14.4	(28)	**2**
Foundation Staff	7.1	(28)	**7**	6.0	(14)	**6**	7.7	(15)	**4**
Museum Curator	5.9	(23)	**8**	8.6	(20)	**3**	8.2	(16)	**3**
Writer	5.6	(22)	**9**	5.6	(13)	**7**	4.1	(8)	**7**
Mass Media	4.1	(16)	**10**	3.4	(8)	**10**	.05	(1)	**12**
Translator	3.8	(15)	**11**	1.7	(4)	**12**	3.1	(6)	**9**
Secondary Teacher	3.6	(14)	**12**	3.0	(7)	**11**	1.5	(3)	**11**
Other	7.4	(29)		16.8	(39)		21.6	(42)	
Total	100.1	393		99.9	232		99.3	194	

* 1995 data calculated from 1995 database, not previously reported. Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding. The "other" category in each time period contains occupations with a smaller number of respondents than the smallest category reported separately.

of academia as evidence of the normalization of Japanese Studies in American society. That still holds true, but it is now much clearer that the more Japan specialists move into the normal mainstream of American society, the harder it is to track and count them in studies such as this.

Another approach to understanding the nature of Japan specialists' expertise is to look at their disciplinary specializations. These overlap in some categories with occupational categories, but allow us to examine academic specializations in more detail. For this analysis we revert to using the full sample, since those who are retired or unemployed remain active in the field through publication and other forms of participation.

All the studies of the field since 1970 have looked at disciplines, so we can take a relatively long look at their persistence and change. Table 2.8 shows the change in disciplinary distribution of Japan specialists since 1970. The 1970 data had a limited number of disciplinary categories and thus a large percentage of people were lumped into the "other" category.

The 1984 data lacked an "interdisciplinary" category. For all other categories the definitions appear to have been consistent. The percentages of most standard academic disciplines have been quite consistent over the past 42 years, after we factor in the smaller number of available categories in 1970. The notable exception is history, which originally comprised a full third of all Japan specialists and now is down to about a fifth. The other notable feature is that the 1995 distribution now appears to have been somewhat of an aberration in an otherwise relatively stable picture.

The sharp increase in the professions in 1995, and the smaller increase in economics in 1984 and 1995 reflect both the influence of the Japanese bubble economy and the existence of special well-funded programs designed to increase the number of lawyers and economists

Table 2.8. Disciplinary Distribution of Japan Specialists in 1970 to 2012

Discipline	1970 %	1984 %	1995 %	2005 %	2012 %
Anthropology	10	7	6.0	6.9	7.3
Art, Art History	5	10	6.3	5.7	5.6
Economics	4	5	5.8	3.2	2.2
History	33	24	16.3	20.9	21.1
Lang. & Literature	19	22	21.2	22.0	22.1
Political Science	10	13	8.3	9.2	9.1
Religion, Philosophy	–	6	5.9	6.5	6.8
Sociology	4	4	3.6	3.7	3.1
Interdisciplinary	–	–	3.8	6.1	7.3
Professions	–	4	13.3	6.3	6.4
Other	15	6	9.7	9.5	9.2
Total %	100	101	100.2	100.0	100.2
# Specialists	332	841	1,544	1,236	1,333

* 1970 data from 1970 SSRC-ACLS Report, p.110; 1984 data from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table A-2, p. 95. 1995 data from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s*, p. 29, Table 2.5; all included with 2005 data in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*, p. 26, Table 2.6.

specializing in Japan during that period. Both categories have decreased by about 50 percent since 1995, which corresponds to our findings about non-faculty employment in these areas.

The special programs achieved their aims and their funding ended. While they have not been pumping large numbers of economists and lawyers into Japanese Studies over the past decade, the people these programs trained in the 1980s and early 1990s are presumably still working, but largely outside of academics, where we are less able to keep track of them. With the end of the Japanese bubble economy, interest in business shifted from Japan to China, and that also accounts for some of the decline in the category of the professions, as we saw earlier. Despite the decrease in the numbers represented in the current study sample, these professional fields have left a strong mark within academics, as will be apparent when we examine the range of courses, degree programs, and specialists at the larger Japanese Studies programs in Chapters 5 and 6.

While this disciplinary distribution is useful for a long-term view of the field, in the 1995 study we also began using a broader system of disciplinary clusters that allows us to analyze disciplines in relation to other variables more effectively. The new code clusters the disciplines as follows: humanities (art history, history, religion, philosophy, literature); social sciences (anthropology, economics, political science, sociology, geography, psychology, communications); language and linguistics; interdisciplinary fields (Asian studies, Japanese studies, women's studies, international studies, urban studies, etc.); arts (all performing and practicing arts); professions (architecture, business, law, library science, education); sciences (natural sciences, information and computer science, engineering). Table 2.9 gives this distribution for the past three studies for which we have directly comparable data.

Overall, the traditional academic areas of the humanities, language and linguistics, and the social sciences continue to account for the overwhelming majority of Japan specialists, with percentages very similar to those found in 2005. The humanities alone now account for nearly half of all Japan specialists. Interdisciplinary fields have increased recently, while the professions are holding steady.

Table 2.9. Japan Specialists by Discipline Cluster, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

Discipline Cluster	1995 Total		2005 Total		2012 Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Humanities	579	37.9	562	45.6	628	47.3
Lang. & Ling.	100	6.5	109	8.8	117	8.8
Social Sci.	483	31.6	308	25.0	311	23.4
Arts	46	3.0	54	4.4	50	3.8
Interdiscip.	81	5.3	76	6.2	97	7.3
Professions	226	14.8	118	9.6	119	9.0
Sciences	12	0.8	5	0.4	7	0.5
Total %	1,527	99.9	1,232	100	1,329	100

* 1995 data from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* p. 30, Table 2.6. Included with 2005 data in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* p. 27, Table 2.7.

Table 2.10. Employment Distribution of Japan Specialists by Disciplinary Group, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

Discipline Group	1995 (% and #)		2005 (% and #)		2012 (% and #)	
	Faculty	Non-Faculty	Faculty	Non-Faculty	Faculty	Non-Faculty
Humanities	82.5	17.5	86.2	13.8	90.2	9.8
	(429)	(91)	(451)	(72)	(507)	(55)
Social Sci.	77.5	22.5	82.2	17.8	86.5	13.5
	(335)	(97)	(240)	(52)	(244)	(38)
Lang. Ling.	83.9	16.1	88.8	11.2	90.4	9.6
	(78)	(15)	(95)	(12)	(104)	(11)
Professions	45.1	54.9	45.1	54.9	55.7	44.2
	(96)	(117)	(51)	(62)	(63)	(50)
Interdisc.	50.7	49.3	66.2	33.8	74.4	25.6
	(38)	(37)	(49)	(25)	(67)	(23)
Arts	61.0	39.0	68.1	31.9	83.3	16.7
	(25)	(16)	(32)	(15)	(35)	(7)
All Fields (% and #)	72.9	27.1	79.4	20.6	84.7	15.3
	(1,001)	(373)	(918)	(238)	(1,020)	(184)

* Table does not include those who are not working, scientists and engineers, and cases with missing data. Data for 1995 from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s*, p. 32, Table 2.7, included with data for 2005 in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* p. 27, Table 2.8.

One final issue is how the disciplinary clusters relate to type of employment. Table 2.10 compares the distribution of faculty and non-faculty by discipline cluster for all employed respondents in 1995, 2005, and 2012 (omitting those who are retired and unemployed). While the overall balance between faculty and non-faculty employment has shifted toward faculty employment (bottom row of table), the distributions have not been consistent in all disciplinary groups.

The comparison with 1995 data demonstrates the overall effect of the loss of a dispro-

portionately larger percentage of the non-faculty sample. In the professions, the split between faculty and non-faculty is identical for 1995 and 2005 with a 10 percentage point difference in favor of non-faculty employment. This has reversed in 2012, leaving a ten percentage point difference in favor of faculty employment. The actual numbers in this category have also decreased by about half since 1995. All other groups have a higher percentage employed as faculty in all three years, with higher margins in faculty employment in each successive study. In Chapters 5 and 7 we will take another look at changes in the number and distribution of academic faculty within Japanese Studies programs, using staff lists reported by academic programs rather than entries in the specialist directory.

Geographic Distribution of Japan Specialists

As in 1995 and 2005, the largest numbers of Japan specialists were found in the two largest states, with 209 in California and 137 in New York. Massachusetts is not far behind with 108 specialists. Four more states had more than fifty Japan specialists participating in the study: Hawaii with 76, Pennsylvania with 71, Illinois with 62, and Michigan with 68. Nine other states have more than 30 Japan specialists represented in the sample: Ohio (53), Indiana (40), Connecticut (34), District of Columbia (35), Washington (38), Virginia (34), North Carolina (32), New Jersey (33) and Wisconsin (35). These top 15 states plus the District of Columbia account for three-fourths of the Japan specialists in the study, and all but one of them had a larger number in 2012 than in 2005. At the other end of the spectrum, only one state, North Dakota, did not have any Japan specialists represented. This is a substantial improvement from 1995, when there were six states with no Japan specialists in the study. Also, only nine states were represented by less than five Japan specialists. Thus, the geographic spread of Japan specialists throughout the United States has continued and most states now have at least a minimal cluster of expertise on Japan available.

For further analysis of the geographic distribution of Japan specialists, we combine them into regional clusters. Data are available from several earlier studies for comparison, as shown in Table 2.11. As explained in the earlier studies, we have recalculated data from studies in 1970, 1977, and 1984 to arrive at these figures. They are somewhat inexact because the data for 1977 and 1984 are calculated from faculty FTE (full-time equivalent) counts reported by academic institutions; we do not know to what extent part-time faculty members were combined in the overall FTE counts. The numbers for 1984 are also substantially undercounted because they come only from academic institutions, but by that time nearly 10 percent of Japan specialists were not affiliated with academic institutions. There is also a decrease in the absolute number of specialists reported for 1984 compared to 1977, which we believe is accounted for largely by variations in the quality of the data collection of the two surveys. The 1977 survey was conducted by CULCON and thus had strong legitimacy within the field, intensive personalized follow-up, and high compliance; the 1984 study was conducted by a professional survey firm with no ties in the Japanese Studies community, using only standard survey methods and limited follow-up. Data from the last three studies are comparable in method, and the variations in their responses have already been discussed.

The regions are defined as follows: Northeast (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont); Mid-Atlantic (Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and District of Columbia); South (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee); Midwest (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio,

Table 2.11. Change in Regional Distribution of Japan Specialists, 1970–2012*

	1970	1977	1984	1989	1995	2005	2012
Region	% #	% #	% #	% #	% #	% #	% #
Northeast	25.1 (103)	17.6 (155)	18.2 (142)	23.7 (282)	19.9 (307)	23.9 (304)	22.2 (314)
Mid-Atlantic	7.5 (31)	9.1 (80)	7.2 (56)	13.1 (156)	17.0 (263)	14.5 (184)	14.0 (198)
South	3.9 (16)	7.0 (62)	7.0 (55)	6.3 (75)	6.7 (104)	6.3 (80)	7.6 (107)
Midwest	23.6 (97)	24.4 (215)	21.1 (165)	21.2 (253)	20.9 (323)	23.6 (300)	24.3 (344)
Southwest-Mountain	6.1 (25)	9.1 (80)	7.9 (62)	5.5 (66)	6.3 (98)	6.7 (85)	7.1 (101)
Pacific	33.8 (139)	32.7 (288)	38.5 (301)	30.1 (359)	29.2 (451)	25.1 (319)	24.9 (352)
Total N	(411)	(880)	(781)	(1191)	(1546)	(1272)	(1416)

* 1970 data based on roster of specialists at academic institutions included as a supplement to the 1970 SSRC-ACLS study. 1977 data based on count of faculty from the 1977 CULCON institutional survey. 1984 data from 1984 Japan Foundation study, based on faculty counts reported in institutional survey. 1989 data reported in "Introduction" to *Directory of Japan Specialists and Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada*, vol. 1, p. xiv and based on specialists in the directory. 1995 data based on specialists included in the 1995 study as reported in *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s*, p. 44, Table 3.1. Data from previous studies included with 2005 data in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* p. 29, Table 2.9.

Table 2.12. Japan Specialists' Geographic Region by Employment Status, 2012*

	Faculty		Non-Faculty		Not Employed		Total	
Region	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Northeast	229	73.4	52	16.7	31	9.9	312	100
Mid-Atlantic	135	68.2	48	24.2	15	7.6	198	100
South	94	87.9	9	8.4	4	3.7	107	100
Midwest	268	77.9	43	12.5	33	9.6	344	100
Southwest-Mountain	83	82.2	13	12.9	5	5.0	101	100
Pacific	264	75.0	49	13.9	39	11.1	352	100
Total	1073	75.9	214	15.1	127	9.0	1414	100

* Data from 2012 entrants in directory of Japan specialists, minus cases with missing data.

Wisconsin); Southwest-Mountain (Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming); Pacific (Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, Washington).

Most regions display both percentages and absolute numbers that are reasonably consistent with past studies. The two areas with unusually high increases in 1995, the mid-Atlantic and the Pacific, have declined somewhat, while the Northeast and Midwest regions that experienced decreases in 2005 have now rebounded. The two smallest regions, the South and Southwest-Mountain, have surpassed their 1995 peak number of specialists.

Since Japan specialists operate in a national or even international job market, the distribution of specialists reflects to some extent the kinds of job opportunities that are available in each region, as shown in Table 2.12. Although the differences are not large, the relatively

higher percentage of faculty in the South reflects the more recent build-up of Japan expertise at academic institutions there, and the relatively low demand for Japan specialists in non-faculty areas. By contrast, the Mid-Atlantic and Northeast regions have a relatively higher proportion of Japan specialists in non-faculty positions. Although the numbers are small, the higher unemployed levels in the Northeast, Midwest, and Pacific reflect primarily retired faculty in the areas with the largest and oldest concentrations of Japan specialists.

Thus far we have examined the basic demographic characteristics of the current pool of Japan specialists in the United States, and we have tried to see patterns of change by comparing the current data with that of previous studies. We can begin to project these patterns into the future by analyzing the current crop of doctoral candidates in Japanese Studies, and comparing it with the earlier data on doctoral candidates that we have collected since 1989.

Doctoral Candidates in Japanese Studies

The primary purpose of analyzing data on doctoral candidate in Japanese Studies is to see where the field is headed in the future; however, because we have been building a database of doctoral candidates now for close to two decades, we are also able to examine more closely what has been happening to the flow of doctoral students during that time. It therefore adds another dimension to our efforts to find out how Japanese Studies has changed over the past decade. And even though we do not collect data directly from doctoral candidates, we have enough information now to put doctoral candidates into the large demographic and geographic context of the field as a whole. We therefore begin this analysis with an extended explanation of our methods for collecting information about doctoral candidates and tracking them over time. We then look first at overall patterns of stability and change over time, and then move to look more closely at the composition of the current crop of doctoral candidates.

The number of doctoral candidates in Japanese Studies has been assessed in various ways by all studies since the 1977 CULCON study, but differences in the methods of data collection make comparisons with the earliest studies difficult. In addition, changes in the nature of the field itself make it more and more difficult to get an accurate count of the number of doctoral candidates. These changes are beginning to call our basic definitions into question. We must work through these issues as we try to make sense of the data we do have.

The 1977 CULCON study reported 314 doctoral candidates, based on reports from the degree-granting institutions of the number of candidates they had enrolled. At that time the number of institutions with Japanese Studies programs was small and well-known. Doctoral candidates in Japanese Studies were generally associated with these programs and often supported by them, and their work was guided by a relatively small number of Japan specialist faculty members who were also affiliated with the same Japanese Studies programs. It was feasible at that time to ask the Japanese Studies programs how many doctoral students they had, and to obtain something pretty close to a true national total in that way.

Just a few years later, the 1984 Japan Foundation study used the same method, but as we have noted before, that study was carried out by a professional survey firm and lacked the intensive follow-up, inside understanding, and network ties of studies before and since. Both of these early studies asked institutions to report numbers, and not the actual names of students. The 1984 study's numbers were sufficiently ambiguous that we have been unable to use them in subsequent analyses. That study reported 308 currently enrolled doctoral students plus 174 students at Columbia who were "concurrently enrolled in both masters and doctoral programs." Absent any attempt to sort out that wildly inflated number to separate masters and

doctoral level students and eliminate double-counting, all that can be said is that the number of doctoral candidates had probably increased in the early 1980s, but it is not clear by how much. We also do not know how many of the same students were counted in both 1977 and 1984.

The difficulty with the numbers in the 1984 study points to a chronic problem in the reporting that continues to plague all attempts to count doctoral candidates. Systems of graduate education vary considerably between institutions in the United States and also between departments and programs within the same institution. Some programs admit students with bachelor's degrees directly into doctoral programs, and have them carry out MA level course work along the way to their doctorates. Others keep masters level and doctoral level programs completely separate. At some institutions, a Center for Japanese Studies or East Asian Studies offers MA programs in Japanese Studies, but all doctoral programs related to Japan are housed in individual disciplinary departments. The faculty advising students in those doctoral programs may or may not insist that their students acquire Japanese language and some certification of their Japanese Studies expertise through an MA program or a graduate certificate. Other institutions manage their Japanese programs through a broad language and culture department that encompasses several disciplines and offers both masters level and doctoral degrees. These structural variations make it impossible to achieve a high level of consistency in the reporting of doctoral students in Japanese Studies.

To complicate matters further, although the Japan Foundation always asks for students who are "writing doctoral dissertations on Japan," there is no agreement about when that commitment is made and what it means. It varies by program, by discipline, and even by individual student, since doctoral dissertations are developed in many different ways. Programs also report the data they have to collect for other purposes, which is likely to be either all those currently in the program or all those who have just graduated. Consequently, what is typically reported is the students who have been admitted to a doctoral program (or a track leading to a doctoral program), and appear to have a strong intention of writing a dissertation on Japan. This means that the count at any point in time may include students who were counted in an earlier study, and may also include some students who do not ultimately complete or even begin a doctoral dissertation on Japan.

While there are no perfect solutions to these chronic problems, the three most recent studies of Japanese Studies in the United States sponsored by the Japan Foundation have attempted to clarify the situation in a number of ways. First, since the 1989 directory study, we have asked not for a count of doctoral students, but for the actual names, departments, and dissertation topics (if known) of doctoral students in Japanese Studies. Second, we also ask both the Japanese Studies programs and the Japan specialists who participate in the study to report doctoral students. These two methodological innovations allow us to obtain the broadest possible reporting on current doctoral students. However, even though two sources are better than one, our information is still limited to those programs and specialists who respond to the survey.

For the 2005 study with its online data collection system, we added a way for doctoral students to register themselves on the data collection website. A total of 90 doctoral students did so; two-thirds of them were also reported by either their institution or one or more faculty members, but one-third we would not have known about otherwise. We also had a place for direct registration on the 2012 data collection website, but a much smaller number of students actually registered. Our methods of triangulation in data collection and the use of actual names of doctoral students also allow us to track the students over time, and to determine which students have been reported previously and which are new. As part of this tracking of doctoral

students over time, in the past three studies we have asked both Japanese Studies programs and Japan specialists to tell us the current status of their previously reported doctoral students. We received update information from institutions about 882 students, nearly half no longer in the program, six percent continuing, and 45.6 percent new. Current status was reported for 40 percent of those who had left, and a degree year was reported for a third. A very small number had left the program without finishing or had left Japanese Studies. Japan specialists who participated in the directory reported on 1,130 doctoral students, of whom five percent were still in the program, 36 percent were new, nearly a quarter had recently completed their degree, and a third were reported as no longer at the institution. Here, too, a very small number had left without finishing or left Japanese Studies. A degree year was provided for one third of all the students reported. There is fairly a high degree of overlap between those reported by the institutions and by specialists, so the yield from the two sources is much smaller.

While this updating is far from complete, it helps us follow these students after they leave their doctoral programs. We further supplemented the list by adding all persons with entries in the specialists directory who had listed a doctorate received after the publication of the previous directory. This method added 168 persons to the list, only a third of whom (59) were already on our lists. To prepare the doctoral student information for analysis, we first cleaned the data to eliminate as many duplicate entries as we could identify from names and institutional affiliations. We were helped by specialists and programs who occasionally reported new married names for students, but there may still be some duplication that we could not eliminate because the same person is in the database under two different names. A handful of students had moved to a different doctoral institution, generally because their primary advisor had also moved. In a few cases, students were reported to us by a faculty member at a different institution. This time we had 47 doctoral students reported who are studying outside the United States. For this analysis we use only doctoral students at institutions in the United States. We have confirmed that 484 students have completed doctoral dissertations in the United States since 2005. A third of those students have entries in the 2012 directory of Japan specialists.

A total of 639 current doctoral candidates have been reported to the study, and we can do some additional analysis of this sample, comparing it with the current doctoral candidates reported in the previous studies. The gender ratio in Japanese Studies has been steadily moving toward parity, and this movement is clearly shown in the analysis of past and present doctoral candidates. Gender was reported directly for the majority of the current doctoral candidates in the sample. When it was not reported by the institution or a faculty member or by a candidate who registered on the project website, we were generally able to deduce it from the name, as we did in the previous studies. Gender could not be determined by these methods for about 6 percent of the sample. A small part of the indeterminacy can be attributed to persons with gender-neutral first names. However, most of it is due to doctoral students who do not have American, European, or Japanese first names from which gender could be readily deduced. Among both past and current doctoral students for whom gender could be determined, results were close to gender parity. The past doctoral candidates sample as of 2005 was 48.5 percent female and 51.5 percent male, while the 2005 current doctoral candidates sample was 51 percent female and 49 percent male. In 2005 we raised the possibility that if the gender ratio continued to shift toward women, this might raise the danger in the future of feminization of the profession, which in other fields has carried with it a decline in professional status. However, the 2012 sample of current doctoral candidates, minus the ones for whom gender could not be determined, has shifted back somewhat: 54.7 percent of those for whom gender could be determined are male, and 45.3 percent are female. If all of the 39 gender-missing individuals were female, the ratio

would be 48 percent female to 52 percent male. If all of them were male, it would be 57 percent male to 43 percent female. The real ratio is somewhere in between.

Actually, the shifting gender ratio among Japanese Studies doctoral candidates reflects the gender shift in American academics in general. While men still dominate in faculty positions, particularly at higher academic ranks, the study body is now increasingly female. Analyses of these changes in American academic institutions generally point to factors that are not particularly relevant to Japanese Studies, such as the return to school of older women. One factor that may be relevant is the relatively higher proportion of Asian women in the college population. Our data on doctoral candidates does not permit us to pursue these lines of analysis further, since we do not have reliable data on age, ethnicity, or national origin.

We can also examine changes in the disciplinary distribution of doctoral candidates. For this purpose, we also have data from the 1995 study on both 1989 doctoral candidates' disciplines and those of new doctoral candidates in 1995. We omit the 2005 sample of past doctoral students from this analysis, since it largely represents a retrospective look at the two earlier groups, but include the current doctoral candidates in 2005. Table 2.13 shows the comparative results, using the same disciplinary categories that were employed in 1995 and 2005.

The table presents both the actual number of candidates in each discipline and the disciplinary percentage distribution of these four discrete cohorts of doctoral candidates. We have also added the rank order to further illuminate the situation. Because there are changes in the distribution as well as fluctuations in the actual number of doctoral candidates in each discipline, we have to look at both, and at their rank order, to see what is happening. First, as we first discovered in 1995, a number of programs have expanded or have been reconfigured as

Table 2.13. Disciplinary Distribution of Doctoral Candidates in 1989, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	1989 Candidates			1995 Candidates			2005 Candidates			2012 Candidates		
Discipline	#	%	Rank	#	%	Rank	#	%	Rank	#	%	Rank
Anthropology	35	7.9	4	74	11.1	4	43	7.6	6	52	8.1	3
Art History	32	7.2	6	21	3.1	11	36	6.4	8	35	5.5	5
Economics	21	4.7	10	15	2.2	13	5	0.9	12	2	0.3	12
Education	16	3.6	11	20	3.0	12	13	2.3	11	4	0.6	11
History	67	15.1	2	88	13.2	2	100	17.7	1	128	20.0	1
Linguistics	34	7.6	5	61	9.1	6	47	8.3	5	25	3.9	9
Literature	84	18.9	1	72	10.8	5	74	13.1	2	87	13.5	2
Performing Arts	13	2.9	12	22	3.3	10	3	0.5	13	13	2.0	10
Political Science	58	13.0	3	96	14.4	1	68	12.0	4	44	6.9	4
Religion-Philos.	29	6.5	7	34	5.1	8	30	5.3	9	29	4.5	7
Sociology	25	5.6	8	28	4.2	9	29	5.1	10	26	4.1	8
Asian-E.Asian St.	6	1.3	13	86	12.9	3	74	13.1	2	35	5.4	5
Other	25	5.6	8	51	7.6	7	43	7.6	6	74	11.5	
Not Stated										85	13.3	
Total	445	99.9		668	100.0		565	100.0		639	99.9	

* 1989 and 1995 (new) data from *Japanese Studies in the United States, The 1990s*, ch. 2 Table 2.9. Reproduced with 2005 data in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 2.12, p. 37.

East Asian languages and cultures programs, which encompass a broader range of humanities disciplines and encourage students to do doctoral work that crosses traditional disciplinary lines. The result is that it is more difficult to assign current doctoral students in these programs to a traditional discipline, although after the dissertation is completed it is often clear whether it is primarily history, literature, linguistics, or something else. There was a large jump in the number of students in such programs in 1995 that was sustained in 2005, but the number and percentage have declined in 2012.

The most striking finding for 2012 is the large increase in History doctoral students. History, which ranked second to Literature in 1989 and to Political Science in 1995, emerged in 2005 as the leader in number and percentage of doctoral students by a wide margin. That position has been maintained in 2012 and fully 20 percent of all current doctoral students in Japanese Studies fields are getting their degrees in History. One possible explanation for this dramatic increase is that Japanese History now actively embraces the study of postwar Japan, which up through the 1990s was largely relegated to anthropology, political science, and sociology. Literature retains its #2 ranking in 2012 but shows only a modest increase in numbers and has a stable percentage for 2005 and 2012.

Political Science, which rose sharply to a number one ranking in 1995, ranked fourth in 2005 and 2012. Both the number and percentage of Political Science students dropped substantially in 2012 even though it retained its #4 ranking. Anthropology has now overtaken Political Science in both number of students and percentage, to take the #3 ranking. Linguistics has also dropped in numbers, percentage, and correspondingly, in the rankings. Performing Arts suffered a big decline in 2005, but has recovered in 2012, while Education has seen a steady decline.

It is clear that Economics has suffered a drastic decline since the late 1980s, which was visible in 1995 and has grown more severe since. Although there was a brief period of interest in the Japanese economy in the late 1980s and there were special programs designed to encourage doctoral students to specialize in the Japanese economy, the highly quantitative nature of modern economics training makes it difficult to define Japanese economics as a professionally relevant area of expertise. Some of the more qualitative content that characterizes the Japanese economy has been redefined as being in the purview of "political economy," which is pursued under the rubric of political science, or as relevant to international business, and pursued as part of management programs. Hence while there is still research being conducted on the Japanese economy, and there are still graduate level courses on the subject, doctoral students with expertise on the Japanese economy are much less likely to define themselves, or to be identified by others, as doing economics under the rubric of Japanese Studies. Moreover, doctoral students with expertise on the Japanese economy are much more likely to go into the private sector or other non-academic employment, making them even more invisible as academic Japan specialists.

In contrast to the shifting patterns we have seen in these disciplines, Religion-Philosophy and Sociology are characterized more by relatively level numbers of doctoral students in each of the four time periods. Although Art History showed a dip in 1995, it, too, now has about the same level of students it had in 1989. For all three of these fields, the percentage distributions and rankings suggest a decline, when in fact all three have been quite stable or even show a slight increase in the number of students they attract. They are likely to remain small but important components of the field for the foreseeable future.

Overall, our analysis of doctoral candidates in Japanese Studies reveals a solid flow of new blood that will be entering the field over the next few years. The fairly large current cohort of

doctoral candidates in Japanese Studies is particularly important in light of the overall demographic transition in the field. This solid cohort of doctoral students ensures that there will be a steady flow of specialists into academic departments to replace those who are retiring and leaving the field. Given the current shape of the field and the disciplinary distribution of the current crop of doctoral students, it seems likely that most of them will end up in academic positions.

Japanese Studies remains small enough, however, that a large increase in doctoral students in a particular discipline can produce short-term dislocations in the job market. We have seen in the past that many of the academic positions that Japan specialists fill were not marked as "Japanese Studies" but instead were filled serendipitously by someone who happened to be a Japan specialist. This is easier to accomplish in some disciplines than in others. Social scientists can usually sell themselves as generalists or as having some recognizable disciplinary subfield that does not refer specifically to Japan. Specialists in Japanese language and literature do not have that luxury. The discipline that is most likely to experience this sort of job market pressure in the near future is history; many of these newly minted Japanese historians may need to find their niche more broadly in Asian history or world history even though the largest Japanese Studies programs can now accommodate several Japanese historians specializing in different time periods or approaches. We will revisit this issue again in Chapter 7.

We now turn back from looking at doctoral students as the coming generation of Japan specialists, to look more closely at the credentials and expertise of those who are already in the field.

3

Expertise and Credentials of Japan Specialists

This chapter will look more closely at the expertise and credentials of Japan specialists who have participated in the 2012 study, comparing this group whenever possible with our findings from previous studies. We will look at the areas of specialization of Japan specialists, their Japanese language skills, their academic and professional credentials, and how they maintain and expand their language skills and expertise about Japan. Some of the topics we will examine are based on data from the survey portion of our questionnaire, as opposed to the directory entry portion. Not everyone who participated in the project completed the lengthy survey portion, so the sample size is somewhat smaller for these parts. We will use the maximum amount of information available for each question, and the relevant sample size and any other methodological considerations will be noted in the tables or in the discussion. Even though the survey sample is smaller, it still represents such a large proportion of the estimated overall population of Japan specialists in the United States that we can present the data with considerable confidence using simple percentages and means.

Areas of Specialization

Although from the outside, the term "Japan specialist" may conjure up an image of people who know everything there is to know about Japan, no Japan specialist in the United States would claim such comprehensive knowledge. In the 1995 study we noted the increasing specialization in the field, and the correspondingly greater depth and specialization of the research Japan specialists do. While this has produced overall a much broader array of material about Japan available in English, that in turn means that even specialists no longer can keep up with all of the scholarship their colleagues have produced, while at the same time maintaining their own expertise in a narrower area. A wide range of disciplines are represented within Japanese Studies, as noted in Chapter 2. Both disciplinary training and the demands of professional teaching and research affect what aspects of Japan are significant for any specialist.

We look now at three additional dimensions of specialization: historical periods, geographic regions, and a very broad array of subject matter specializations, or topics, in which specialists claim expertise. Information on these three dimensions was collected as part of the specialist directory entries, and the categories were used to produce indexes for the directory that help users identify specialists with particular qualifications. We now use this information

to examine the current state of the field and compare it with the shape of the field in the past. In all three of these dimensions of specialization, our data collection methods encourage specialists to report all of the categories in which they have expertise. This requires special handling of the data, since the number of responses far exceeds the number of people who responded. In addition, we are often constrained to handle the current data in the same way it was reported in the past, in order to see patterns of continuity and change. Most of this change comes about through new people entering Japanese Studies and older ones leaving, but some part also reflects the continuing intellectual development of Japan specialists who pursue new research topics and acquire expertise in new areas over the course of their careers.

Historical Periods

Perhaps the most basic form of specialization, with an obvious but imperfect relationship to academic discipline, is the range of historical periods in which a Japan specialist has some expertise. Table 3.1 compares the range of historical periods of specialization reported in the current study with those reported in 1995 and 2005, when the data were collected in the same

Table 3.1. Historical Periods of Specialization, 1995 , 2005, and 2012*

	1995		2005		2012	
Historical Period	# of Responses	% of Respondents	# of Responses	% of Respondents	# of Responses	% of Respondents
Prehistory	69	5.1	61	5.4	52	4.0
Nara	103	7.6	102	9.0	101	8.0
Heian	174	12.9	159	14.0	185	14.6
Kamakura	172	12.8	154	13.6	164	12.9
Ashikaga	135	10.0	131	11.5	134	10.6
Sengoku	131	9.7	131	11.5	146	11.5
Tokugawa	261	19.4	255	22.4	288	22.7
Early Tokugawa	112	8.3	111	9.8	122	9.6
Late Tokugawa	127	9.4	128	11.3	143	11.3
Bakumatsu	149	11.1	142	12.5	162	12.8
Tokugawa All**			636	30.2	655	30.1
Meiji	514	38.2	485	42.7	554	43.6
Taisho	458	34.0	460	40.5	527	41.5
Shōwa	567	42.1	514	45.2	571	45.0
Early Shōwa	324	24.1	341	30.0	405	31.9
Postwar Shōwa	741	55.0	613	54.0	660	52.0
Shōwa All**			1,468	75.6	1,636	72.7
Heisei	479	35.6	568	50.0	700	55.1
Total	4,516	1,347	4,355	1,136	4,914	1,270
Mean # Responses		3.35		3.83		3.87

* Data for 1995 from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 4.2, ch. 4, p. 72. 1995 data included with data for 2005 in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 3.1, p. 41.
** Because of the possibility of multiple responses, the Tokugawa All and Shōwa All percentages are calculated based on the number of respondents across the internal categories, with overlap eliminated. These figures were not calculated for the 1995 data.

way. Overall, the three distributions are quite similar. Virtually every historical period shows some increase from 1995 that is fairly stable between 2005 and the present. However, there are noteworthy increases in the number and percent of respondents who specialize in three periods: Taisho, Early Shōwa, and the contemporary Heisei era. While it is quite understandable that more people would now report that they specialize in Heisei Japan, which had barely begun when data were collected for the 1995 study, the increase in interest in the first half of the twentieth century is less predictable. By 2012, the Heisei category contains all those who study contemporary Japan, and the Late Shōwa category is shrinking somewhat as it comes to be understood as the postwar era that ended in the 1980s.

Two historical periods, Tokugawa and Shōwa, have internal subdivisions to reflect the more fine-grained periods in which specialists concentrate their study. There is some overlap, as some respondents reported specializing in the entire period, while others picked only internal subdivisions and still others reported both. The results indicate that while the majority of Japan specialists have expertise on modern Japan, there are still substantial numbers of specialists on earlier historical periods. Although persons in the humanities are more likely to specialize in pre-modern Japan and social scientists are more likely to specialize in Shōwa and Heisei Japan, there is also substantial overlap. Overall, nearly three-quarters of Japan specialists report that they study the Shōwa era, and more than half say they study Heisei, reflecting the general tilt toward studies of modern Japan.

Geographic Specialization

While Japan specialists quite obviously specialize in the geographic area of Japan, some specialists also treat Japan either comparatively or in the context of a larger regional grouping. In addition, there are individuals who specialize in a particular geographic area within Japan. Our question about geographic specialization is designed to explore both of these issues. Respondents were asked to identify all of their geographic areas of expertise, using a list that permitted the choices of All Japan, Other Countries in relation to the study of Japan, and then specific regions within Japan and other countries and regions. The results are shown in Table 3.2, which compares the data from the present study with data from 1995 and 2005 that was collected in a similar manner. The most dramatic finding is the same as it was a decade ago: the great majority of Japan specialists study Japan alone; they do not study Japan either in comparative context with other societies or as part of a regional perspective that includes Japan. We will look more closely at the detailed findings separately for Japan and for other world areas studied in relation to Japan. In both cases, respondents were offered more specific choices, but we have aggregated them into larger units for presentation in the table, and have corrected for multiple responses by presenting both the total number of responses for the category (which can include the same person choosing two units within a category) and the number of respondents. Percentages are calculated based on the number of respondents, and adjusted to eliminate these multiple responses.

Most respondents report that they study Japan as a whole, but the percentage has declined from its 2005 high. There have consistently been two regions for which more than 10 percent of the sample claims special expertise: Kanto and Kinki areas, the regions encompassing the Tokyo metropolitan area and the Kansai cities of Kyoto and Osaka and the new entrant, Kyushu-Okinawa. These are undoubtedly the two areas in which most Japan specialists have resided while conducting research on Japan, even if the research itself concerned Japan as a whole. If we read the results more as an indication of the areas in which specialists have resided and with which they are therefore most familiar, and not necessarily because they have done

Table 3.2. Geographic Areas of Specialization, Domestic and International, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	1995		2005		2012	
Geographic Region	# of Responses	% of Respondents	# of Responses	% of Respondents	# of Responses	% of Respondents
Domestic						
All Japan	1,215	88.6%	1125	93.7%	1190	87.1
Chubu	76	5.5%	94	4.8%	202	7.5
Chugoku	62	4.5%	82	3.8%	99	5.2
Hokkaido	36	2.6%	35	3.0%	50	3.7
Kanto	174	12.7%	244	15.2%	470	21.4
Kinki	178	13.0%	335	14.4%	615	18.7
Kyushu/Okinawa	105	7.7%	142	7.7%	238	10.0
Shikoku	21	1.5%	27	1.7%	160	2.6
Tohoku	44	3.2%	76	4.4%	150	5.9
Total N	1,911	1,372	2,133	1,201	3,057	1,366
Mean # responses	1.39		1.7		2.24	
International						
Other Countries (general)	63	9.8	43	8.3%	78	10.7
China	323	50.2	374	56.3%	542	74.5
Hong Kong*	86	13.4	[47]	[9.1%]	[29]	[3.9]
Taiwan	164	25.5	126	24.5%	153	21.0
Korea	267	41.5	251	41.0%	356	48.9
Southeast Asia	175	27.2	197	23.9%	307	42.2
Pacific Islands	60	9.3	42	8.2%	40	5.5
Former Soviet Union	71	11.0	52	6.8%	102	14.0
Other World Areas	330	51.3	391	46.4%	952	130.8
Total N	1,539	643	1,477	515	2,530	728
Mean # responses	2.39		2.87		3.48	

* Data for 1995 adapted from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 4.Ch. 4, p. 74. For 2005, Hong Kong is included in the China category. The data contain multiple responses at two levels. Some categories have been combined for this display, so the number of responses in such categories exceeds the number of respondents. In addition, respondents are counted in each geographic region in which they responded, so the total of the regional percentages exceeds 100%.

research explicitly on these regions, the pattern makes more sense. What is new in 2012 is that the percentage of specialists reporting expertise in specific regions of Japan has increased for every region. Kyushu-Okinawa (reflecting primarily interest in Okinawa), now is reported as a region of specialization by 10 percent of respondents. There is a one-third increase in those reporting expertise on Tohoku, presumably because of scholars turning their attention to the area after the 3.11 disasters.

The findings for the study of other areas as part of the study of Japan can be read in a similar way. As in the past, less than half as many people report expertise on such other areas, compared to the number who report that they study all or some part of Japan. However, this survey had the highest number of respondents reporting study of other areas (728), and a total

number of reports of expertise outside of Japan that is dramatically higher than in previous surveys. Moreover, the mean number of choices in the international regions is substantially higher than the mean number reported within Japan itself. In short, most Japan specialists claim expertise only on Japan as a whole but not on specific regions of the country; those who claim expertise on other geographic areas outside Japan are fewer in number, but they claim expertise on more areas.

The percent who report that they have expertise on China has increased, but there are also substantial increases in the number and percent who report expertise on Korea, Southeast Asia, the Former Soviet Union, and the generic category of "other world areas," which includes Western Europe and North and South America, as well as Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia.

Subject Matter Specialization

As in the previous studies, we have used a very detailed list of subject matter specializations that was based originally on the subject classification system used by the Bibliography of Asian Studies. Within fifteen basic subject matter domains, specialists were encouraged to select from a list of more specific topic areas or to write in additional ones. We first used this system in 1989, and found that the new topic areas that specialists wrote in reflected emerging areas of research interest. Those write-ins were added to the basic list in 1995, and respondents contributed additional new topics. We followed the same procedure for the 2005 study and 2012, but received relatively few new write-in topics. Since this question is part of the data that appears in the directory, we have information from 1,380 respondents who reported an average of 10.7 subject matter specializations. Table 3.3 shows the fifteen basic subject matter domains, comparing the 1995 and 2005 data with the current study. Because multiple responses are possible within each domain, for each time period the first two columns report the total number of responses in a domain and the mean number per respondent. The remaining columns report the number of respondents who selected the domain and the percent of respondents who selected one or more topics within a particular domain.

Subject matter domains may appear to correspond roughly with academic disciplines, but they are intended to reflect topical areas on which scholars may do research and publish their findings. Particularly in a field with an interdisciplinary tradition such as Japanese Studies, we would expect respondents to make selections from different domains, and in fact they do. The domains differ in the array of specializations listed and their specificity, which may have influenced the number of specializations selected within a domain, but should not have affected the number of respondents who made any selection at all within a domain. Based on the distribution of the percent of respondents who made any selections within a particular domain, we can view the domains as larger or smaller within the overall context of Japanese Studies. They therefore provide a rough snapshot of the relative dominance of particular subjects of study within Japanese Studies in 2012.

As in the past, the largest domain is History (40.4% of respondents), with Anthropology, Psychology and Sociology (33.2%) next, followed by Literature (26.7%) and Politics (22.8%). These percentages reflect substantial decreases for the two social science categories. Overall, respondents selected specializations in an average of 2.76 domains, further reinforcing the notion that these domains reflect areas of interest that frequently cross disciplinary lines. Literature had the highest mean number of selections, at 6.06, followed by Anthropology, Psychology, and Sociology at 5.75. In most other domains the mean number of selections ranged from two to four. This pattern indicates that while the number of specialists in the

Table 3.3. Domains of Subject Matter Specialization, by Number of Responses and Number and Percent of Respondents, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	1995				2005				2012			
	Responses		Respondents		Responses		Respondents		Responses		Respondents	
Domain	#	Mean	#	%	#	Mean	#	%	#	Mean	#	%
Anthropology, Psych., Soc.	2,444	3.97	615	40.8	2,174	5.10	426	37.4	2,633	5.75	458	33.2
Art, Art History	846	3.14	269	17.9	824	3.78	218	19.1	1,049	4.18	251	18.2
Business and Economics	1,518	3.42	444	29.5	684	3.29	208	18.2	637	3.37	189	13.7
Communication, Library Science	434	1.90	229	15.2	274	2.03	135	11.9	337	2.13	158	11.4
Education	579	2.15	269	17.9	344	2.63	131	11.5	432	2.79	155	11.2
Geography, Environment	226	1.81	125	8.3	218	2.48	88	7.7	290	2.44	119	8.6
History	1,546	2.42	638	42.3	1,573	3.13	502	44.0	2,035	3.65	557	40.4
Language, Linguistics	829	2.74	303	20.1	503	3.16	159	13.9	842	3.63	232	16.8
Law	464	2.71	171	11.3	227	2.84	80	7.0	285	3.39	84	6.1
Literature	1,627	4.51	361	24.0	1,942	6.03	322	28.2	2,597	7.06	368	26.7
Music, Dance, Theatre Arts	625	3.08	203	13.5	501	3.71	135	11.8	655	4.12	159	11.5
Philosophy	407	2.05	199	13.2	275	2.29	120	10.5	372	2.62	142	10.3
Politics	1,404	3.15	446	29.6	1,118	3.80	294	25.8	1,222	3.89	314	22.8
Religion	1,094	3.27	335	22.2	906	4.06	223	19.6	1,107	4.29	258	18.7
Science and Technology	416	2.14	194	12.9	232	2.11	110	9.6	267	2.01	133	9.6
Total*	14,459	9.59	1,507		12,249	10.74	1,140		14,738	10.7	1,380	

* Data for 1995 from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 4.6, Ch. 4, p. 80. Data were not available for 45 respondents. For 2005, reported for both years in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 3.3, p. 45. Data were not available for 17 respondents. Mean number of responses calculated by dividing the number of responses in each category by the number of respondents for that category. Percent of respondents is calculated for each category against the total number of respondents. The count of respondents is unduplicated within each category, but respondents selected items in an average of 3.19 categories in 1995, 2.76 categories in 2005, and 2.7 categories in 2012.

actual disciplines of anthropology, psychology, and sociology is not large enough to account for its high ranking, topics within this general social domain are often selected by persons in other disciplines.

The most striking finding at the domain level is the continuing sharp reduction in the percent of respondents selecting specializations in the domain of Business and Economics, which has dropped from 29.5 percent in 1995 to 13.7 percent in 2012 and is now less than half the scale it was during the heyday of the economic competition paradigm. The decrease in the smaller Law domain is of roughly the same magnitude, as it has gone from 11.3% of respondents in 1995 to 6.1% in 2012. In both of these cases, the decline is due to the absence in the study of people who were included previously, either because they no longer work on Japan or because they are now outside the range of our collection methods. Most other fields have stayed roughly at the level they were in 2005, with small fluctuations. These results correlate well with our general findings about the shift in the composition of Japanese Studies since the 1995 study.

Comparison of the individual subject matter specializations within these general domains reveals more subtle shifts in topic that suggest current trends in the field. These findings are too detailed for a table, so we present only the highlights. Within the large domain of Anthropology, Psychology and Sociology, the subject matter specializations of cultural and social change, comparative and cross cultural studies, gender, sex roles, and women, and popular culture remain the most commonly selected specializations. The categories of cultural studies and material culture have grown rapidly. There is substantial interest in a more differentiated approach to Japanese society that examines particular sub-groups and subcultures, which we have linked to the rise of the cultural studies paradigm. In the domain of communication, information, and library science, mass media and film studies remained the most frequently selected categories.

By contrast, the decrease in the Business and Economics domain continues across the board. The small domain of law also declined across the board, as did Science and Technology. In the large domain of history the standard categories remain strong, but there were increases in women's history, local and regional history, colonial history, and historiography. Most subject matter specializations in the small domain of language and linguistics were stable or decreased, except for an increase in rhetoric, discourse analysis, and pragmatics. In the domain of literature, the most common specializations were modern fiction, fiction in general, comparative literature, and literary translation. However, there were increases in specialization in popular fiction, historical fiction, literary theory, feminist theory and criticism, women's literature, and oral narrative and performance, all of which reflect the influence of the cultural studies paradigm. In the domain of Religion there were decreases across the board, except in the very small categories of monastic institutions, shamanism, and Jishu Buddhism.

Overall, what can be discerned from these many small shifts is an increased focus on the kinds of specializations that are associated with cultural studies, which are found scattered across several domains. These include greater interest in subcultures and minorities, in local and regional variations, in discourse analysis, in literary and feminist theory, and in various forms of popular culture that are also registered in literature, performing arts, and religion. Just as significant are the decreases in many more standard areas of specialization found in the various domains. And while the evidence just from analysis of subject matter specializations is not overwhelming, we will see that it resonates with evidence in other parts of the data as part of an emerging picture of a paradigm shift away from economic competition and toward cultural studies.

Language Competence

Regardless of their areas of special interest and expertise, most Japan specialists need a fairly high level of Japanese language competence in order to claim and exercise that expertise. It is difficult to measure language competence in a survey instrument, since one can only ask respondents to assess their own level of competence. For the 1989 and 1995 directories, respondents were asked to list the languages they knew, and just the names of these languages were printed in the directory, with no indication of the level of ability. For the 2005 directory study, The Japan Foundation wanted to know more specifically whether respondents could participate in an academic conference in certain languages. We adapted that into a question asking respondents to list up to four languages in which they had "working competence," defined as sufficient listening and speaking ability to participate in an academic conference, and sufficient reading ability to conduct research. These self-assessments were published in the directory entries.

However, the survey portion of the studies in 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012 also asked a set of more specific questions about the respondent's Japanese language competence. All three studies asked respondents to rate their Japanese language ability in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, using a scale ranging from "no usable proficiency" to "native proficiency." In 1984 the scale jumped from "Limited Scholarly Needs" to "Scholarship with Ease." From 1995 a new category of "Adequate for Scholarship" was added in between these two to reflect better the gradations in Japanese language ability for non-native Japan specialists. Table 3.4 shows the results for these self-report measures for the four time periods. In each case we show the percent of respondents choosing each category, plus a cumulative percentage figure, which makes it easier to see how language skills have changed over time.

The data demonstrate steady increases in Japanese language competence since these skills were first measured in 1984. The percentage whose listening skills are inadequate for more than limited scholarly needs has decreased from over 40 percent of the sample in 1984 to a quarter of the sample, while the percentage whose speaking ability in Japanese is inadequate for more than limited scholarly needs has decreased similarly. The increase in reading skills is even more impressive: from over a third whose reading ability was inadequate for more than limited scholarly needs in 1984 to only a fifth with such limited reading ability now. Writing in Japanese remains the weakest skill, but even here there has been substantial progress. In 1984 nearly two-thirds of the sample reported that their ability to write in Japanese was inadequate for more than limited scholarly needs, but that percentage has dropped to less than half. At the same time, the percentage reporting native proficiency is under a quarter of the sample: hence the increases are accounted for by specialists who have achieved levels of proficiency in Japanese as a second language that are either adequate for scholarship or permit scholarship with ease.

The importance of particular Japanese language skills may vary with an individual's discipline and area of specialization, so since 1995 we have also asked respondents to rank the importance of each language skill for their work, using a simple three point scale ranging from "not necessary" through "useful" to "indispensable." Table 3.5 compares reported language ability in the four skills and the respondent's assessment of its importance, by age, for 1995, 2005, and 2012. The table shows both the number of respondents in each category and the mean value for all respondents in that category. Mean scores on importance can range from 0 to 2, while mean scores on language ability can range from 0 to 5.

Although the changes are not dramatic, there is a fairly consistent increase in the mean perception of the importance of each of the language skills in the younger age groups, and a

Table 3.4. Specialists' Japanese Language Competence by Language Skill, 1984, 1995, and 2005*

Language Skill and Competence Level	1984		1995		2005		2012	
	%	Cum %	%	Cum %	%	Cum %	%	Cum %
Listening								
No Usable Proficiency	10	10	8.9	8.9	5.8	5.8	6.5	6.5
Adequate for Daily Needs	14	24	15.4	24.4	10.2	15.9	9.3	15.8
Limited Scholarly Needs	19	43	12.2	36.5	9.2	25.1	9.3	25.1
Adequate for Scholarship	–	–	19.0	55.5	26.5	51.5	24.4	49.6
Scholarship with Ease	28	71	20.4	75.9	27.2	78.8	25.5	75.1
Native Proficiency	29	100	24.1	100.0	21.2	100.0	24.9	100.0
N	789		1,010		798		835	
Speaking								
No Usable Proficiency	9	9	9.5	9.5	6.2	6.2	6.8	6.8
Adequate for Daily Needs	16	25	15.6	25.1	10.5	16.7	10.3	17.2
Limited Scholarly Needs	21	46	13.5	38.6	11.6	28.2	10.4	27.6
Adequate for Scholarship	–	–	20.9	59.5	28.4	56.6	28.9	56.5
Scholarship with Ease	27	73	17.7	77.2	23.3	79.9	19.7	76.2
Native Proficiency	27	100	22.8	100.0	20.1	100.0	23.8	100.0
N	813		1,010		798		833	
Reading								
No Usable Proficiency	12	12	16.4	16.4	7.1	7.1	8.1	8.1
Adequate for Daily Needs	6	18	7.8	24.2	4.7	11.8	5.1	13.1
Limited Scholarly Needs	19	37	9.8	34.1	9.9	21.7	8.9	22.0
Adequate for Scholarship	–	–	24.6	77.2	23.7	45.5	23.1	45.1
Scholarship with Ease	37	74	24.6	77.2	34.9	80.4	30.7	75.8
Native Proficiency	26	100	22.8	100.0	19.6	100.0	24.2	100.0
N	805		1,007		798		831	
Writing								
No Usable Proficiency	22	22	24.6	24.6	14.9	14.9	14.9	14.9
Adequate for Daily Needs	22	44	18.7	43.3	16.8	31.7	14.2	29.2
Limited Scholarly Needs	20	64	16.6	59.9	17.2	48.9	17.0	46.2
Adequate for Scholarship	–	–	14.2	74.0	25.7	74.7	23.3	69.5
Scholarship with Ease	13	77	6.3	80.3	9.2	83.9	10.3	79.8
Native Proficiency	23	100	19.7	100.0	16.1	100.0	20.2	100.0
N	797		989		798		823	

*1984 data from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table 21, p. 40. 1995 data from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 4.9, Ch. 4, p. 86. All reported in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*, table 3.4, p. 48.

Table 3.5. Language Competence and Perception of its Importance, by Language Skill and Age, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	1995				2005				2012			
	Importance		Ability		Importance		Ability		Importance		Ability	
Competence Levels	Mean	#	Mean	#	Mean	#	Mean	#	Mean	#	Mean	#
Listening												
<35	1.71	38	3.83	36	1.79	73	3.62	73	1.61	38	3.32	37
35–44	1.66	211	3.47	210	1.67	173	3.49	169	1.62	203	3.59	203
45–54	1.51	314	2.94	323	1.66	178	3.36	179	1.60	198	3.54	196
55–64	1.38	217	2.84	224	1.52	166	2.73	168	1.65	202	3.19	205
>64	1.35	189	2.55	204	1.56	89	2.84	91	1.45	193	2.77	194
Total	1.49	969	2.99	997	1.64	707	3.23	709	1.58	834	3.28	835
Speaking												
<35	1.59	39	3.67	36	1.62	73	3.51	73	1.39	38	3.14	37
35–44	1.60	211	3.33	210	1.57	173	3.38	169	1.53	202	3.46	203
45–54	1.43	314	2.83	322	1.61	178	3.21	179	1.46	197	3.39	196
55–64	1.28	213	2.76	226	1.34	167	2.63	168	1.53	200	3.06	205
>64	1.29	189	2.53	204	1.39	88	2.79	90	1.33	190	2.69	192
Total	1.41	976	2.90	998	1.51	706	3.12	708	1.46	827	3.16	833
Reading (Modern)												
<35	1.79	38	3.69	36	1.82	73	3.58	73	1.84	37	3.49	37
35–44	1.77	211	3.45	210	1.82	173	3.56	170	1.76	202	3.67	203
45–54	1.59	312	2.92	324	1.75	178	3.43	178	1.72	195	3.57	196
55–64	1.45	214	2.76	223	1.51	168	2.93	166	1.74	202	3.32	204
>64	1.41	192	2.57	202	1.59	90	2.98	88	1.53	192	2.84	191
Total	1.57	967	2.96	985	1.70	710	3.34	704		828	3.36	831
Writing												
<35	1.29	38	2.18	36	1.26	73	2.86	73	1.14	37	2.86	37
35–44	1.20	209	2.62	209	1.18	173	2.72	170	1.25	199	3.01	202
45–54	0.99	311	2.07	324	1.15	178	2.60	176	1.15	195	2.80	196
55–64	0.87	207	2.05	218	0.92	165	1.86	166	1.18	196	2.51	202
>64	0.82	180	1.81	190	0.85	89	2.01	87	0.93	185	2.01	186
Total	1.00	945	2.18	977	1.09	706	2.46	703		812	2.60	823

* Perception of Importance is measured on a 3-point scale: 0 = not necessary; 1 = useful; 2 = indispensable. The mean falls between 0 and 2.0. Language competence is measured on a 6-point scale: 0 = no usable competence; 1 = adequate for daily needs but not for research; 2 = sufficient for limited scholarly needs; 3 = meets research needs adequately; 4 = meets research needs with ease; 5 = native proficiency. The mean falls between 0 and 5.0. Data for 1995 from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 4.10, ch. 4, p. 88. These data were included in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 3.5, p. 49. For 2005, 29 persons for whom age could not be calculated are omitted from the age categories but included in the totals.

corresponding increase in mean levels of competence in the corresponding skills. In short, younger scholars accord greater importance to all of the language skills, and also believe they have achieved higher levels of competence in those skills. It must be emphasized, however, that lower mean levels of language skill in the older age groups does not reflect uniformly lower levels of ability. Rather, the older age groups simply have a higher proportion of individuals with lower levels of language skill, which brings the means down.

When we do the comparison by faculty status, as in Table 3.6, the means for both perception of the importance of Japanese language ability and actual skill levels in Japanese have increased for all three categories: faculty, non-faculty, and retired persons, since 1995. This shift suggests that the relatively greater loss of the "bubble factor" in 1995 is contributing to the increases in mean levels across the board. That is to say, the participants in the 2005 and 2012 studies, and the survey portion in particular, are more likely to be committed Japan specialists, whether they are current faculty, non-faculty, or retired. However, it is also clear that faculty have both the highest perception of the importance of language skills and the highest actual reported abilities.

Table 3.6. Language Competence and Perception of Its Importance, by Language Skill and Current Employment Status, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	1995				2005				2012			
Employment Status and Language Skills	Importance		Ability		Importance		Ability		Importance		Ability	
	Mean	#	Mean	#	Mean	#	Mean	#	Mean	#	Mean	#
Listening												
Faculty	1.56	671	3.12	685	1.65	557	3.24	557	1.62	684	3.35	686
Retired	1.42	89	2.72	96	1.61	31	2.96	23	1.49	75	3.01	72
Not Faculty	1.33	223	2.70	229	1.57	119	3.21	129	1.37	137	3.03	137
Total	1.49	983	2.99	1,010	1.64	707	3.23	709	1.57	896	3.27	895
Speaking												
Faculty	1.48	667	3.03	685	1.54	557	3.15	556	1.50	678	3.24	685
Retired	1.34	90	2.67	97	1.45	29	2.83	23	1.37	73	2.96	71
Not Faculty	1.24	222	2.90	228	1.41	120	3.08	129	1.25	137	2.83	137
Total	1.41	979	2.90	1,010	1.51	706	3.12	709	1.45	888	3.16	893
Reading												
Faculty	1.65	669	3.16	680	1.74	560	3.42	553	1.73	677	3.48	683
Retired	1.57	89	2.79	97	1.63	30	3.09	22	1.68	76	3.25	71
Not Faculty	1.32	222	2.43	230	1.56	120	3.03	129	1.48	137	2.89	138
Total	1.57	980	2.96	1,007	1.70	710	3.34	704	1.68	890	3.37	892
Writing												
Faculty	1.05	655	2.34	670	1.10	556	2.49	552	1.18	666	2.71	677
Retired	0.98	82	2.09	94	1.03	30	2.22	23	0.97	72	2.41	69
Not Faculty	0.85	221	1.73	225	1.06	120	2.36	128	1.01	134	2.31	137
Total	1.00	958	2.18	989	1.09	706	2.46	703	1.14	872	2.63	883

* Data for 1995 from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s*, Table 4.11, ch. 4, p.90. 2005 data along with 1995 data reported in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 3.6, p. 50.

Table 3.7. Language Competence and Perception of Its Importance, by Language Skill and Disciplinary Category, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

Disciplinary Categories and Four Language Skills	1995				2005				2012			
	Importance		Ability		Importance		Ability		Importance		Ability	
	Mean	(#)	Mean	(#)	Mean	(#)	Mean	(#)	Mean	(#)	Mean	(#)
Listening												
Language & Linguistics	1.90	69	4.29	68	1.93	45	4.36	44	1.51	182	3.14	185
Humanities	1.53	395	3.20	399	1.67	361	3.30	359	1.59	419	3.23	417
Social Sciences	1.53	291	2.94	305	1.59	167	2.87	170	1.88	74	4.43	75
Professions	1.25	133	2.39	136	1.55	49	2.94	51	1.49	68	3.15	68
Interdisciplinary	1.30	50	2.21	53	1.53	49	3.47	47	1.71	62	3.50	60
Arts	1.19	26	2.18	28	1.44	27	2.68	28	1.46	39	2.87	38
Total	1.49	964	3.00	989	1.64	701	3.22	702	1.59	852	3.31	851
Speaking												
Language & Linguistics	1.87	70	4.25	68	1.89	45	4.32	44	1.37	180	2.99	183
Humanities	1.45	395	3.10	399	1.57	361	3.19	359	1.47	414	3.12	417
Social Sciences	1.45	285	2.85	307	1.43	166	2.75	170	1.86	74	4.37	75
Professions	1.18	50	2.04	52	1.33	49	2.90	50	1.31	67	2.97	68
Interdisciplinary	1.18	50	2.04	52	1.39	49	3.28	47	1.61	62	3.32	60
Arts	1.04	26	2.18	28	1.37	27	2.68	28	1.28	39	2.74	38
Total	1.41	960	2.91	989	1.51	700	3.12	701	1.47	844	3.19	849
Reading												
Language & Linguistics	1.91	69	4.27	67	1.89	45	4.30	44	1.49	179	2.99	183
Humanities	1.76	395	3.37	403	1.82	364	3.58	358	1.82	417	3.54	418
Social Sciences	1.51	290	2.80	303	1.54	167	2.80	168	1.86	74	4.32	75
Professions	1.21	132	2.13	134	1.45	49	2.71	49	1.40	67	2.93	67
Interdisciplinary	1.14	49	1.77	53	1.59	49	3.57	47	1.81	62	3.68	60
Arts	1.07	26	2.07	27	1.44	27	2.54	28	1.38	39	2.54	37
Total	1.57	961	2.96	987	1.70	704	3.33	697	1.69	846	3.40	848
Writing												
Language & Linguistics	1.71	68	3.90	67	1.69	45	3.95	44	1.03	175	2.38	178
Humanities	1.03	385	2.29	392	1.11	361	2.47	355	1.10	406	2.52	414
Social Sciences	0.95	280	2.12	298	0.96	167	2.04	169	1.72	75	4.09	75
Professions	0.83	130	1.66	134	0.96	48	2.31	49	1.05	66	2.48	67
Interdisciplinary	0.66	50	1.18	51	1.06	49	2.75	48	1.25	60	2.95	60
Arts	0.62	26	1.55	27	1.00	27	1.96	28	0.97	38	2.11	37
Total	0.99	939	2.18	969	1.09	700	2.45	696	1.14	828	2.64	839

* Data for 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States, The 1990s,* Table 4.12, ch. 4, p. 91. Included in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 3.7, p. 51.

Although there are the expected variations in both perceptions of importance and actual skill levels between the disciplinary categories, it is also apparent that both perception of importance and actual skill levels have increased in virtually every category. The most remarkable increases are in the weakest skill category of writing Japanese. This may well be a function of the greater availability of Japanese language capability in standard word-processing software, which makes it much easier for non-natives to produce written Japanese based on their speaking and reading ability rather than on their ability to write Japanese characters by hand, from memory. In 2012, the highest levels of language competence are reported by social scientists. The category is small (75) and appears to contain a relatively high percentage of native speakers, which may have skewed the results.

Overall, our findings on language competence are encouraging. We find higher language skills more or less across the board, reflecting the greater language abilities of the younger age cohorts. Moreover, there is a correspondingly higher evaluation of the importance of Japanese language ability which also can be found pretty much across the board. Higher language levels reflect stronger language training and greater exposure to Japan, but they still require constant maintenance for all but native speakers. We therefore are interested in how Japan specialists maintain and enhance their language skills.

Language Learning and Maintenance

A total of 822 persons answered the survey question asking how they had learned Japanese. This was a multiple response variable and respondents gave an average of 1.8 responses. Only 2.2 percent reported that they did not know Japanese, while 19.8 percent said they were native speakers and 4.6 percent had learned Japanese as children. Two-thirds had learned Japanese through formal instruction outside of Japan, a slight decrease from 2005. In addition, half said they had learned through formal instruction in Japan, about the same as in 2005. However, nearly a quarter said they had taught themselves in Japan, while 17.4% had taught themselves outside of Japan, the same as in 2005.

A slightly smaller number, 807, answered a survey question asking how they maintained their Japanese language skills. This question had more categories, and respondents selected an average of 3.1 responses. About a third of the respondents said they use Japanese at work, and a quarter say they use it frequently in Japan. About half as many reported that they use it at home (18.7%) or in leisure activities (16.4%). Ten percent use Japanese on the Internet. Sixty percent of respondents maintain their Japanese by reading for research purposes. However, over one-third keep up by watching TV or movies (37.8%) and a nearly identical number read but not for research purposes (37.4%). Nearly a third (31.1%) keep up by using Japanese on the Internet. A relatively small percentage of respondents report barriers to maintaining their Japanese: they do not have good opportunities to do so (13.4%) or they do not have the time to make use of available opportunities (10.5%).

Language skills have risen substantially among younger Japan specialists, As language skills rise and opportunities to use Japanese in daily life expand, the process of language maintenance becomes self-reinforcing. Overall, it appears that Japan specialists today are likely to have regular opportunities to maintain their Japanese and the primary barrier is the lack of time to do so, if the opportunities are not already incorporated into their daily lives.

Academic Credentials

In addition to language skills, most of the participants in our study of Japan specialists in the United States have academic credentials that attest to their professional status. However,

they do not necessarily hold a doctorate. For some professional fields in Japanese Studies another professional degree is the appropriate credential. Our data on academic credentials are taken from the information respondents report for their directory entries. They are asked to report all academic degrees, with the year of receipt, the field, and the institution. To use the data for this analysis, we identify all candidates with one or more doctorates. We also identify a variety of professional degrees, such as JD or other post-graduate law degree, MBA, MD, MFA, and post-graduate library degrees, counting only one instance of each degree per candidate even though a substantial number of respondents have double degrees. For this analysis we have only counted the MA if the respondent does not have any of these other higher degrees, and in many cases the MA is a specialized professional credential, such as a Master's in International Relations for someone in government service. The results are shown in Table 3.8, which compares the findings for 2012 with data from previous studies that used similar criteria.

The percentage of PhDs has increased to its highest level ever, at 87.1 percent. One reason for the increase is that in the present sample, many of the respondents with professional degrees such as an MBA, one or more law degrees, a library credential, or an M.D., also had a PhD. Than in turn reflects the increasingly academic nature of the sample and the rising demand for academic credentials in order to teach in professional fields in academic institutions. It is also noteworthy that the percentage of persons at the "All But Dissertation" stage is at its lowest level ever. The percentage of respondents whose highest degree is an MA has also dropped considerably, and they were often in fields where this was the most appropriate credential such as journalism, diplomacy, and some areas of academic support.

Table 3.9 compares Japan specialists with doctorates and those with other professional degrees (including those for whom the MA is the appropriate terminal degree) on several dimensions. Among those with a PhD, 82 percent currently hold faculty positions, 9 percent hold non-faculty positions, and 8.5 percent are retired. Only a quarter of those who hold another advanced terminal degree other than an MA, or for whom the MA is the appropriate terminal

Table 3.8. Percent Distribution of Highest Degree Earned by Japan Specialists, 1970, 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

Highest Degree	1970 %	1984 %	1995 %	2005 %	2012 %
PhD	79.9	81.0	77.4	81.2	87.1
ABD	10.8	7.0	1.8	1.2	0.7
MA**	7.0	9.0	11.1	11.4	6.2
JD or other Law Degree	0.7	–	6.5	2.2	2.5
MBA (Business)	0.0	–	2.9	1.1	1.2
MLS or Library Science	–	–	2.5	2.4	3.2
MD (Medical degree)	0.2	–	0.5	0.4	0.3
MFA (Master of Fine Arts)	–	–	1.3	1.2	–
BA, unknown, other	1.4	–	3.9	4.5	2.1

* Data for 1970, 1984, and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 4.13, ch. 4, p. 95. 1970 data from 1970 SSRC-ACLS Report, calculated from supplemental roster of specialists. 1984 data from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table 2, p. 14. All figures previously reported along with the 2005 data in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 3.8.

** Figures for MAs are for persons with no other advanced degree, but ll other degrees are reported in total, and there is some overlap between them.

Table 3.9. Comparison of Specialists with Doctorates and Specialists with Professional Degrees, by Employment Status, Gender, and Language Competence, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	1995				2005				2012			
	Doctorate		Professional		Doctorate		Professional		Doctorate		Professional	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
A. Employment												
Faculty	875	77.2	97	41.5	871	84.0	61	49.2	984	82.3	26	24.1
Not Faculty	143	12.6	114	48.7	130	12.5	60	48.4	109	9.1	73	67.6
Retired	115	10.2	23	9.8	36	3.5	3	2.4	102	8.5	9	8.3
Total	1,133	100.0	234	100.0	1,037	100.0	124	100.0	1,195	99.9	108	100.0
B. Gender												
Male	833	73.5	185	79.1	679	65.5	85	68.5	743	62.2	51	47.2
Female	300	26.5	49	20.9	358	34.5	39	31.5	451	37.8	57	52.8
Total	1,133	100.0	234	100.0	1,037	100.0	124	100.0	1,194	100.0	108	100.0
C. Language Competence												
Scholarly Use	455	60.9	71	47.7	345	67.8	11	61.1	514	71.6	32	50.8
Not Scholarly Use	237	31.7	55	36.9	140	27.5	6	33.3	90	12.5	12	19.0
None	55	7.4	23	15.4	24	4.7	2	5.6	116	16.2	19	30.2
Total	747	100.0	149	100.0	509	100.0	39	100.0	718	100.3	63	100.0

* Data for 1995 and 2005 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*, Table 3.9 p.54. Sample size is reduced for the language analysis because the scale is based on survey data that are available for a smaller number of respondents.

credential, are faculty, two-thirds hold non-faculty positions. The percentage retired or unemployed is the same as for faculty, at 8.3 percent.

The gender balance has also improved both for those with doctorates and those with other degrees, where now more than a third of faculty members in the sample are female, along with half of non-faculty. There has also been substantial improvement in the Japanese language skills of both groups. Just over 70 percent of those with doctorates have Japanese language capabilities for scholarly use, while half of those with professional degrees also had strong Japanese language skills. However, the number of persons reporting no Japanese ability has jumped for both categories, although the sample size for the professional category is quite small.

For those with a doctorate, four studies in 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012 have asked whether the dissertation was wholly or partly on Japan, or not on Japan. The percentage distributions are shown in Table 3.10 for each study by the major disciplinary categories, although the 1984 study reported a slightly different residual category. The clear overall trend is toward a higher percentage of dissertations wholly on Japan, and a much smaller percentage in the main disciplinary grouping with dissertations that were not on Japan at all. Even in the social sciences, where there is often pressure not to do dissertation research wholly on Japan, two-thirds of social scientists in the 2012 study reported that their doctoral dissertations were wholly on

Table 3.10. Relation of Doctoral Dissertation to Japan (in %), 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	Wholly on Japan (%)	Partly on Japan (%)	Not on Japan (%)	N
1984 Study				
History	70	20	10	(173)
Language & Literature	54	25	21	(178)
Arts	46	11	43	(56)
Social Sciences	54	24	22	(272)
Total Sample	58	22	21	(679)
1995 Study				
History	68.7	22.7	8.6	163
Language & Literature	62.3	27.3	10.4	209
Social Sciences	50.4	20.9	28.7	230
Other	40.0	18.9	41.1	190
Total Sample	54.4	22.2	23.4	(737)
2005 Study				
History	79.0	16.8	4.2	(143)
Language & Literature	75.0	14.6	10.4	(96)
Social Sciences	66.0	24.7	9.3	(97)
Other	55.2	18.3	26.5	(230)
Total Sample	66.4	18.4	15.2	(566)
2012 Study				
History	76.3	15.6	8.1	135
Language & Literature	74.3	16.2	9.6	136
Social Sciences	65.0	17.5	17.5	120
Other	52.1	26.1	21.8	238
Total Sample	64.5	20.0	15.4	629

* Data for 1984 and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 4.15, ch. 4, p. 98. 1984 data from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table 5, p. 18. We are unable to reconstruct exactly the same categories used for the 1984 study, but categories except "arts" and "other" should be equivalent. All earlier data was reported in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 3.10, p. 56. For 1995, 2005, and 2012, only persons who responded to the survey question and who had completed a doctoral dissertation are included in the calculations.

Japan. Half of respondents in the "Other" category also wrote a dissertation wholly on Japan. This suggests an very strong focus on Japan, which reinforces the earlier finding that the majority of Japan specialists do not claim expertise on other countries in relation to Japan, though interest is rising.

Table 3.11 compares the data from 1995, 2005, and 2012 on several additional variables, all of which reflect this general trend. The tendency for dissertations to be wholly on Japan is strong in all age groups, but higher in the younger age cohorts. The focus on Japan is greater for women than for men, but is substantial for both genders. The focus on Japan is strong for academics, but the non-academic category is too small to evaluate.

Table 3.11. Japan As Subject of Doctoral Dissertation, by Age, Gender, Academic Status and Language Competence, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	1995				2005				2012			
	% All on Japan	% Partly Japan	% Not on Japan	Total # Cases	% All on Japan	% Partly Japan	% Not on Japan	Total # Cases	% All on Japan	% Partly Japan	% Not on Japan	Total # Cases
A. Age												
35 or Under	44.4	50.0	5.6	18	67.3	29.1	3.6	55	70.8	29.2	0.0	24
35–44	58.6	27.8	13.6	169	77.1	16.4	6.4	140	73.3	18.7	8.0	150
45–54	57.9	22.6	19.6	235	67.6	19.0	13.4	142	68.3	19.3	12.4	145
55–64	49.4	16.5	34.1	222	60.0	16.3	23.7	135	64.9	18.3	16.8	131
65 or Older	49.3	18.1	32.6	144	56.8	14.9	28.4	74	56.6	18.2	25.2	143
B. Gender												
Male	52.9	21.8	25.3	541	64.1	17.8	18.1	370	63.5	18.5	18.0	367
Female	58.4	22.8	18.8	197	73.3	18.5	8.2	184	70.2	20.0	9.8	225
C. Academic Status												
Academic	53.9	22.7	23.4	638	66.7	18.0	15.3	472	66.1	19.1	14.8	581
Non-Academic	57.0	18.0	25.0	100	66.2	22.1	11.7	77	33.3	33.3	33.3	3
D. Language Competence												
None	1.9	16.7	81.5	54	40.9	18.2	40.9	22	23.7	29.0	47.3	93
Not Scholarly	42.4	19.6	37.9	224	68.0	15.2	16.8	125	60.5	25.0	14.5	76
Scholarly Use	66.8	24.3	8.9	440	78.0	26.0	13.7	300	78.3	15.7	6.1	396

* Data for 1995 from *Japanese Studies in the United States, The 1990s,* Table 4.16, p. 99. Included with 2005 data in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 3.11, p. 57.

One somewhat surprising finding is that 60 percent of those who claim their Japanese is not adequate for scholarly use did a dissertation solely on Japan, along with nearly a quarter of the much smaller group that claims to have no Japanese language skill. Although this finding seems anomalous, it is conceivable for certain fields in which the relevant research materials are primarily either quantitative data or are available in English. Our summary measure of language competence for scholarly use also sets the bar quite high; it is possible that persons who rated their Japanese language skills as adequate for limited scholarly needs, or adequate for scholarly needs in only one or two of the four skills, would score on the summary measure as not having Japanese suitable for scholarly use, even though they did have sufficient Japanese to meet the limited requirements of their dissertation.

In 1995, our analysis of the areas of specialization of Japan specialists, their language competence, and their academic credentials pointed to a divide between those who had acquired their expertise on Japan through language, area, and disciplinary training acquired through formal academic study, as opposed to those who had acquired their expertise experientially or through different professional track and for whom Japan was not necessarily the sole focus of interest. That division has now largely disappeared, and the pool of people who are now identified as Japan specialists are more likely to have strong Japanese language skills and an academic focus that is wholly on Japan. While on the one hand this attests to the high level of expertise these Japan specialists have attained, it does leave the field open to the criticism that it is too narrow and tends to look at Japan in isolation. It is important to remember that those other people with their more diverse forms of expertise on Japan still exist; they are simply less likely to be identified, or to identify themselves, as "Japan specialists" today, and they are much less likely to be working in an academic setting.

Maintaining Expertise on Japan

Japan specialists need not only to maintain their language skills, but also their expertise about Japan, both for teaching and for research purposes. We need to know what sorts of materials Japan specialists use in order to keep up in their field, and how they get access to those materials. Our primary concern here is with the general maintenance of expertise, rather than with the highly specialized resources one might need in order to carry out a specific research project. In 1995, 2005, and 2012 we have asked a set of questions designed to explore this topic. In 1995 we asked about a range of different types of materials that might be used in various fields, including books, journals, government documents, technical reports, mass media, quantitative data, and visual materials. For each type, we asked whether the person needed to use English materials, materials that had been translated into English, or materials in Japanese. For 2005, we had to add several new categories to reflect the realities of the information age: online news reports, online discussions, and online journals. For 2012 we kept the same expanded list.

A total of 755 persons responded to this set of survey questions, which is somewhat more than the number responding to it in 2005. Virtually everyone reported that they need to read books (97.2%) and journals (94.2%) in English. Presumably this includes both academic materials in their discipline and the English language literature about Japan that they and their colleagues produce. Already, by the 1990s, the latter had grown so voluminous that it is no longer possible for most Japan specialists to keep up with it beyond the range of their own discipline and specific research interests. Around half of respondents reported that they also need to read books (53.6%) or journal articles (42.2%) that have been translated into English. For Japan specialists, however, this English language material is simply the beginning of what

is needed in order to keep up in one's field. More than three-quarters of respondents said that they need to read books (77.0%) and journals (69.4%) in Japanese in order to keep up. The majority of respondents also reported that they need to read newspapers and magazines in English (68.93%) or Japanese (57.0%) to keep up with their field. Over half use visual materials in English (55.9%), and only a slightly lower percentage (49.8%) use visual materials in Japanese. A clear indication of the rapid inroads made by online material is that well over half of the respondents (60.7%) reported that they need to read online news to keep up, while almost half (46.9%) read online news in Japanese. Similar percentages participate in online discussion groups in English (43.4%) or read online journals in English (56.7%) to keep up, although substantially smaller numbers use online discussion groups in Japanese (19.6%) or online journals in Japanese (32.8%) to keep up. Overall, the percentages seemed to be up slightly for all of the categories of Japanese materials.

While the overall figures are dramatic and impressive, the need for materials of various types varies by discipline. We present these data in Table 3.12, comparing the 1995 and 2005 findings with those from the current study for Japan specialists in the humanities and the social sciences.

Books and journals in English rank continue to rank at the top of the list for Japan specialists in both the humanities and the social sciences, but after that the divergence is striking. While books and journals in Japanese rank third and fourth for those in the humanities, in the social sciences newspapers and magazines in English rank third, followed by online news in English. In the social sciences, newspapers and magazines in Japanese, and books in Japanese come next in fifth and sixth place. In contrast, translated books, and newspapers and magazines in English, hold the fifth and sixth ranks for those in the humanities. Visual materials in English rank seventh for those in the humanities, while for social scientists, that place is held by government documents in English. There is nothing particularly odd about these differences, since they clearly reflect the places where the tools of the trade for these two disciplinary groups are most likely to be found.

The Japanese library community has been struggling for the past three decades to keep up with the expanding range of types of materials that Japan specialists need for their work beyond the basics of Japanese language books and journals. Various arrangements have been painstakingly created to provide better access to the sorts of specialized materials that social scientists need, and libraries are also trying to meet the growing demand for visual materials. Fortunately, new technologies are making it easier for Japan specialists to obtain some of these materials on their own, and are also helping libraries provide better access. We will examine these efforts in some detail later; the point to be reinforced here is that these needs for a broader array of resources in Japanese are now widespread within Japanese Studies. Quite obviously the increased need for materials in Japanese reflects the increased levels of Japanese language ability that we have found among Japan specialists.

Overall, these findings suggest that the current pool of Japan specialists not only have strong language skills and subject matter expertise, but that these two types of expertise are complementary and mutually reinforcing. We can now look briefly at how these specialized skills and expertise are utilized. Although the number of Japan specialists who responded to the survey portion of the questionnaire is considerably smaller than the number that completed the directory portion, the overwhelming majority of those survey respondents report that they are currently doing research on Japan. Those who said they are currently doing research were asked a series of more detailed questions about the nature of that research, while those who reported that they are not currently doing research skipped to a different part of

Table 3.12. What Japan Specialists Need to Read to Keep Up in their Fields, with Rank Order, by Material Type & Language, for Humanities and Social Sciences*

Material Type and Language	1995				2005				2012			
	Humanities		Social Sciences		Humanities		Social Sciences		Humanities		Social Sciences	
	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
Books												
English	94.8	1	92.9	1	99.4	1	98.7	1	77.3	1	67.6	1
Translated	67.8	5	50.2	5	66.0	5	47.2	13	51.3	5	28.4	
Japanese	80.3	3	54.7	4	82.2	3	61.0	6	64.2	3	43.7	6
Journal Articles												
English	90.9	2	90.4	2	96.3	2	96.2	2	75.3	2	64.0	2
Translated	55.3	6	39.2	9	52.1	9	39.0	16	38.0	12	22.5	
Japanese	74.0	4	49.8	6	77.3	4	56.6	8	61.8	4	39.2	9
Government Documents												
English	13.3		39.2	9	16.6		59.1	7	13.7		40.5	7
Translated	7.9		24.8		8.0		25.8	21	5.6		14.4	
Japanese	13.5		29.9	12	17.2		56.0	9	15.0		35.6	12
Technical Reports												
English	11.8		28.3	14	5.5		27.7	20	4.1		22.1	
Translated	6.9		12.9		2.8		12.6		1.9		6.8	
Japanese	10.3		22.5		3.7		22.0		3.6		17.1	
Newspapers, Magazines												
English	50.6	7	69.1	3	62.6	6	87.4	3	48.5	6	53.6	3
Translated	24.3		28.9	13	21.8		30.2	19	16.5		16.7	
Japanese	43.2	8	45.7	8	52.8	8	62.9	5	39.9	10	45.0	5
Quantitative Data												
English	22.1		46.0	7	11.3		52.2	10	6.2		36.0	11
Translated	12.3		21.9		4.6		17.6		2.4		10.8	
Japanese	19.7		35.7	11	9.2		40.9	15	5.8		27.9	
Visual Materials												
English	22.1		19.3		54.9	7	43.4	14	45.7	7	30.2	
Translated	12.0		6.8		23.9		16.4		18.0		6.8	
Japanese	18.4		14.5		51.5	10	32.1	18	41.8	9	27.0	
Online News												
English	–		–		47.5	11	73.0	4	39.7	11	52.0	4
Translated	–		–		15.3		25.2	22	13.7		12.2	
Japanese	–		–		36.8	14	49.7	11	28.8	14	40.1	8
Online Discussion												
English	–		–		42.3	13	37.7	17	32.2	13	31.5	
Translated	–		–		4.9		5.0		4.5		4.5	
Japanese	–		–		13.5		12.6		10.9		13.5	
Online Journal												
English	–		–		44.2	12	49.1	12	44.0	8	38.7	10
Translated	–		–		11.3		10.7		12.2		7.2	
Japanese	–		–		23.3		22.6		24.9		19.8	
# Respondents	407		311		326		159		466		222	

* Data for 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 5.11, chapter 5, p. 123. Ranks only given for categories with at least 25 percent response. Reproduced with 1005 data in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 3.13, p.60.

the survey. Consequently, although the sample size is smaller for this part of the survey, all the respondents are actively doing research. Respondents were asked whether the purpose of their research was academic publication, preparation for teaching, or for their non-academic work. The overwhelming majority (86.3%) say their research is intended for publication. Less than half (43.8%) say they do research to prepare for teaching, but the categories overlap substantially. Nearly 10 percent say they do research as part of their non-academic professional work.

Another way of distinguishing types of research is whether it is classified as basic or applied. Just over half of those doing research report that they do basic research on intellectual questions, while about a fifth say that they do applied research with practical applications. Over a third said they do primary research using original Japanese sources or data, and a third say they do primary research using original English sources. Nearly half say they do secondary research based on the research literature in Japanese and forty percent say they do secondary research based on the research literature in English. These categories often overlap, and more than 20 percent of researchers say they do all four. The strong overlap reflects the fact that Japan specialists in the United States are not simply using certain Japanese materials for their research, but are also incorporating both the Japanese language and English language scholarship that is relevant to their work.

A related issue is how Japan specialists obtain the materials they need for their research. This question was also asked in 1995 and 2005, so we are able to compare responses for the two major disciplinary groups in the current study, those in humanities and the social sciences, as shown in Table 3.13. As in the past, most Japan specialists report using materials from their

Table 3.13. Research Sources Japan Specialists Utilize, by Discipline Group, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	1995		2005			2012		
Research Sources	Humanities %	Social Sciences %	Humanities %	Social Sciences %	Total %	Humanities %	Social Sciences %	Total %
Personal Collection	88.6	77.9	93.6	86.6	90.2	91.2	78.9	85.1
Institution's Collection	71.4	71.5	78.1	76.4	78.9	79.5	74.6	68.3
Other Institution Collection	78.4	52.2	88.9	65.4	78.7	88.6	69.3	79.6
Government Materials	18.4	34.7	26.6	60.6	34.9	28.4	67.5	37.9
Private Collections	17.1	13.9	25.6	23.6	25.7	25.9	21.1	24.0
Data from Collaborator	5.2	14.6	4.4	22.8	12.9	5.4	23.7	12.2
Data Collected by Respondent	24.4	62.8	30.3	73.2	48.2	25.2	74.6	43.0
Private/Comm. Databases	2.9	10.6	9.4	19.7	13.3	10.7	14.9	13.2
Internet Resources	–	–	32.7	55.9	43.3	44.4	59.6	51.3
ILL/Document Delivery	–	–	40.7	33.1	37.3	52.4	29.8	42.4
Ordered Online	–	–	17.2	17.3	19.0	18.0	13.2	18.1
# Respondents	385	274	297	127	541	317	114	597

* Questions are independent, so percentage totals exceed 100%. Data for 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 6.15, Chapter 6, p. 149. Data reproduced and 2005 data included in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 4.15, p. 85.

own personal collection, but to a slightly lesser extent than in previous studies. Two-thirds of respondents now report that they use materials from their institution's collection, down from three-quarters in 2005. Four out of five also report using materials from the collections of other institutions, with humanities scholars as heavier users than social scientists. By contrast, social scientists are more than twice as likely to use government documents. About a quarter of Japan specialists obtain research materials from private collections. data Social scientists are more likely than humanities scholars to obtain data from collaborators, but the level is quite low. Three quarters of social scientists still collect their own data through interviews and observational methods, compared to only a quarter of humanities scholars.

We added three new response alternatives in 2005 to reflect the increased availability of research resources from online sources. Half of all respondents now report obtaining data research data from the Internet, with social scientists more likely to use such sources. Interlibrary loan and document delivery also are now used by about 40 percent of the sample as a source of research materials, but not surprisingly, this is used more by scholars in the humanities. Less than 20 percent of Japan specialists now order needed research materials themselves online. It is significant that while very high percentages of Japan specialists use research materials in their own private collection, and three-fourths of social scientists collect their own data through interviews and observations, Japan specialists still remain heavily dependent on research materials in their own and other institutions' collections. Hence even while travel to Japan for research purposes is now reasonably accessible, library resources remain very important, particularly those that are accessible either in the United States or can be ordered online for delivery in the United States.

As in previous studies, we asked Japan specialists about the most important audiences for their research, giving them three choices out of a list of six options. The results paralleled those in 2005. "The scholarly community of Japan specialists" was the most common first choice, while "the scholarly community in my discipline" was the second most common choice. These two responses also garnered the vast majority of second choices. "Students" was a distant third choice, with "the general public" as a distant fourth. The priority given to the scholarly community of Japan specialists over the scholarly community in the discipline underscores the distinctive nature of this multidisciplinary community. Probably only for specialists in Japanese language and literature who live in East Asian language and literature departments is there no tension at all between these two research audiences, because they are essentially the same. In other disciplines Japan specialists are unlikely to comprise more than a small minority within their department and the question of which audience should be more salient can have serious career consequences. Even if the department is very supportive of the Japan specialist's area of research and teaching, the work will still be evaluated by disciplinary standards. It is clear from these data that Japan specialists consider both the Japan specialist audience and the disciplinary audience to be very important, and they aim to have their work evaluated positively by both audiences. This is easier to accomplish in some disciplines than in others. In some social sciences it may require writing different publications for two quite distinct audiences that evaluate the work according to different standards.

Japan specialists maintain their expertise through their research, through participation in professional organizations, and by maintaining personal networks with colleagues. As in previous studies, Japan specialists have high participation rates in the Association for Asian Studies and in other Japan-related conferences and seminars, but also participate to a lesser extent in their national disciplinary associations. This pattern also attests to the salience of

their identity as Japan specialists. They continue to report high levels of contact with both Japanese scholars and with other Japan specialists. They view these relationships as personal friendships as well as valuable ways of keeping up with new developments in the field and furthering their own research. In all of these ways, Japanese Studies constitutes a true community of scholars with which participants identify to a remarkable degree.

4

Japanese Studies at Academic Institutions

In this chapter and the following three we shift our attention from looking at Japan specialists as individuals to studying the institutional contexts within which they work and produce the field we call Japanese Studies. We will use the maximum amount of data we have for each component of this analysis, which will require a certain amount of gear shifting and additional methodological explanation at various points so that the information can be assessed properly. We will begin in this chapter by taking the broadest possible view of Japanese Studies in the United States, using three different data sources: Japan specialists' entries from the specialists' directory, program entries from the directory of Japanese Studies institutions, including staff lists, and a national list of academic institutions in the United States. Our goal will be to place Japanese Studies in a national academic and geographic context.

Then in chapter 5 we will move down to the smallest unit of academic instruction on Japan and examine individual courses offered at academic institutions, combining that with some information from the specialists about teaching conditions and teaching materials for Japanese Studies courses. In chapter 6 we will examine organized programs of study at the undergraduate and graduate levels. In addition to applying criteria to classify programs offered by various institutions, we will refer back to the national context in order to see where programs of various types are located in the academic and geographic landscape. This chapter will also bring doctoral students and doctoral degrees back into focus by examining changes in the institutions that are producing specialists with doctorates related to Japanese Studies. Finally, chapter 7 will examine the infrastructure and support for Japanese Studies at academic institutions and other institutions that provide resources for the field. In that context we will look particularly at library resources and other research resources, focusing on recent changes in how Japan specialists and students can obtain access to them. That chapter will also examine funding for Japanese Studies and offer Japan specialists' current views on how resources for Japanese Studies ought to be allocated. These four chapters will provide much data and many perspectives on the current state of Japanese Studies programs and activities in the United States.

We begin now by placing Japanese Studies into a broad, national context. In this chapter we will look at the distribution or spread of Japanese Studies within the United States. Over the past sixty years, both the number of academic institutions with Japan specialists and the density of Japan specialists at those institutions have grown dramatically. We begin with the academic institutions that employ Japan specialists, combining data from institutions with that

from specialists. After using these data to look for changes in the overall distribution and scale of Japanese Studies programs over the past decade, we will try to place the academic institutions with Japan specialist staff and programs into the broader picture of post-secondary academic institutions in the contemporary United States. This will not only place the geographic distribution of the programs into context, but also allows us to look at the representation of Japanese Studies within different types of academic institutions. Here, too, we are able to compare the present situation with the data from the previous two studies. Along the way, we will also try to understand the growing divergence between the Japan specialists who participate in the specialists' directory and survey, and the staff numbers reported by Japanese Studies programs. The answer will help us understand the structural changes that are taking places within Japanese Studies programs as they adapt to the constraints and opportunities in their environment.

How We Measure Japanese Studies at Academic Institutions

There are two basic ways to gather data about the number of academic institutions with Japan specialists, and the number of Japan specialists at those academic institutions: by collecting data directly from the institutions; or by using rosters of individuals that list their institutional affiliation. The 1970 data are from a roster of individuals, whose institutional affiliations were re-calculated and presented in the 1977 study for comparison. The 1977 and 1984 data are from questionnaires sent to institutions, with the same caveats about their relative completeness discussed earlier.

The 1989, 1995, 2005, and 2012 study also collected data from institutions, but were able to supplement it with information collected directly from Japan specialists whose institutions did not submit a questionnaire. This procedure has provided a more comprehensive count of institutions once Japanese Studies had expanded beyond being a small pool with clearly defined limits. However, it has the additional effect of increasing the count of institutions that have only one or two Japan specialists, usually with no formal Japanese Studies program.

In 1995 the number of such institutions was further inflated because the data collection procedures included sending an institutional questionnaire to a commercial list of all post-secondary academic institutions in the United States, in order to identify institutions that had either recently added something related to Japanese Studies or were planning to do so. This 1995 mass mailing had generated a very modest response. Although 7 percent of the institutions dutifully returned blank questionnaires and 5.7% responded to the survey to report that they did not have any program at present, only 1.8 percent of the institutions actually returned the survey and reported some Japanese Studies activity and therefore were included as program entries in the 1995 directory. Still, 1.8 percent of a mailing list of 3,139 added 57 programs to our list. All of these were coded as "minimal" programs, and virtually all were offering only one or two Japanese language courses and perhaps a history course that covered Japan.

We did not repeat this mass mailing in the subsequent two studies. Although we did purchase a commercial mailing list of 2,890 academic institutions in the United States in 2005 in order to obtain various pieces of information to use for our analysis, the e-mail addresses on that list were for the top academic administrator at each institution. We concluded that we would get even less response to an e-mail solicitation to these individuals in 2005 than we had from the mass mailing in 1995 and that the benefits did not outweigh the costs.

Although previously the Association for Asian Studies provided us both a current membership list of individuals and their list of programs on Asia, this time they told us that our list

of Japanese Studies programs was probably much better than theirs. By this time we had a very extensive list in our database of all the programs that had reported any trace of Japanese Studies activity in any of the previous studies, together with the data that had been included in the earlier directory studies. That list is much larger than the number of institutions that have actually responded to any of the surveys. In addition to including any institution that previously participated in the study, it also includes an institution record for any institution that employed a Japan specialist who participated in the study, even if their institution did not. The new AAS membership lists also provided information about where Japan specialists were located, which allowed us to expand the list further. The staff worked from our existing list, using the Internet to verify whether there was any trace of Japanese Studies activity, whether the same or a different person should be the initial contact, and making sure we had an e-mail address for the academic unit or a contact person.

Throughout the data collection, we assessed the response rates for all academic institutions that had been represented with full entries in the previous directory. Using criteria from the earlier studies that classified programs by their degree of development, we soon had 100 percent participation from the largest programs, very high participation from the remainder of those with full programs, somewhat lower response from those with more limited area studies programs in previous studies, and considerably weaker response from those that had reported the smallest programs or simply the beginning of a Japanese Studies presence earlier. Our staff then conducted another search of all the missing programs with at least "minimal" Japanese Studies in 2005, in an attempt to find a more appropriate contact person. We verified that many of those programs did still exist, and were able with more intensive follow-up to get responses from many of them. At a later stage, we sent programs their old entries as pdf proofs and threatened to publish them again, if they did not update the information. That produced a flurry of late responses that overloaded the staff in the final months of the study but definitely increased the response rate. I ended up also collecting some data from program websites to make sure we had reasonably current information for the directory from programs that had failed to respond to all our entreaties but were large enough that they needed to be included.

The end result of this intensive follow-up was the addition of a substantial amount of information about the expansion of small-to-medium-sized programs over the past decade, coupled with the possible systematic omission of some of the institutions with minimal Japanese Studies activity in earlier years. This potential bias must be kept in mind in evaluating the program numbers we present below. The process also reinforced my conviction that even in the Internet era, the Japan directory still serves an important function by presenting detailed information about the broad array of academic Japanese programs available, in a single place and in a systematic format.

This lengthy methodological discussion has been necessary so that we may interpret the comparative data about academic institutions and the number of Japan specialists on their staffs. We still need to consider the growing discrepancies between our sources of data and how we deal with them. In the 1970s, the counts the studies produced were probably virtually complete in terms of both institutions and numbers of specialists, because the field was so small at the time. That also means that for the earliest studies, the counts of specialists were probably about the same regardless of how the data were collected. By contrast, for all of the studies since the early 1980s, the counts of institutions and specialists are inevitably less than complete because the increasing scale and dispersion of the field limits our ability to keep track of this expanding universe.

For the past four studies in which we have had data from both specialists and institutions,

there is considerable discrepancy between the two sources. Not all Japan specialists respond to our invitation to be listed in the directory, so our count of specialists is certainly less than complete. Our attempts to survey institutions directly are also imperfect, so we supplement the count of institutions with Japan specialists' reports of their institutional affiliations. Even institutions that do respond may not know how many Japan specialists they have and who they are, especially if they do not have a well-established center or institute whose business it is to keep track of them. Hence the counts of specialists at particular institutions derived from the specialists' own reports differ from the counts reported on institutional staff lists. We will look more closely at the nature of the differences later in the study, but for the present purpose of locating Japanese Studies activity in institutions, our solution is simply to eliminate any overlap.

For this chapter, our procedure is to first count the number of institutions with program entries in the directory. The count is for whole institutions, even if the larger ones may have several different directory sub-entries for different components of their Japanese Studies programs. We supplement that information by adding the institutional affiliations reported by Japan specialists whose institutions did not have a full entry in the institutional directory. (These are listed as "Other Academic Institutions with Japan Specialist Staff" in the institutions directory).

The 2012 study includes full program entries for 248 academic institutions in the United States. We identified 163 other institutions in the United States that had at least one Japan specialist who completed an entry for the specialists' directory, for a total of 411 academic institutions with some Japanese Studies presence. The total number of academic institutions identified by these measures in 2012 is larger than the 184 full program entries plus 164 institutions identified through specialist entries in 2005 for a total of 348 institutions with some Japanese Studies presence. Both of these numbers are smaller than we obtained in 1995, but the 2012 count is very close to the 1995 peak.

A clearer picture of these fluctuations can be obtained by examining the crossover between full directory entries and "other academic institutions with Japan specialist staff" between 2005 and 2012, compared with the crossover between 1995 and 2005, and between 1989 and 1995, as shown in Table 4.1. In each part of the table, read across (the rows) for the current study numbers in each category, while the columns distribute them according to their placement in the previous study. In the crossover tables we produced for the two previous studies (the top two sections of the table), the cells for people who were not listed in either directory are blank. However, when compiling the data for the current crossover table, I noticed that some of the programs that had not been included in either 2005 or the current study had been in the 1995 directory, so I have included them in the cell for programs that were in neither of the two most recent directories. This helps to provide a more complete assessment of what has happened to the "bubble" programs from 1995.

We can now look more closely at the crossover patterns and what they tell us about the presence of Japanese Studies throughout the United States over the past two decades. Because of the increased number of full program listings in 2012, only two thirds of the full entries had also been full entries in 2005. By contrast, nearly 90 percent of those that had a full institutional entry in the 2005 study also had a full entry in the 1995 directory because of the disappearance of unsustainable minimal programs during that decade. Overall, we have evidence of great stability among 135 institutions that have had a full program listing in the past three directories, and some of them have a much longer history of Japanese Studies.

The situation with secondary directory listings is quite different. As we found in 1995 and 2005, there is quite high turnover in these listings of "other academic programs with Japan

Table 4.1. Full and Secondary Directory Listings of Japanese Studies at American Academic Institutions, 1989 to 1995; 1995 to 2005; 2005 to 2012*

	Full Entry		Secondary List		Not Listed		
Directory Listing	#	%	#	%	#	%	Total #
1989 to 1995							
Full Entry	98	(39.7)	43	(17.4)	106	(42.9)	247
Secondary Listing	3	(1.6)	114	(59.1)	76	(39.4)	193
No Listing	7	(18.4)	31	(81.6)	–		38
Total	108		188		182		478
1995 to 2005							
Full Entry	163	(88.6)	12	(6.5)	9	(4.9)	184
Secondary Listing	15	(9.1)	87	(53.0)	62	(37.8)	164
No Listing	45	(35.2)	83	(64.8)	–		128
Total	223		182		71		476
2005 to 2012							
Full Entry	165	(66.5)	43	(17.3)	40	(16.1)	248
Secondary Listing	8	(4.9)	82	(50.3)	73	(44.8)	163
No Listing	6	(5.8)	38	(36.9)	[59]	[57.3]	103
Total	179		163		172		514

* Data for 1989 and 1995 in Part A of the table reproduced from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s*, Table 3.5, p. 51. Data for Parts A and B of the table reproduced from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*, Table 5.1, p. 97. Institutions counted with no listing in either 2005 or 2012 [in brackets] had full listings in 1995.

specialist staff." In each period only about half of the secondary listings came from institutions with a secondary listing (i.e., a specialist at that institution) in the previous directory. However, in both 1995 and 2012, about 17 percent of the full directory entries came from programs that had only a secondary listing in the previous directory, while the upgrade was only 6.5 percent of entries in 2005. In 2012, 43 institutions moved from a secondary listing in 2005 based on a specialist's institutional affiliation to a full directory listing in 2012. To some extent these upgraded listings can be viewed as part of the general strengthening of Japanese Studies programs between 2005 and 2012, but in some cases the institution would have qualified for a full entry in 2005 but did not contribute one.

In fact, the nearly 50 percent movement in such institution listings between studies does not fully capture the extent of the fluctuations, because in many cases when the same institution is still listed, the current listing is derived from a different specialist. This suggests that there is a fair amount of movement among institutions, and that when Japan specialists do move, it is often to a program that has a bigger Japanese Studies presence. A major finding of the 1995 study was that much of the expansion of Japanese Studies in the early 1990s necessarily involved new PhDs taking positions in smaller institutions without a Japanese Studies program, often a "serendipitous" position that was not related to their expertise on Japan. While that movement was interpreted as part of the "normalization" of Japanese Studies within American academics, it may also have been the result of limited academic job opportunities for Japan specialists. The findings in 2005 and 2012 indicate that some of these highly trained

specialists have been able to move to an institution with a Japanese Studies program, or have helped their own institution develop one. In either case, they are making use of their Japanese Studies expertise and also contributing to the expansion of Japanese Studies programs.

In sum, then, while the secondary listings do not absolutely mean that there is a Japanese Studies program at an institution, or that the resident Japan specialist is able to offer courses on Japan, we do know that there is a person with Japan expertise at those institutions, and that some of those institutions do have a Japanese Studies program that was not captured in our regular program listings. We therefore use the broader measure when there is sufficient data to enhance the analysis.

Scale of Japanese Studies Programs at Academic Institutions

Now let's approach the problem from a different angle. Table 4.2 compares the number of specialists reported in Japanese Studies programs in 2012 with those reported in all of the previous studies from 1970 through 2005. For this measure we use the staff lists reported by participating institutions for our count of specialists, adding the counts of Japan specialists from the specialist directory only for those institutions without a full institutional entry. This procedure offers the largest unduplicated counts we can produce, but also tends to increase the count of institutions with only one or two Japan specialists, for which we have no additional information about actual Japanese Studies program activity. Unfortunately, a number of institutions that provided a directory entry did not list their staff. Hence pooling the staff lists with specialist entries from "other" institutions produced 366 academic institutions in the United States for which we could count the number of Japan specialist staff. This is more than we were able to count in 2005, but still slightly less than the count in 1995.

The most striking finding is the steady growth and increased scale of Japanese Studies programs over time, which has continued in the 21st century. While there are slightly more programs with only one Japan specialist than were reported in 2005, the absolute number is still less than the number of such one person programs we found in 1995. In 1995 nearly half of all programs had only one Japan specialist, while in both 2005 and 2012 just under 40 percent of all programs were in this minimal state. This underscores our view that the large increases found in 1995 were at least partly a response to the Japanese Bubble economy that could not be sustained. It should be noted that some of the expansion in the early 1990s was at two year

Table 4.2. Institutions with Japan Specialists, 1970–2012, by Number of Specialists*

	1		2–3		4–7		18–11		12 or More		Total	
Year	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
1970	56.1	(78)	24.5	(34)	12.2	(17)	2.9	(4)	4.3	(6)	100	(139)
1977	35.7	(70)	29.1	(57)	21.9	(43)	5.6	(11)	7.7	(15)	100	(196)
1984	33.0	(61)	30.3	(56)	24.8	(46)	4.9	(9)	7.0	(13)	100	(185)
1989	43.5	(127)	23.3	(68)	17.8	(52)	6.2	(18)	9.2	(27)	100	(292)
1995	47.7	(185)	23.7	(92)	16.2	(63)	5.2	(20)	7.2	(28)	100	(388)
2005	39.5	(136)	22.1	(76)	14.6	(50)	11.6	(40)	12.2	(42)	100	(344)
2012	39.9	(146)	21.0	(77)	16.9	(62)	12.3	(45)	9.8	(36)	99.9	(366)

* Data for 1970 to 1995 from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s*, p. 50, Table 3.3. Reproduced with 2005 data in Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities, Table 5.2, p. 98.

colleges, which could meet student demand for Japanese language without needing the kind of disciplinary specialists that would be required for Japanese Studies at a four year institution. Today we find very few Japan specialist staff at two year colleges, but there are some at schools that have upgraded from a two-year to a four year program as part of the reorganization of higher education in state systems.

There are tremendous variations among the 146 institutions that have only one Japan specialist staff member today; many of these staff hold quite stable positions at small colleges. At nearly two-thirds of those institutions, the one Japan specialist is an associate or full professor and generally has been there for some time. The one Japan specialist at 19 percent of the institutions is an assistant professor, who presumably has come to the institution just in the past few years. The sole Japan specialist staff person at the remaining institutions holds a more tenuous position; there are ten lecturers, nine instructors, five adjuncts, and two visitors. A program with only one Japan specialist can remain stable, grow, or vanish. Programs with more than one Japan specialist may remain stable or grow, but they are less in danger of disappearing entirely.

Although we do not attempt to track individual programs over time, it is clear from the aggregate data over time that the trend is toward stability and growth. The percentage of institutions with two or three Japan specialist staff has been declining gradually since the late 1980s, while the number of programs with four to seven staff members has remained roughly in the same range since the late 1980s. We do not know how much movement there has been between these categories for specific institutions—or indeed, how many two or three person programs later shrank to one, or one-person programs grew to two or three between our directory studies.

What is clear is that the major increases are in the numbers and proportional representation of the largest programs. The absolute number of programs with eight to eleven Japan specialists has doubled from 1995 to 2005, and has grown even larger since then, suggesting that one reason for shrinkage in the number of programs with four to seven staff members in 2005 is because they grew larger. The number of programs with twelve or more Japan specialists barely changed between 1989 and 1995, but now has increased substantially. Even more astonishing is the actual scale of the largest programs. There are now nineteen Japanese Studies programs listing 20 or more staff members, and the five largest of those programs list between 48 and 71 persons on their Japanese Studies staff. They are University of Michigan (71), Stanford University (64), University of Hawaii at Manoa (63), Harvard University (60), Columbia University (48).

Three important qualifications are necessary in interpreting these numbers. First, most of the staff counts for programs of all sizes include persons below the rank of assistant professor, primarily as language instructors. While such persons are generally excluded from the specialist directory at The Japan Foundation's request, they in fact constitute an integral part of Japanese Studies programs throughout the country. The fact that many institutions routinely list such persons as staff members of their Japanese Studies programs makes this clear. In well-developed Japanese Studies programs, such persons may be permanent faculty members who participate fully in academic activities, while for fledgling programs they may be the first people hired by modern language departments, to meet demand for introductory Japanese language classes.

Second, there has been a major structural change in American academic institutions over the past ten or fifteen years. In response to economic exigencies, institutions have been hiring fewer full-time, tenure track faculty and instead employing many more part or full-time lec-

turers and adjunct faculty on a contract basis, a phenomenon that has been well-documented by the American Association of University Professors in its studies of the state of academics in the United States. Many of the individuals employed as lecturers or adjunct faculty work full-time and they may be employed for many years, but they generally lack the long-term job security of tenure. This means that many Japan specialists even with doctorates may be employed in less secure academic positions because of the nature of the job market and not because there is anything lacking in their academic credentials. Consequently, it is no longer appropriate to use only the traditional definitions of faculty rank and permanent status to assess the size of Japanese programs.

The terms used for special statuses are ambiguous, often deliberately so. Adjunct professor may be a courtesy appointment for a senior colleague conferring some institutional privileges without salary, or it may be a marginal status for a person the institution pays for teaching without offering any permanent position. In our staff listings at American academic institutions, there were 61 persons listed as adjunct. They included 11 adjunct assistant professors, 10 adjunct associate professors, and four listed as adjunct professor. In addition, there were 23 adjunct instructors or lecturers, two adjunct researchers, and two more only entitled adjunct with no further description of status. "Visiting" also at one time meant a faculty member temporarily at one institution on leave from another, but now in some institutions it may be given to a person who does not have another permanent affiliation, as another indicator of marginal status and lack of formal institutional commitment. In our list of staff there were 13 persons "visiting" with academic rank (including nine visiting assistant professors), and eight visiting instructors or lecturers. Persons with these designations comprised 4.6 percent of the overall staff listings for academic institutions in the U.S., a substantial increase from 2005. These designations have "marginal" written all over them, but in the absence of any clear sense of what precisely they imply, we have simply classified them according to whether they were accorded professorial rank or listed as instructor or lecturer. We added the completely ambiguous ones to the lecturer or instructor category, because the absence of professorial rank seemed to be a message in its own right. For what it is worth, we also noted that two-thirds of those designated adjunct were female, while visitors were evenly split by gender.

In addition, many programs list emeritus faculty on their staff lists. Such faculty may have retired from their permanent positions, but they often continue to teach on a part-time basis and to serve on graduate students' committees. While we excluded them from the employment analysis in the previous chapter, we include them in the count of Japan specialists at an institution if they appear on the staff list or as specialists at institutions without a program entry.

Third, while small Japanese Studies programs are usually administered as part of an existing department or broader program, the larger and more focused a Japanese Studies program becomes, the more it develops an infrastructure that extends well beyond the core teaching faculty. Typically, larger programs have program directors, who may be faculty but have very reduced teaching loads; they may also have full time associate or assistant directors who hold doctorates in Japanese Studies fields. They may also employ professionally qualified Japan specialists as program coordinators, outreach coordinators, and administrators of East Asia National Resource Center grant programs. Large Japanese language programs are likely to be housed within a broader departmental structure, which may designate someone as the coordinator or director of the Japanese language program.

At institutions with major Japanese Studies programs there are also Japanese librarians, who hold a critical place in the institutional infrastructure of Japanese Studies and are counted among the Japan specialist staff. A few of them hold doctorates in a Japanese Studies field

in lieu of or in addition to a library degree, and they may also teach on occasion. The largest libraries may have both Japanese bibliographers and Japanese cataloguers on their staff. In addition, the institutions with the largest Japanese Studies programs also support specialized research institutes related to Japanese Studies, often in professional fields. These programs have their own research and administrative staff who hold advanced degrees in Japanese Studies fields. A few large programs have Japanese museums with professional curators on the staff. And finally, there are now a number of postdoctoral programs for Japan specialists. While some are basically research positions, others explicitly involve teaching courses about Japan at the undergraduate level.

Since we have no way of investigating the nature of these positions beyond the titles given on the staff lists, we have routinely counted all of these various types of positions if they appear on institutional staff lists. The only exceptions have been the exclusion of lower level positions such as library assistant, office assistant, or staff assistant that appear to be forms of student employment. While it may appear that these inclusions disproportionately inflate the size of the larger Japanese Studies programs, in fact small programs that operate under the broader rubric of Asian Studies may have a different form of inflation when they include in their staff lists persons who teach courses all or partially about Japan but are primarily specialists on some other part of Asia. Where we could clearly identify these persons as not being Japan specialists we have excluded them, but in many cases we did not have sufficient information to do so.

Except for the documented increase in unstable adjunct or visiting positions, is difficult to determine precisely the extent to which the staff lists of Japanese Studies programs in 2012 contain more of these inflationary factors today than they did in the earlier studies. Certainly the studies in the 1970s systematically excluded most language instructors who did not hold doctorates. As the teaching of Japanese became more professionalized and these same language instructors became pedagogy specialists who wrote textbooks and experimented with new ways of teaching language, the situation has gradually changed. Some institutions now list them as Japan specialist staff, while others still do not. The earliest studies also did not include the many other categories of staff that we now include, largely because those positions did not exist twenty or thirty years ago. They are products of both the expansion of Japanese Studies since the early 1980s, and the more recent structural changes in American academics in general. Hence they must be counted in Japanese Studies programs in 2012, even if this limits the comparability with earlier studies. And despite the fact that some part of the phenomenal growth in the size of the largest Japanese programs can be attributed to non-teaching positions, these same programs also have shown steady growth in the breadth and depth of their academic offerings, which we will explore in greater detail in Chapters 5 and 6. The expansion in non-teaching positions is a direct result of the expansion of their academic offerings.

These factors also help to account for the divergence in the 2012 data between the number of Japan specialists in the U.S. who were included in the specialist directory (1435) and the growing number of persons on academic staff lists (1982). The changing nature of the staff lists at academic institutions is also a significant factor. The expansion of some non-faculty occupational categories within academic Japanese Studies can be seen in both the specialist directory and the staff lists, such as the growing number of educational administrators and the strong representation of Japan specialist librarians. In addition, however, the institutional staff lists also include large numbers of persons integral to academic Japanese Studies programs who do not meet the narrower criteria for inclusion in the specialist directory.

Overall, the staff lists of academic institutions in 2012 were composed of two-thirds cur-

rent faculty of professorial rank (65.6%), 6.1 percent emeritus or retired faculty, 18 percent lecturers and instructors and 6.5 percent administrative and specialized positions including library and museum staff. Persons in the lecturers and instructors category were generally excluded from the specialist directory on the basis of The Japan Foundation's criteria, although some were included who met other criteria for inclusion. Some of those classified as administrative staff members were eligible for inclusion in the directory. Japan specialist librarians and museum curators were included, as were administrators with doctorates in Japan-related fields, but many other positions would not have met the criteria for inclusion in the specialists' directory.

In sum, although there is always fluidity among the smallest programs, most Japanese Studies programs have become larger, stronger, and more complex over time. Their increased scale and infrastructure suggest that they are now deeply embedded in their institutions and are here to stay, even though both large and small programs now employ more specialists in less permanent academic positions. This raises the question of where these Japanese Studies program fall in the overall landscape of American higher education.

Level and Selectivity of Academic Institutions

For this analysis we will continue to use the combined dataset that includes both the 248 academic institutions with Japanese Studies programs that have full entries in the 2012 study, and the list of 163 "other academic institutions with Japan specialist staff" that was constructed from entries to the specialists directory, for a total of 411 institutions. In order to place the academic institutions that have some Japanese Studies presence into context, we use a list that offers a good representation of all post-secondary academic institutions in the United States. We can use this list as a denominator, and by linking the two sources we can calculate the extent of penetration of Japanese Studies within all post-secondary institutions in the United States using particular characteristics for which we have data.

For the 1995 study we used such a list, purchased from a mailing list company, to send out a mass mailing to all the institutions asking if they had any Japanese Studies activity at their institutions. Although the return from that mass mailing was minimal, the list itself provided a base with which to compare our Japanese Studies data. The list contained 3,139 institutions and included a number of variables describing the characteristics of the institutions. We supplemented that information with additional data on several other variables related to academic selectivity taken from the current editions of Peterson's Guides to two and four year institutions, which were available for a high proportion of the institutions. We also used the same material for a comparative analysis of the 1989 data, because the information for the national base fell between the dates of the two studies.

For this 2005 study we did not repeat the mass mailing, but we did purchase a similar list from the successor to the earlier company that contained a similar array of more current variables about institutional characteristics. Additional variables on academic size and selectivity were added from two different sources: data on undergraduate enrollments, number of faculty, and degrees offered were taken from the 2004 edition of a college handbook produced by The College Board, which provided a relatively complete listing of two and four-year institutions. However, to maintain comparability with the 1995 study, we used the academic selectivity index in the 2004 edition of Peterson's Guide to Four Year Colleges. No such listing of selectivity was available for two year colleges. The national list for 2005 contained a slightly smaller set of 2,890 institutions. Some institutions had merged or closed in the intervening decade, and

some were simply not on the newer list. However, only seven institutions in our Japanese Studies list for 2005 were missing. Not all data were available for every institution, but there was sufficient data for the analysis.

For the 2012 study, we did not try to purchase another list, but instead had the staff use current published editions of the two college guides plus materials online from the same sources and the websites of the institutions to update and clean the master list from 2005. The two college guides claim to cover all accredited four year colleges, so we are reasonably confident that our list is comprehensive for the four year institutions that constitute the bulk of the study. We found some consolidation, some upgrading of local two-year and four-year institutions into state college or university networks, and a few institutions that had completely disappeared. A very small number of Japanese Studies institutions were not on the basic 2012 list of 2,892 accredited American educational institutions, but some of the measures we use were not available for all institutions.

We begin our analysis by examining the levels of degrees offered by academic institutions. Table 4.3 requires a bit of explanation. The columns for 1989, 1995, 2005, and 2012 present the number of institutions with some Japanese Studies presence at which academic degrees at various levels were offered in each of the four study years. This is not an indication that degrees in Japanese Studies were offered at those levels (an issue we will take up in a later chapter). It simply means that the institutions were offering degrees at those levels and allows us to examine how widely available instruction on Japan is within American higher education. The percentages in these four time periods represent what percent of all the schools in the United States offering degrees at that level had some presence of Japanese Studies. It is thus, in demographic terms, the rate of Japanese Studies presence per 100 academic institutions at each degree level. The institution columns at the right of the table give the number and percent of academic institutions in the United States that offered degrees at those levels in 2012, with the 2005 figures in parentheses for comparison. To avoid further clutter to the table, we have

Table 4.3. Rate of Availability of Japanese Studies at American Academic Institutions in 1989, 1995, 2005, and 2012 by Level of Degree*

Degree Level	1989		1995		2005		2012		Institutions	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
AA	63	3.8	129	7.7	88	4.7	114	7.0	1618 (1885)	55.9 (65.2)
BA	269	16.5	383	23.5	333	19.7	366	23.3	1570 (1690)	54.3 (58.5)
MA	224	21.6	314	30.2	272	24.8	299	29.2	1023 (1096)	35.4 (37.9)
PhD	153	45.5	181	53.8	174	42.6	189	53.5	353 (408)	12.2 (14.1)
All Inst.	296	9.4	440	14.0	348	12.0	405	14.0	2892 (2890)	100.0 (100.0)

* Data for 1989 and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 3.6, ch. 3, p. 54; 2005 data along with earlier data reproduced in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*, Table 5.3, p. 103. This table combines separate analyses of institutions for each level at which degrees are offered, so there is considerable overlap between categories and the numbers cannot be summed vertically. Institution numbers and percentages are given for 2012, with 2005 number in parentheses.

omitted the 1989-1995 institutional total figures, but keep in mind that the base for those years was about 8 percent larger, primarily because it included a larger number of two year institutions that would only have offered associate degrees.

The first thing to note is that most institutions offer degrees at more than one level, so the numbers and percentages cannot be added vertically. All of the absolute numbers of degree-granting institutions with some Japanese Studies presence were larger in 1995 than before or since, so as with other comparative statistics in this study, it is sometimes helpful to skip 1995 and compare 1989 with 2005 and 2012, which shows a smoother upward trajectory. The calculations are also affected by changes in the base. That is, although the total number of academic institutions in the denominator is almost the same for 2005 and 2012, the actual number of institutions offering degrees at each level is lower in 2012.

Even with these caveats, it is clear that Japanese Studies is more likely to be available at institutions that offer advanced degrees. There is some presence of Japanese Studies at nearly 30 percent of the academic institutions in the United States offering Master's degrees, and at over half of those offering doctorates. This is particularly impressive given that overall, there is only a Japanese Studies presence at 14 percent of all institutions of higher education.

Another way to examine these data is to remove the rate calculations showing the percentage of all U.S. institutions at each level that have some Japanese Studies presence, and ask instead whether the internal distribution of Japanese Studies programs across the various degree levels has changed over time. Table 4.4 gives this comparison, calculating the percentage distribution of institutions with some Japanese Studies presence that offer degrees at each level. Once again the percentages exceed 100% because most institutions offer degrees at more than one level. In other words, we use the same numbers as Table 4.3, but this time we simply calculate what percentage of the total number of institutions with Japanese Studies presence offer a degree at that level.

This comparison clarifies the anomalies of the 1995 data somewhat. In 1995 the pool of institutions reporting some Japanese Studies presence was inflated by a large number of junior colleges that had begun offering elementary Japanese language courses. Since those institutions do not offer any four year or advanced degrees, this not only increased the percentage of institutions offering associate degrees, but also reduced the percentage offering four year and advanced degrees. In 2005 and 2012 the number of junior colleges in the sample is considerably smaller and more of the institutions counted as offering AA degrees are actually four year institutions that also offer two year degrees. In the 2012 sample, 90% of the institutions that have some Japanese Studies presence offer BA degrees; three quarters offer MA degrees, and

Table 4.4. Percentage of Academic Institutions with Some Presence of Japanese Studies in 1989, 1995, 2005, and 2012, by Level of Degree offered by the Institution*

Degree Level	1989		1995		2005		2012	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
AA	63	12.1	129	29.3	88	25.3	114	28.1
BA	269	90.9	383	87.0	333	95.7	366	90.4
MA	224	75.7	314	71.4	272	78.2	299	73.8
PhD	153	51.7	181	41.1	174	50.0	189	46.7
All Inst.	296		440		348		405	

* Percentages recalculated from numbers of institutions in Table 4.3 above.

about half offer doctorates. Again, this does not mean that they offer degrees in Japanese Studies at those levels; it is simply an indication of what kinds of academic institutions have some presence of Japanese Studies.

A somewhat different measure of the location of institutions with some Japanese Studies presence in the overall landscape of American high education is a scale provided by the Peterson guides that indicates how difficult it is for students to enter. For 1989 and 1995 we were able to use Peterson's code for both two year and four year institutions, but for 2005 and 2012 the two year guide did not offer this measure. In the four year Guide, the scale values were obtained by self-report of the institutions (p. 2933) and fewer institutions reported their level of difficulty of entrance. We were able to supplement the information in some cases if the institution reported that it had open admissions. The results are shown in Table 4.5, which should be read in the same fashion as Table 4.3. The columns for 1989, 1995, 2005 and 2012 give the number of institutions in our sample at each level of difficulty, and the percentage column gives the rate that this represents among all institutions at that level of difficulty. The Institutions columns provide the numeric basis on which each percentage was calculated, plus the percentage distribution of difficulty of entrance levels across all institutions reporting.

The number of institutions for which selectivity ratings were available is considerably smaller for 2005 and 2012, but the discrepancy is concentrated at lower levels of selectivity. These categories are still very small overall, and the two top categories constitute a small fraction of all institutions of higher education in the U.S. Given that, plus the fact that our sample of institutions with some presence of Japanese Studies comprises only 21% of all the institutions for which selectivity levels were reported, the results are quite impressive.

There is some presence of Japanese Studies at 80 percent of the most difficult institutions to enter, and at over half of those that are reported to be very difficult to enter. Just over half of our Japanese Studies sample (53.6%) falls into the moderately difficult to enter category, where they comprise 22 percent of the institutions reporting this level of difficulty. The only surprise in 2012 is the larger number of institutions falling into the open admission category.

The bulge in the 1995 sample is shown here quite clearly to fall disproportionately into the two lowest categories and the large "moderately difficult to enter" category. While in 1995 I expressed great enthusiasm over the movement of Japanese Studies into these more accessible

Table 4.5. Rate of Availability of Japanese Studies at American Academic Institutions in 1989, 1995, 2005, and 2012, by Difficulty of Entrance

Year entrance	1989		1995		2005		2012		Institutions	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
None	13	1.3	43	4.3	13	2.4	60	11.0	545	28.7
Minimal	7	2.0	16	4.5	4	2.2	8	4.4	182	9.6
Moderate	163	16.0	233	22.9	185	19.0	217	22.3	975	51.4
Very diff.	66	46.5	84	59.2	80	54.4	81	55.1	147	7.7
Most diff.	23	62.1	27	73.0	40	81.6	39	79.6	49	2.6
Total*	272	10.8	403	15.9	322	17.0	405	21.3	1898	100.0

* Data for 1989 and 1995 from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table. 3.7, ch.3, p. 55. Entrance difficulty for 1989 and 1995 coded from *Peterson's Guide to Four-Year Colleges*, 1995 ed. and *Peterson's Guide to Two-Year Colleges*, 1995 ed. Data were not available for 599 institutions, including 24 from the 1989 sample and 37 from the 1995 sample. Entrance difficulty for 2005 and 2012 coded from Peterson's Guide to Four-Year Colleges, 2005, 34th ed. Data were not available for 992 institutions, including 26 in our 2005 sample and 12 in our 2012 sample.

institutions as a measure of the "normalization" of Japanese Studies, it now appears to have been to some extent an artifact of the Japanese bubble. This time, I take comfort in noting that the presence of Japanese Studies is holding its own at the middle levels, where the bulk of the programs are located, and is even more strongly represented among the smaller number of the most selective institutions.

The selectivity measure is also skewed by the fact that the most highly selective undergraduate institutions—the measure we are using here—tend to be quite small private institutions. Not only are there few institutions in that category, they also enroll relatively small numbers of students. To get a better picture of where Japanese Studies is located in the overall range of American academic institutions, we must also examine the distribution by size. However, something as simple as the size of an institution can be measured in different ways and we will explore several of them.

Size of Institutions with Japanese Studies

We begin with total enrollment, again using our data representing all academic institutions in the United States to calculate the rate of penetration of Japanese Studies among institutions of a particular size range. As shown in Table 4.6, Japanese Studies presence was most

Table 4.6. Rate of Availability of Japanese Studies at American Academic Institutions in 1989, 1995, 2005, and 2012, by Total Enrollment

Total Enrolled	1989		1995		2005		2012		Institutions	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<1,000	16	2.2	29	3.0	10	1.4	14	2.0	696 (695)	24.0 (26.5)
1,000–1,999	35	6.3	64	11.4	51	8.9	56	10.1	555 (570)	19.7 (20.8)
2,000–4,999	43	6.5	69	10.5	70	9.6	77	10.5	736 (732)	25.3 (24.4)
5,000–9,999	39	10.1	75	19.3	46	10.7	65	15.1	430 (428)	14.8 (14.4)
10,000–14,999	42	23.0	67	36.6	49	26.6	56	29.8	188 (184)	6.4 (6.8)
15,000–19,999	36	45.0	40	50.0	30	34.1	38	41.8	91 (88)	3.0 (3.0)
20,000+	65	58.5	73	65.7	89	58.6	96	63.2	152 (152)	5.3 (4.1)
Total*	276	10.2	417	15.5	345	12.1	405	14.2	2,848 (2,849)	100.0 (100.0)

* Data for 1989 and 1995 from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s*, Table 3.8, ch. 3, p. 57. Enrollment category assignments from *Peterson's Guide to Four-Year Colleges*, 1995 ed. and *Peterson's Guide to Two-Year Colleges*, 1995 ed. Data were not available for 446 institutions, including 20 with Japanese Studies in 1989 and 23 with Japanese Studies in 1995. For 2005, total enrollment was derived from our national list source supplemented by data in *The College Board College Handbook 2004*. Data were not available for 41 institutions, 3 of which were in our Japanese Studies institutional sample. http://www.petersons.com/college-search.aspx was the source for total enrollment for 2012. Data were not available for 44 institutions, including 15 in our institutional sample.

heavily concentrated in the largest academic institutions, those with total enrollment of over 20,000 students, where it was available at 63% of institutions. It scales down systematically to a smaller percentage of each successive size category.

This pattern differs substantially from the overall size distribution of academic institutions in the United States, which is skewed in the opposite direction. Japanese Studies was least likely to be available at institutions with an enrollment of less than 1,000 (2.0% in 2012) although institutions of that small size comprised nearly a quarter of all institutions of higher education in the United States. The pattern is roughly similar for all four studies. The most basic explanation for the disproportionate representation of Japanese Studies at larger institutions is that they are more able to support the specialized faculty and courses that Japanese Studies entails, because they have a larger student market and a larger faculty. The largest institutions that are most likely to have some presence of Japanese Studies are also most likely to be comprehensive research institutions offering graduate programs, although some are simply very large undergraduate institutions.

We know that Japanese Studies began initially at graduate institutions and served primarily graduate students. This has changed substantially in the past two decades. Now it is typically through exposure to Japan and to Japanese language at the undergraduate level (or even earlier) that students decide to move more deeply into Japanese Studies. Looking only at undergraduate enrollment therefore provides a clearer picture of the extent of availability of Japanese Studies to American undergraduates, as shown in Table 4.7. The number of institutions

Table 4.7. Rate of Availability of Japanese Studies at American Academic Institutions in 1989, 1995, 2005, and 2012, by Undergraduate Enrollment

Undergrad. Enrollment	1989		1995		2005		2012		Institutions	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<1,000	19	2.7	35	5.0	10	2.0	10	2.0	506 (503)	21.0 (27.6)
1,000–1,999	42	7.4	70	12.4	52	9.8	57	10.7	533 (529)	22.1 (22.0)
2,000–4,999	53	8.4	86	13.5	79	12.2	92	14.2	650 (649)	27.1 (24.8)
5,000–9,999	46	12.5	76	20.7	60	15.9	81	20.9	388 (378)	15.8 (14.3)
10,000–14,999	47	30.3	64	41.3	37	25.5	41	27.3	150 (145)	6.1 (6.0)
15,000+	64	46.7	74	54.0	93	48.4	103	52.8	195 (192)	8.0 (5.3)
Total*	271	10.5	405	15.7	331	13.8	384	15.9	2,422 (2,396)	100.0 (100.0)

* Data for 1989 and 1995 from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s*, Table 3.9, ch. 3, p. 58. Enrollment category assignments from *Peterson's Guide to Four-Year Colleges*, 1995 ed. and *Peterson's Guide to Two-Year Colleges*, 1995 ed. Data were not available for 568 institutions, including 25 with Japanese Studies in 1989 and 35 with Japanese Studies in 1995. Enrollment category assignments for 2005 from *The College Board Handbook 2004*. Undergraduate enrollment data for 2005 was not available for 494 institutions, including 17 with Japanese Studies. http://www.petersons.com/college-search.aspx was the source for enrollment figures for 2012. Undergraduate enrollment data for 2012 was not available for 470 institutions, including 33 with Japanese Studies.

with some Japanese Studies presence in each size category of undergraduate enrollment has fluctuated considerably over the four studies, and the reported total number of institutions with undergraduate enrollment in each size category has also fluctuated, largely due to incomplete data. Despite this, the overall pattern remains quite clear and stable: Japanese Studies has some presence at about half of academic institutions with undergraduate enrollment of over 15,000 students, and a quarter of those with 10,000 to 14,999 undergraduates. Thus, even though the overall penetration of Japanese Studies reaches less than 16 percent of all academic institutions, its reach is more extensive because of its much higher relative availability at institutions with large numbers of undergraduates. Many of the institutions with the largest undergraduate enrollments are public institutions, usually at least partially state-supported.

However, to stop there would provide a somewhat misleading picture of the situation. Institutions with 10,000 or more undergraduates make up only a small fraction of all academic institutions in the United States, which is why the penetration of Japanese Studies appears to be so high at that level. In fact, over sixty percent of the Japanese Studies presence is at institutions with less than 10,000 undergraduates. As we have noted since 1995, supporting Japanese Studies in a large number of smaller institutions poses challenges quite different from the needs at large research institutions.

Geographic and Regional Distribution of Japanese Studies

Using our broadest count of 411 academic institutions with some presence of Japanese Studies, such institutions can now be found in all 50 states. In four states there is no academic institution with a full entry in the institutions directory, but these states have Japan specialists with entries in the specialist directory who list an academic affiliation. Conversely, twelve institutions did not have anyone on the list of Other academic institutions with Japan specialist staff, but there was at least one institution with a full entry in each of those states. We can explore their distribution further with the regional categories we used earlier for Japan specialists, as shown in Table 4.8. The number and regional percentage distribution of Japan specialists from the specialists directory have been added for comparison.

Overall, Japanese Studies was most prevalent at academic institutions in the Midwest, Northeast, and Pacific regions. These three regions also had higher concentrations of programs

Table 4.8 Distribution of Academic Institutions and Specialists, by Region, 2012*

	Full Entry		Secondary List		All Institutions		Specialists	
Region	#	%	#	%	#	% Dist.	#	%
Northeast	45	18.1	34	20.9	79	19.2	314	22.2
Mid-Atlantic	33	13.3	23	14.1	56	13.6	198	14.0
South	33	13.3	24	14.7	57	13.9	107	7.6
Midwest	66	26.6	43	26.4	109	26.5	344	24.3
Southwest-Mountain	22	8.9	14	8.6	36	8.8	101	7.1
Pacific	49	19.8	25	15.3	74	18.0	352	24.9
Total	248	100.0	163	100.0	411	100.0	1416	100.1

* Percents for institutions and specialists slightly off due to rounding. Southwest and Mountain regions combined.

with full directory entries, but the differences are not that great. However, there is a significant discrepancy between the distribution of specialists and the distribution of academic institutions. This is only partially caused by the non-academic employment of Japan specialists. It also reflects the fact that in the Northeast and Pacific regions there are larger academic programs employing more Japan specialists, while in the South and Southwest-Mountain regions the Japanese Studies programs tend to be smaller in scale.

We can now compare the overall distribution of Japanese Studies at academic institutions in the United States in 2012 with the distribution found in previous studies, as shown in Table 4.9, below. The Midwest region contains the largest percentage of academic institutions with some Japanese Studies presence, at around 25 percent, which has held steady through all four studies. The Pacific region has steadily lost ground compared to the Northeast. The percentages allow us to make a relative comparison of the distribution of Japanese Studies institutions over the four study periods, but they do not account for the varying sizes of the regions, which are, after all, simply collections of states with greatly varying populations and thus different numbers of academic institutions.

The situation may be clarified further by examining the rates of penetration by region, using our national database. This analysis controls for the differing number of academic institutions in each region. The results are shown below in Table 4.10. below. This table reveals that the Northeast and Pacific regions have comparable rates of penetration of Japanese Studies, with some level of Japanese Studies available at 20 to 22 percent of all post-secondary academic institutions in the region, or about one in five. The high percentage distribution in the Midwest region is now shown to be simply a function of the much larger number of academic institutions in that region. The rate of penetration in the Midwest is at the same level as the Mid-Atlantic region, at 13 to 15 percent or one in six. The South and the Southwest-Mountain regions now have penetration rates of eight to nine percent, which is a substantial increase from just six years ago.

These regional findings can be further clarified if we look at the regional distribution of institutions offering different levels of academic degrees. As indicated earlier, institutions of-

Table 4.9. Regional Distribution of Japanese Studies at Academic Institutions, 1989, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	1989		1995		2005		2012	
Region	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Northeast	61	20.6	76	17.3	75	21.6	79	19.2
Mid-Atlantic	40	13.5	69	15.7	50	14.4	56	13.6
South	30	10.1	48	10.9	41	11.8	57	13.9
Midwest	72	24.3	113	25.7	87	25.0	109	26.5
Southwest-Mountain	22	7.4	42	9.5	28	8.0	36	8.8
Pacific	71	24.0	92	20.9	67	19.3	74	18.0
Total	296	99.9	440	100.0	348	100.1	411	100.0

* Data for 1989 and 1995 recalculated from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 3.11, ch. 3, p. 61. Southwest and Mountain regions have been combined because of the relatively small number of cases. Data for 2005 and all previous years taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 5.10 p. 110.

Table 4.10. Rate of Penetration of Japanese Studies at American Academic Institutions in 1989, 1995, 2005, and 2012, by Geographic Region*

	1989		1995		2005		2012		Institutions	
Total Enrolled	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Northeast	61	14.5	76	18.0	75	19.0	79	20.0	611 (611)	21.1 (21.4)
Mid-Atlantic	40	8.8	69	15.1	50	12.0	56	13.5	718 (717)	24.8 (24.6)
South	30	4.5	48	7.1	41	6.7	57	9.3	411 (411)	14.2 (15.2)
Midwest	72	9.3	113	14.7	87	12.1	109	15.2	328 (340)	11.8 (12.7)
Southwest-Mountain	22	4.6	42	8.8	28	6.8	36	8.8	2,879 (2,890)	100.0 (100.0)
Pacific	71	17.8	92	23.1	67	19.7	74	22.6	340	11.8
Total	296	9.4	440	14.0	348	12.0	411	14.3	2,890	100.0

* Data for 1989 and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 3.11, ch. 3, p. 61. Southwest and Mountain regions have been combined because of the relatively low number of cases. Data for 2005 and all previous years from Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities, Table 5.11, p. 110.

Table 4.11. Rate of Availability of Japanese Studies at American Institutions in 2012, by Region and Level of Degree Offered*

	Associate		Bachelor's		Master's		Doctorate	
Region	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Northeast	19	9.9	76	29.9	64	36.2	35	63.6
Mid-Atlantic	17	7.9	51	21.1	38	24.8	26	54.2
South	20	5.8	54	17.2	51	26.8	33	49.3
Midwest	32	7.7	98	23.7	68	28.8	42	60.0
Southwest-Mountain	9	3.5	33	17.1	29	40.8	24	38.1
Pacific	13	6.8	49	33.3	45	37.2	27	56.3
All Regions	110	6.8	361	23.1	295	28.9	187	53.3

* Rates calculated separately for each region and degree level, so the cell numbers and rates cannot be summed.

fer degrees at multiple levels and the rates are calculated against the base of all institutions that offer the specified degree level in that region, hence the percentages or rates cannot be summed. In addition, the calculation simply indicates whether there is some presence of Japanese Studies at an institution that offers a particular level of degree; it does not indicate that a Japanese Studies degree is actually available.

As shown in Table 4.11, at the bachelor's degree level the Pacific has the highest rate of penetration with some presence of Japanese Studies at one-third of all institutions offering the BA, followed by the Northeast at about 30 percent. At the MA level the Northeast and Pacific

are both above one-third, and the small Southwest-Mountain region is even higher, presumably because of a small total number of institutions. The other three areas are not far behind with some presence of Japanese Studies at over a quarter of all institutions offering the MA. The results are most dramatic at the doctoral level, where more than half of all institutions that offer PhD degrees in the Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, Midwest and Pacific regions have some presence of Japanese Studies. The South and Southwest-Mountain regions are lower, but still very respectable.

Limits of These Measures

We have gone as far as we can using our broadest measure, in which we combine academic institutions with full entries in the directory of Japanese Studies with additional academic institutions that were identified through the affiliations of Japan specialists listed in the specialists' directory. While this has allowed us to examine in very general terms where there is some presence of Japanese Studies both geographically and in terms of different structural aspects of academic institutions, and has helped to clear up the discrepancy between staff lists and entries in the specialist directory, it does not really tell us much about the actual academic programs in Japanese Studies that these people and institutions represent. For that, we must turn to the data provided by institutions about their Japanese Studies programs, supplemented with what Japan specialists have told us in their survey about their experiences in these programs. We begin with academic courses, which are not only the most basic building blocks of academic study of Japan in the United States, but also offer the most complete and reliable data we have been able to collect about academic programs in Japanese Studies.

5

Academic Courses on Japan

In this chapter and the next one we will examine the array of opportunities to learn about Japan that are currently offered by and through academic institutions in the United States, using the information collected through our directory questionnaire and the additional surveys to both Japanese Studies institutions and Japan specialists.

We will focus on individual instructional course offerings in this chapter, since these are the basic building blocks of instruction in the American higher educational system. In our survey, the course offerings are also the most comprehensive and reliable form of data we were able to collect about academic programs in Japanese Studies. Although the specific courses may change somewhat from year to year, they offer a very detailed picture of the range and nature of the options available to students at a particular institution. They also are the vehicle by which students who are not Japanese Studies majors may sample the field, so they represent the broadest way that Japanese Studies is offered at an academic institution.

Most courses are available to all students who meet the basic prerequisites, regardless of whether they are enrolled in a degree program in that field or not. In fact, more than half of the course credits that students must acquire in order to obtain an undergraduate degree are either used to fulfill general education requirements across several disciplines, or are electives that the student can choose. General education requirements typically include a basic foreign language requirement, and some students may meet this requirement with Japanese language courses. Students may also take Japan-related area courses as electives.

As noted in the introduction, the American higher education system is distinctive in that only a relatively small proportion of all the courses that a student takes, perhaps a quarter, are counted as part of an academic major or minor. A distinction is often made between lower division courses that students normally take in their first two years to fulfill general education requirements, and upper division courses that students take as juniors or seniors to meet the requirements of their major or as electives. We will also look at graduate courses as part of this assessment, since graduate education is an intrinsic part of Japanese Studies in American higher education. Even at the graduate level, students may take both language and area courses and seminars on Japan that are independent of their specific degree program.

In chapter 4 we used an expanded data set to examine staffing, by combining the 248 programs with entries in the 2012 directory with a secondary list of 163 institutions that have at least one Japan specialist on their staff, whether or not they have an academic program

related to Japan. We now must abandon that strategy and look only at the data we have collected directly from institutions. Even then, things are not straightforward because our data are inevitably incomplete. Although we have 248 entries in the directory, we did not have staffing information from all of them and we also do not have course information for all of those programs. We will look both at Japanese language courses and at academic courses that are all or partly about Japan, using the maximum number of cases available for each analysis.

Our online data collection system presented institutional respondents with a list of the courses their program had reported in 2005, and asked them to indicate on the form whether the course was still being offered as before, had been changed, or had been dropped. We then asked them to add any new courses. The information we requested theoretically allows us to examine quite directly what has happened to Japanese Studies courses over the past decade, because we retained considerable data from the old courses. As was true in 2005, twice as many new courses have been added as have been dropped. Of the 1,702 new courses, two-thirds (1151) were area courses while the rest were language courses. One-fifth (340) of the new courses were from 29 institutions that had only a secondary entry in the directory in 2005. The remaining 80 percent of the new courses came from institutions that had a full entry in the 2005 directory. Needless to say, we only know about courses that were dropped if the program had an entry in the 2005 directory. Of the 792 courses dropped since 2005, 80 percent (635) were area courses and the remaining 20 percent were language courses. If we omit the programs that did not have courses reported for the 2005 directory, there is still a 72 percent increase in new courses at the institutions that did have a program entry in 2005. A word of caution is in order here. We are only looking at whether courses were listed as "new" as opposed to those that previously existed at the institution. This is not a measure of the overall increase in courses, but only indicates that there is a fair amount of curricular revision taking place. That is normal in the American academic world, where individual faculty members can usually create new courses quite easily within their department, unlike the situation in Japan where such courses have to be approved at much higher administrative levels. This flexibility allows Japanese Studies programs to respond to student demand fairly quickly.

The basic course unit that institutions report is either a semester with two semesters per academic year, or the quarter, with three quarters per academic year. The majority of institutions use the semester system, but a substantial minority use quarters. Most academic courses change some part of their identifier if they continue for more than one quarter or semester, and in that case we would have separate records for each unit. A few institutions reported only one entry for each year level of their Japanese language courses. We have made some adjustments to regularize the course data, and we believe any remaining anomalies in the three types of courses balance out so that the number of courses can be thought of as roughly corresponding to the number of semester courses offered.

There were 248 academic institutions in the United States with program entries in the 2005 directory, but only 231 reported any courses. Of these, 21 reported only language and no area courses, while 17 others reported only area courses and no Japanese language instruction. These 231 institutions reported a total of 6, 205 current course offerings with some coverage of Japan, including both language and area offerings. The total number of courses reported increased by 13 percent over the number reported in 2005, as shown in Table 5.1, which includes both language and area courses. The increase is found across the board: it occurs at all levels and both for courses exclusively on Japan and for multinational courses that include some Japan content. This is very clear evidence that instruction on Japan has continued to broaden and deepen. The increase is slightly greater (14.8%) in upper division courses, where advanced

Table 5.1. Courses Related to Japan, by Course Level and Extent of Content on Japan, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

Level / Content	Year	Lower Division		Upper Division		Graduate		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Exclusively on Japan	1995	1,260	35.2	1,695	47.3	629	17.6	3,584	79.5
	2005	1,355	31.8	2,245	52.7	661	15.5	4,261	77.6
	2012	1,580	33.0	2,585	53.9	628	13.1	4,793	77.2
Multinational with Japan	1995	285	30.9	474	51.4	163	17.7	922	20.5
	2005	411	33.5	629	51.2	188	15.3	1,228	22.4
	2012	467	33.1	713	50.5	232	16.4		20.7
Total on Japan	1995	1,545	34.3	2,169	48.1	792	17.6	4,506	100.0
	2005	1,766	32.2	2,873	52.4	848	15.5	5,489	100.0
	2012	2,047	33.0	3.298	53.2	860	13.9	6.205	100.0
% Increase in 2012			+13.9		+14.8		+1.4		+13.0

* Data from 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 7.1, Chapter 7, page 168. Data for 2005 and data for 1995 reproduced in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 6.1, p. 114.

language courses and specialized area courses are generally offered as compared to lower division basic courses. There is only a slight increase at the graduate level, in part probably because many advanced language courses are now offered to upper-division undergraduates.

Over three-quarters of the courses are exclusively on Japan. The counts are somewhat confounded by the fact that large Japanese Studies programs tend not to report their multinational courses, while small programs report them even if the Japan content is relatively small. Our counts are always incomplete; consequently, the number of courses that we have documented here should really be considered a very conservative estimate of the actual number of courses related to Japan that are currently being offered in the United States.

As in previous studies, we used each institution's course numbering system, department and course title to code the courses according to the same disciplinary categories used by Japan specialists in the study to identify their own disciplines. The courses were distributed across 52 disciplines, four more than in 2005, plus 162 courses that could not be classified and were coded as "other." These "other" courses were primarily directed readings or other forms of independent work that programs offer to accommodate individual circumstances. They are included in our tallies because the institutions included them in their course listings, and they do represent additional opportunities for students to do individualized work related to Japan.

The additional disciplines are partly a coding artifact. Our coding system for disciplines gets expanded when specialists want to add new disciplines, when in fact some of these may have been incorporated in a more traditional discipline in the past. They reflect the fluidity of disciplinary categories in general, and we take note of them because they are indicators of how the field is changing over time. However in some cases we recombine them into older categories in order to make comparisons with earlier data. For example, the category of political economy has been available as a discipline for some time, as has international relations, but in earlier studies we may have coded such courses as political science. When this causes anomalies in the comparisons, we combine the categories. Similarly, we have distinguished courses

on translation and those on second language acquisition because they are increasingly being recognized as separate disciplinary categories. However, previously these courses might just have been coded as language or literature courses. The one clear case where a new category does not easily fit into old ones is popular culture. It is a clear manifestation of the ascendance of the cultural studies paradigm in American Japanese Studies.

In the following sections we will examine in more detail first Japanese language courses and then area courses that contain Japan content. Whenever possible we will make comparisons with data from earlier studies in order to examine the long-term trajectory of academic instruction on Japan in the United States, adapting the coding as needed.

Japanese Language Courses

By far the largest single group of courses is 1,994 Japanese language courses, which comprise over 30 percent (32.1%) of all Japan-related courses. This is a 15.6 percent increase in the number of Japanese language courses using the same criteria as in 2005. However, this figure does not include 199 literature courses and 66 linguistics courses taught in Japanese, plus smaller numbers in other disciplines that are either taught in Japanese or rely heavily on Japanese language materials. All graduate level courses and seminars taught primarily in Japanese were coded in their respective disciplines, although they were also identified as requiring Japanese language. If we include all of these additional courses that are essentially taught using Japanese language, a total of 2,425 courses involve teaching or using Japanese language. These courses now account for nearly 40 percent (39.1%) of the total of 6,205 courses with Japan content.

Of the 2,425 Japanese language courses and disciplinary courses that use Japanese language materials, we have coded 17.8 percent, or 431 courses, in disciplines outside of regular language departments and programs. This is an increase of 51 percent over the 2005 number. These include advanced courses reading original Japanese materials that are offered in various departments, plus linguistics courses analyzing aspects of the Japanese language, second language acquisition courses dealing with Japanese language pedagogy at an advanced level, and specialized courses in technical Japanese for fields as diverse as law and engineering. Table 5.2 shows the distribution of all courses that use Japanese language materials, with percentages also calculated only for those coded as disciplinary offerings.

We have been able to code most of these 2,425 courses into nine categories of language courses. The categories include the basic levels of language instruction, plus a variety of specialized offerings such as accelerated courses, courses that teach Japanese language needed for particular professional and technical fields such as business, law, and engineering, and advanced courses that develop Japanese skills for communicating orally and in writing, and for reading materials in various genres. The categories encompass the full range of Japanese courses and seminars available, but they do not fall as neatly into an ordered sequence as one might expect.

The first four categories represent basic years of language instruction, which normally include all four language skills. However, many smaller programs offer three levels of regular language courses and then offer more specialized courses at the fourth level. Hence there is some inevitable overlap between these two categories. Accelerated courses are normally offered to compress the basics of first and second year Japanese into one year, or to offer a year's work or more in one intensive summer session. They thus overlap with the offerings in first and second year Japanese, but need to be counted separately. In addition, some of the larger

Table 5.2. Disciplines Offering Courses Using Japanese Language Materials, 2005 and 2012

	# of Courses Using Japanese		% of All Language Courses		% of Courses Outside Language Program	
Discipline	2005	2012	2005	2012	2005	2012
Anthropology	1	0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0
History	8	9	0.4	0.4	2.8	2.1
Linguistics	53	66	2.6	2.7	18.6	15.3
Literature	134	199	6.7	8.2	47.0	46.2
Political Science	3	2	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.5
Religion-Philosophy	2	6	0.1	0.2	0.7	1.4
Performing Arts	1	4	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.9
Film Studies	8	12	0.4	0.5	2.8	2.8
Women's Studies	3	1	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.2
Culture-Civilization	22	37	1.1	1.5	7.7	8.6
Japanese Lang. Program	1725	1994	85.8	82.2	–	–
2nd Language Acquisition		8		0.3		1.9
Translation		18		0.7		4.2
Other	50	69	2.4	2.8	17.5	16.0
Total	2010	2425	100%	100%	285	431

* Data for 2005 from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 6.2, p. 116.

programs now offer additional tracks at the first and even second year level to accommodate students who have some prior Japanese language exposure or training but are not ready for the higher level offerings. These have been counted within the respective language levels.

Classical Japanese or kambun courses are normally offered only to students who have completed three or four years of regular Japanese courses, whereas the specialized courses for professional and technical fields may be offered at lower levels, as alternatives to the regular sequence of language courses. However, some of these courses are offered at higher levels to develop specialized vocabulary and reading skills to students who already have a strong foundation in Japanese. Most of the disciplinary courses that use Japanese materials have been coded either as advanced reading courses or as courses for specialized professional needs.

Table 5.3 shows the number of courses of each type, and the number of institutions offering courses of that type. The base is all programs that offer Japanese language, omitting the small number of seventeen programs that offer only area courses and not language. Just under forty percent of all Japanese language courses are basic courses at the first and second year level, and the addition of the accelerated offerings only raises this slightly. The number of courses is actually slightly higher in the second year, because of offerings that accommodate students with some background. Nearly thirty percent of the courses are listed as regular Japanese courses at the third and fourth year levels. That still leaves another 30 percent of the Japanese classes that represent some sort of specialized training, either as advanced reading or conversation courses, Japanese for a specialized field, or work on an individualized project under the guidance of an instructor. The broad distribution of course offerings indicates that Japanese language training

Table 5.3. Japanese Language Courses by Type, and Number and Percent of Institutions Offering Each Type, 2012, with 2005 Comparison of Number of Institutions

	Language Courses		Institutions Offering Courses		
Course Type	#	%	# 2012	(# 2005)	2012 %*
First Year	493	20.3	214	(172)	100.0
Second Year	458	18.9	201	(167)	93.9
Third Year	404	16.7	167	(138)	78.0
Fourth Year, Advanced	294	12.1	120	(92)	56.1
Advanced Reading or Conversation	313	12.9	79	(65)	36.9
Classical, Kambun	98	4.0	37	(35)	17.3
Accelerated	56	2.3	26	(22)	12.0
Specialized Field	173	7.1	67	(41)	31.3
Individual, Tutorial	136	5.6	65	(56)	30.4
Total	2,425	100.0	214	(174)	

* Percents in this column cannot be added together. Data for 2005 from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 6.3 p.117.

in the U.S. has matured into a complex enterprise that handles diverse needs and skill levels. However, counting courses inevitably shifts the balance toward the introductory level offerings and obscures the reach of the more advanced and specialized options.

Looking at the number of institutions that offer each type of Japanese language course provides another perspective, one that emphasizes how widely these various types of offerings are available. Overall, 214 of the 231 academic institutions with program entries in the directory of Japanese Studies institutions that reported their courses offer first year Japanese. The other seventeen offer no Japanese language instruction. The number of institutions drops off only slightly for the second year. Nearly four out of five (78 %) of the institutions offering Japanese language now offer at least three years of basic instruction, and over half (56.1%) offer fourth year regular Japanese courses. Over a third (36.9%) offer advanced reading or conversation courses, and 17 percent offer classical Japanese or kambun courses. Nearly a third (30.4%) offer separate courses for students in professional and technical fields.

Another way of examining language offerings and making comparisons over time is to ask what is the highest level of Japanese language courses available as on-campus, in-classroom instruction at each institution. Previous studies have been tracking this since the 1970s, so we can add our 2012 data to the series. These statistics combine offerings at the fourth year or higher, thus avoiding some of the ambiguity in our more detailed classification. The comparisons are shown in Table 5.4, below. The data demonstrate dramatically the increased depth and strength that Japanese language programs have achieved in less than a decade. Only a handful of programs offer just one year of Japanese in 2012, and a relatively small percentage (14.0%) stop at two years. The same number (39) stop at three years as in 2005, but they constitute a smaller percentage of the total in 2012. The most dramatic changes in Japanese language instruction are at the top end of the scale. The number of programs offering four or more years of Japanese has grown by 25 percent, and just over 60 percent of all Japanese language programs offer four years or more of classroom language instruction. This is clear evidence that Japanese Studies programs in the United States are steadily becoming stronger, broader, and deeper.

Table 5.4. Highest Level of Japanese Language Courses Available at Schools Offering On-Campus, In-Classroom Language Instruction, 1977, 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

Highest Level of Japanese	1977		1984		1995		2005		2012	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
First Year	30	27.8	29	19.0	31	14.8	5	2.9	12	5.6
Second Year	22	20.4	34	22.2	59	28.2	26	14.9	30	14.0
Third Year	23	21.3	34	22.2	46	22.0	39	22.4	39	18.2
Fourth Year or higher	33	30.6	33	21.6	73	34.9	104	59.8	131	61.2
Not Clear	–	–	23	15.0	–	–				
Total	108	100.1	153	100.0	209	99.9	174	100.0	214	99.0

* 1977 data from 1977 CULCON Report, Table 4, p. 17; 1984 data from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table 18, p. 38. Data for 1977, 1984, and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 7.12, Chapter 7, page 185. Data from 2005 and earlier data republished in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 6.4, p. 118.

Enrollment data are available for only about 20 percent of the language courses reported to the study. The results are shown in Table 5.5, with corresponding figures for 1995 and 2005. Although the number of institutions reporting language course enrollments is lower, the actual number of enrollments reported is still 90 percent of the total enrollment reported in 2005, which suggests that the unreported actual enrollment must be substantially more. We still need to take the numbers with a grain of salt because they represent a smaller proportion of the total. Yet the change in the proportional distribution of enrollments within each study over the past 18 years is quite astonishing. In 1995, first and second year Japanese accounted for over three quarters of all Japanese language enrollments reported. By 2005 this had dropped to two-thirds of all Japanese language course enrollments. Now in 2012, this has dropped further to less than half of all the reported enrollments! The data also show clearly that this increase in higher level Japanese language courses has taken place in the context of steadily increasing number of courses at the basic levels.

It has been a truism in Japanese Studies that Japanese language enrollments drop substantially after the first year, and then fall steadily at higher levels. Our findings in 2005 showed no drop at all in the number of courses offered at the first and second year, but enrollment in the second year dropped to about half the first year level. This year the pattern was similar except that average enrollments in second year courses was abnormally high, which may be an artifact of the smaller sample size. What is more remarkable is that average enrollments remain higher than in previous studies at the third, fourth, and higher levels. It is these solid enrollments that allow Japanese language programs to continue offering higher level language courses and to diversify their advanced offerings. At the third year level, the decrease of only eight percent in numbers of courses and about 40 percent in enrollments indicates that substantial numbers of students continue through the third year. In fact, the number of third year Japanese courses reported in 2012 is about the same as the number of second year courses offered in 2005. Substantially more courses are offered at the fourth year level in 2012. There is only a 40 percent decrease in the number of Japanese language courses from the first year to the fourth, and the average enrollment at the fourth year level is still very solid, although the number of courses for which enrollment data was available is rather small. The number of programs offering a

Table 5.5. Japanese Language Courses and Course Enrollments for 1995, 2005, and 2012, by Course Level or Type*

	Courses			Enrollment		
Level and Year	#	% of courses	# with enrollment	Total enrollment	Mean enrollment	% of enroll-ments
1995						
First Year	459	29.1	268	17,748	66.2	55.0
Second Year	385	24.4	205	7,740	37.8	23.9
Third Year	270	17.1	129	3,830	29.7	11.9
Fourth Year	146	9.2	80	1,290	16.2	4.0
Advanced, Special	79	5.0	28	392	14.0	1.2
Classical	46	2.9	20	257	12.9	0.8
Accelerated	58	3.7	33	356	10.8	1.1
Business, Technical	90	5.7	37	588	15.9	1.8
Directed Reading	47	3.0	16	146	9.1	0.5
Total	1,580	100.1	816	32,347	39.6	100.2
2005						
First Year	400	20.1	188	7,547	40.1	44.1
Second Year	409	20.5	181	3,881	21.4	22.7
Third Year	330	16.5	149	2,070	13.9	12.1
Fourth Year	202	10.1	103	1,572	16.3	9.2
Advanced, Special	237	11.9	153	877	5.7	5.1
Classical	87	4.4	51	204	4.0	1.2
Accelerated	68	3.4	42	352	8.4	2.1
Business, Technical	140	7.0	88	525	6.0	3.1
Directed Reading	121	6.1	60	78	1.3	0.5
Total	1,995	100.0	1,015	17,106	16.6	100.1
2012						
First Year	493	20.3	115	7,041	24.7	24.7
Second Year	458	18.9	102	4,079	39.99	21.9
Third Year	404	16.7	84	2,019	24.04	18.1
Fourth Year	294	12.1	54	972	18.0	11.6
Advanced, Special	313	12.9	44	500	11.36	9.5
Classical	98	4.0	11	120	10.91	2.4
Accelerated	56	2.3	5	55	11.0	1.1
Business, Technical	173	7.1	33	457	13.85	7.1
Directed Reading	136	5.6	17	162	9.53	3.7
Total	2,425	100.0	465	15,405	33.13	100.0

* Enrollments for 1995 based on number of courses for which institutions reported enrollment figures for 1992-93 academic year. Enrollments for 2005 based on number of courses for which institutions reported enrollment figures for the 2003-2004 academic year. Data for 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 7.13, Chapter 7, page 186 and reported in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 6.5 p. 119.

fourth level of regular Japanese instruction has grown by about 45 percent, but in addition, there has been a proliferation of specialized courses at even more advanced levels.

The number of courses coded as advanced and specialized had tripled from the 79 reported in 1995 to 237 reported in 2005, and is even higher in 2012 at 313. while the number of courses in classical Japanese has nearly doubled, from 46 to 87. Even courses in business and technical Japanese, which one might have expected would fade after the Japan boom ended, are up by more than 50 percent, from 90 reported in 1995 to 140 in 2005. In many cases, this also represents an expansion of the offerings in business or technical Japanese to provide more advanced training. Whereas in 1995 there may have been one or two semesters offered, now there may be three or four levels available. Although the mean enrollment figures for these courses appear to be quite low, at most institutions even higher level and specialized language courses must meet institutional enrollment quotas or face elimination. It is likely that some of the more specialized courses are offered once every one or two years, rather than every semester. The demand for higher levels of Japanese language instruction also translates into more demand for individualized instruction so that students can work on independent projects and theses under faculty guidance. This is reflected in a 157 percent increase in the number of such offerings, from 47 in 1995 to 121 in 2005 and 136 in 2012. The clear implication is that there are more students now in American institutions who have acquired sufficient Japanese language ability to read natural language materials and to do independent work using Japanese.

Other evidence indicates that many of those now enrolled in higher level Japanese courses are students who entered college Japanese classes with prior exposure to the language. Our surveys in 1995 and 2005 asked institutions to estimate the percent of students entering their college level Japanese language classes who had prior exposure to Japanese from five sources, each of which constituted a separate question so the totals may add up to more than 100 percent. In general, the response rate for this set of questions is fairly low because the questionnaires are often completed by persons who do not have direct experience with the institution's lower level language courses. The smaller sample in 2005 reported essentially the same percentages of entering Japanese language students who grew up in Japan and small increases in the percentage who had used Japanese at home with a native-speaking parent or had studied it at another college or university. There was a 25% decrease in the percentage of students who were reported as having lived in Japan for a year or more. Since the question asked about students entering college Japanese classes, this would presumably refer to students who participated in exchange programs during high school or had lived in Japan with their families at an earlier age. It would not include most students who participate in college level study abroad programs after they have taken some Japanese at the institution. The most impressive finding, however, was a 40% increase in the percentage of students who had studied Japanese in high school, which now accounts for more than one in eight entering Japanese language students. The comparisons for 2012 with these earlier findings are shown below in Table 5.6.

Clearly, part of the dramatic increase in higher levels of Japanese courses at the college level is attributable to the increased availability of Japanese language courses at the high school level in the United States. That number now stands at 15 percent. Although our study does not attempt to track this phenomenon directly, other organizations have been monitoring and developing Japanese language instruction at the K-12 levels for some time. Their efforts have been so successful that an advanced placement exam is now available for Japanese. High school students who take Japanese courses meeting certain content standards and who score well on the AP exam can receive college credit for their achievements in high school Japanese language classes, just as they can do for advanced work in other academic fields and in European languages. Japa-

Table 5.6. Estimated Percentage of Students Entering Japanese Language Programs Who Have Prior Japanese Language Exposure*

	1995		2005		2012	
Type of Prior Exposure to Japanese	# of Institutions	% of Students	# of Institutions	% of Students	# of Institutions	% of Students
Grew up in Japan, learned as a child	100	3.37	35	3.34	52	2.4
Use at home, native-speaking parent	114	4.78	45	5.80	69	3.9
Studied at another college or university	110	6.44	54	7.00	73	10.7
Lived in Japan one year or more	123	7.39	54	5.59	81	6.0
Studied Japanese in high school	118	9.21	59	12.93	90	15.4

* Percentage given is the average of percentages reported by all institutions (# of Institutions) responding to the question. Each question is separate, so neither numbers nor percentages can be added. Data for 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 7.14, Chapter 7, page 188. Reported in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*, Table.6.6, p.120.

nese is now the fourth most commonly taught language in the United States, in both high school and college (and ahead of Chinese). This is in large measure because of these developments at the high school level and their impact on enrollments in college courses in Japanese.

By every measure, then, the language component of Japanese Studies programs in the United States has grown deeper and richer over the past decade. The strength of the language offerings provides a strong base for the area courses in Japanese Studies. We turn now to a closer examination of those courses.

Area Courses with Japan Content

In this section our analysis will exclude the formal Japanese language courses offered by language programs and look more closely at area courses exclusively on Japan and multinational courses that include content on Japan. We retain for this analysis the higher level courses using Japanese materials that are classified in a discipline such as literature, linguistics, or history. We also retain a substantial number of non-language courses that are offered by Japanese language programs but taught in English. These include not only Japanese literature and film courses, but also some courses on Japanese culture and society or language and society. If they are offered within a language and literature or language and culture department, we have generally coded them as Japanese studies or sociolinguistics courses, unless they are taught by a social scientist. As noted above, courses related to Japan are now being offered in 52 disciplines. Table 5.7 shows only those disciplines in which 25 or more courses are offered, by course level. They are listed in descending order by number of courses.

There have been several changes in the rank ordering of the courses by discipline over the past decade, as well as some new entries. The top six disciplines remain the same as in 2005, with even larger numbers of courses, but Linguistics has now dropped below Buddhist Studies and Film Studies. Anthropology has also dropped below Linguistics.

Table 5.7. Japanese Area Courses in Disciplines with 25 or More Courses, by Course Level, 2012*

Course Level / Discipline	Lower Division		Upper Division		Graduate		Total		% Change since 2005
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
History	227	21.3	432	18.1	79	10.4	738	17.5	+2.5
Literature	136	12.8	404	16.9	144	23.3	684	16.2	11.2
Art History	100	9.4	170	7.1	40	5.3	310	7.4	+6.2
Japanese Studies	105	9.9	168	7.0	35	4.6	308	7.3	+7.7
Political Science	36	3.4	162	6.8	48	6.3	246	5.8	-12.5
Religion	77	7.2	100	4.2	28	3.7	205	4.9	+15.8
Buddhist Studies	44	4.1	92	3.9	29	3.8	165	3.9	+10.0
Film Studies	52	4.9	99	4.1	12	1.6	163	3.9	+48.2
Linguistics	11	1.0	72	3.0	78	10.3	161	3.8	-5.8
Anthropology	21	2.0	76	3.2	31	4.1	128	3.0	+6.7
East Asian Studies	36	3.4	53	2.2	19	1.3	108	2.6	+24.1
Popular Culture	37	3.5	43	1.8	5	0.7	85	2.0	new
Asian Studies	24	2.3	34	1.4	4	0.5	62	1.5	+82.4
Performing Arts	10	0.9	34	1.4	12	1.6	56	1.3	+9.8
Second Lang. Acquis.	1	0.1	20	0.8	33	4.3	54	1.3	+80.0
Philosophy	22	2.1	22	0.9	9	1.2	53	1.3	+3.9
Sociology	15	1.4	29	1.2	8	1.1	52	1.2	+15.6
Economics	8	0.8	29	1.2	10	1.3	47	1.1	-28.8
Japanese Lang.	10	0.9	29	1.2	7	0.9	46	1.3	+43.7
Women's Studies	5	0.5	34	1.4	4	0.5	43	1.0	-12.2
Music	17	1.6	23	1.0	3	0.4	43	1.0	+13.2
Business Mgmt.	4	0.4	16	0.7	20	2.6	40	0.9	-16.7
Geography	4	0.4	18	0.8	5	0.7	27	0.6	-3.6
Architecture	3	0.3	17	0.7	5	0.7	25	0.6	new
All Other	59	5.5	212	8.9	91	12.0	362	8.6	+43.0
Total	1064	100.0	2388	99.9	759	100	4211	101	+11.9

* This table excludes Japanese language courses, but includes all area courses either on Japan exclusively or including coverage of Japan in a multinational course. It also includes disciplinary courses that use Japanese language materials. Disciplines are ordered by number of courses reported.

The column showing percent change since 2005 sheds further light on what has happened over the past several years. Two new disciplines are represented with 25 courses or more (Popular Culture and Architecture), in addition to three of the four new ones in 2005 (East Asian Studies, non-language courses offered in Japanese language programs, and Second Language Acquisition). One of the new entries in 2005, Law, has now dropped below the 25 course threshold. If such courses had existed earlier, they would have been lumped into the "all other category" but despite all the new categories with 25 or more courses, the number in "all other" has also increased. Overall, there are big increases in Film Studies, East Asian

Studies, and the new category of Popular Culture. A cluster of language-related fields also shows considerable growth, including Second-Language Acquisition,and the courses offered by Japanese language programs that are not language-skill courses. History remains in first place but with a modest rate of increase. Several smaller fields have shown growth of more than 20 percent, but all of these also reflect the relatively small number of courses reported previously.

These changes make sense in the context of the overall paradigm shift in Japanese Studies in the United States that we have sketched out in chapter one. The growth in Japanese Studies and East Asian Studies courses reflects the expansion and in some cases the reorganization of programs and the accompanying development of topical or thematic courses that cut across traditional disciplinary boundaries. In our coding, we placed courses within a standard disciplinary category if we could discern one. This time, we found a much greater number of courses that were offered by Japanese Language and Culture, Japanese Studies, or East Asian Studies programs, but could not be readily reassigned to a discipline.

There have always been interdisciplinary foundational courses in the study of Asia in American institutions that cut across history, literature, philosophy, religion, and the arts to introduce students to a new part of the world. What is different now is that these approaches have been reinforced and reinvigorated under the rubric of cultural studies, which also brings with it an interest in a much broader range of cultural representations that the old high culture approach to civilizations under the Language and Area Studies paradigm would have ignored. Hence the dramatic increase in courses in film and cinema studies must be regarded as part of the same phenomenon, and in fact many of the new film courses are offered by language and culture or language and civilizations programs. While the names "Japanese Studies" and "East Asian Studies" may seem to perpetuate the older area studies tradition, that model encouraged the development of courses about an area from the perspective of a particular discipline. Even if courses were offered under the Japanese Studies, Asian Studies, or East Asian Studies name for institutional convenience, most courses beyond the basic foundation offerings were easily recognizable as belonging to another discipline and in fact were often offered by faculty in a discipline and cross-listed. Some of that can still be seen, but the dramatic increase in courses that cannot be assigned to any traditional discipline that we first noted in 2005 points to something new and different.

The slower increase and in some cases actual decrease in the number of courses in some social sciences and in the professions can be seen as the counterpart of this paradigm shift, and represents the waning of the economic competition paradigm that was so prominent in the 1990s. Within Japanese Studies, the heightened interest in Japan and dominance of the economic competition paradigm during the early 1990s obscured for a while both the emergence of cultural studies and the impact of the intellectual attack on area studies that arose concurrently. The rejection of area studies was most severe in the social sciences, and produced both the hostility and indifference that social scientists in Japanese Studies reported from their disciplines and a strong resistance by departments to replacing Japan specialists in the social sciences when they retired. It is also more difficult to accommodate social scientists and social science training within Japanese Studies and East Asian Studies programs, although cultural studies does borrow freely from social science theories and apply them in its research. The end result is that if the social science disciplines are not willing to hire Japan specialists and let them teach courses about Japan, those courses either get transformed into topics that can be taught by persons who are not social scientists, or they begin to disappear from the Japanese Studies curriculum.

Traditionally, anthropology and sociology have offered courses on Japanese culture or Japanese society within social science departments, taught by Japan specialists who were trained as anthropologists and sociologists. Within Japanese Studies these fields are very similar; however, the disciplines themselves remain reasonably distinct in training and orientation, although at many smaller institutions the departments are combined. The number of courses on Japanese culture or society offered in these social science departments has increased somewhat this time, but there are also more courses offered within Japanese language and literature, or Japanese language and culture departments with titles such as "Japanese language and society," or "Japanese language and culture." Since these courses are primarily taught by persons with credentials in Japanese language and linguistics or in the humanities, we have treated them according to the department in which they are offered and have not coded them as Anthropology or Sociology unless they are taught by persons with training in those disciplines.

The overall increase in the cluster of language-related disciplines can be understood as a parallel and partially independent process. Most basically, as the teaching of Japanese has expanded and become more firmly integrated into academic programs in the United States, the credentials needed for full academic appointments have increased. While Japanese language programs may still employ graduate assistants, lecturers, and instructors to teach basic skill classes and drill sessions, they also need faculty with doctorates to oversee the programs, teach more advanced language courses, and offer related academic courses.

The credentials for these faculty members most commonly are doctorates in literature, linguistics, or language pedagogy (or second language acquisition). These are research degrees and research level academic appointments, so the persons who hold them not only expect to teach courses in their field, but also must conduct research in order to meet requirements for tenure and promotion. The larger programs that offer graduate degrees also must offer advanced training to the next generation of professionals in these same fields. All of these pressures lead to additional course offerings not only in Japanese literature, but also in Japanese linguistics and in language pedagogy, particularly at the graduate level. Similarly, the increased demand for Japanese language teachers for secondary schools has also led to the development of new courses in Japanese language pedagogy at the upper division undergraduate level, to train and certify prospective high school Japanese language teachers. Our coding placed courses explicitly listed as linguistics into the linguistics disciplinary category. Courses offered through second language acquisition programs remained in that category, but some language pedagogy courses offered by Japanese language programs were left within the Japanese language category and were treated as language courses.

One further factor that influences a quantitative assessment of area courses in Japanese Studies must also be noted. At the most basic level, a program adds one course on Japan to its offerings, or perhaps one at the undergraduate and one at the graduate level, taught by the same person. However there is considerable variation between disciplines in terms of the potential for expansion beyond that level. In humanities disciplines, the study of Japan is readily sub-divided by genre or historical period, and specialists become expert in specific genres or historical periods. It therefore is relatively easy to argue for expanding the Japanese offerings through dividing them by genre or historical period, and adding courses or new specialists who can cover these variations. In the social sciences, some fields do recognize geographic or cultural divisions, while others do not. In either case, the primary subdivisions within the disciplines are based on conceptual categories that theoretically can be applied to any geographic area. In hiring a Japan specialist, a social science discipline is also bringing in a person with

expertise in one or more of the conceptually defined subfields of the discipline, who can also teach courses about the geographic and cultural area of Japan. Only in a very large department, or one with an unusually strong emphasis on Asia, would the disciplinary logic encourage the hiring of more than one specialist on Japan, or having one specialist teach a variety of different courses about Japan. Hence courses about Japan are most likely to proliferate within a language and literature or language and culture program that specializes in Japan or East Asia, and are next most likely to do so where the discipline's internal categories recognize geographic units and then historical periods or genres within them.

How Much Japan Content is in the Course?

With this understanding of the overall changes in the distribution of courses with Japan content and their implications over the past decade, we now take a closer look at whether there are different patterns in the array of courses exclusively about Japan, as opposed to multinational courses that contain Japan content. Surveys have been counting courses exclusively on Japan since 1977, so in order to extend the longitudinal analysis we first tried to use the same categories that have been used for the past three decades. This provides a reasonable picture of the major disciplines that have remained important in Japanese Studies for the past three decades, but it obscures important changes that fall outside this realm. The same problem arose with the evaluation of multinational courses with Japan content when we used the disciplinary categories from the earliest study that measured such courses, the 1984 study. Clearly, using the old disciplinary categories alone is not a useful way to analyze these data.

What we most want to know now is how each discipline's courses are divided between exclusively Japan and multinational courses, which will provide a clear measure of the intensity with which Japan is studied in each discipline. A more effective approach to analyzing our current data on these two types of courses is to use the list of disciplines with 25 or more courses that we constructed for Table 5.7, and examine the internal distribution of these courses by whether they are exclusively on Japan or not. These results are shown in Table 5.8, below. Because our interest now is whether the courses are more likely to be exclusively on Japan or only partially on Japan, we present the percentages so they total to 100 for each discipline. However, the total column gives the percentage distribution that each discipline contributes to the whole, as in the previous Table 5.7.

Overall, two thirds of all the area courses are on Japan exclusively, and only one third are multinational in content. Within that general division, this table reveals great variations between disciplines in the intensity of their focus on Japan. Some disciplines that have 25 or more courses with Japan content actually have very few courses that are exclusively on Japan. While there is certainly merit to studying Japan within a larger context, six of the disciplines on the list have fewer than 25 courses that are exclusively on Japan. East Asian Studies catapulted into the middle of the ranking with only two courses exclusively on Japan, and Asian Studies had only three. This makes sense in terms of the mission of Asian Studies and East Asian Studies programs, but it also dilutes the emphasis on Japan. To clarify the situation, we include a column in Table 5.8 that gives the ranking of disciplines based on courses that are exclusively on Japan, omitting the "other" category and eliminating disciplines with less than 25 courses exclusively on Japan. The top six disciplines remain in the top ten, but Buddhist Studies drops out and Popular Culture leaps into ninth place.

In order to reconcile the current situation with the categories from previous studies so that we can look at change over time in the distribution of courses, we have developed a compromise solution. We will retain the specific categories used for previous studies, which included some

Table 5.8. Japanese Area Courses in Disciplines with 25 or More Courses, by Whether Content is Exclusively on Japan or Multinational, 2012*

Discipline	Exclusively on Japan		Multinational with Japan		Total		Rank Japan Only
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
History	524	71.0	214	29.0	738	17.5	1
Literature	597	87.3	87	12.7	684	16.2	2
Art History	184	59.4	126	40.6	310	7.4	4
Japanese Studies	289	93.8	19	6.2	308	7.3	3
Political Science	106	42.9	141	57.1	247	5.9	7
Religion	103	50.2	102	49.8	205	4.8	8
Buddhist Studies	62	37.6	103	62.4	165	3.9	11
Film Studies	128	78.5	35	21.5	163	3.9	6
Linguistics	144	89.4	17	10.6	161	3.8	5
Anthropology	70	63.1	41	36.9	111	2.6	10
East Asian Studies	2	1.9	105	98.1	107	2.5	24
Popular Culture	79	92.9	6	7.1	85	2.0	9
Asian Studies	3	5.1	56	94.9	59	1.4	23
Performing Arts	39	69.6	17	30.4	56	1.3	14
Second Lang. Acquis.	41	75.9	13	24.1	54	1.3	13
Sociology	29	55.8	23	44.2	52	1.2	15
Philosophy	16	32.0	34	68.0	50	1.2	20
Economics	21	44.7	26	55.3	47	1.1	18
Japanese Lang.**	43	93.5	3	6.5	46	1.1	12
Music	23	53.5	20	46.5	43	1.0	17
Women's Studies	29	67.4	14	32.6	43	1.0	15
Business Mgmt.	19	47.5	21	52.5	40	0.9	19
Geography	9	33.3	18	66.7	27	0.6	22
Architecture	16	64.0	9	36.0	25	0.6	20
All Other	233	60.5	152	39.5	385	9.1	
Total	2809	66.7	1402	33.3	4211	100.0	

* This table excludes Japanese language courses, but includes all area courses either on Japan exclusively or including coverage of Japan in a multinational course. It also includes disciplinary courses that use Japanese language materials. Disciplines are ordered by total number of courses reported, but ranking column shows order of courses exclusively on Japan..

** non-language skill courses offered by Japanese language program.

logical combined categories that the lists in Table 5.7 and Table 5.8 have separated, such as combining music into the performing arts category, combining Buddhist Studies with religion and philosophy, and combining international management with business. We omit Asian Studies from the culture and civilization category entirely, since its entries are too broad, but we retain both East Asian Studies and Japanese Studies, even though one is primarily composed of multinational courses and the other has primarily courses that are exclusively on Japan. We relegate geography back to the Other category, but separate out the new disciplines that have come to occupy a much larger share of courses related to Japan: Linguistics, Film Studies, and

Women's Studies. This reduces the "other" category to a more manageable level, and allows us to preserve data from the long sequence of prior studies while still looking forward.

Table 5.9 shows the comparative data for courses exclusively on Japan in 1977, 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012. We have ordered them in decreasing rank order for 2012. While we include the actual numbers of courses reported in each study, our comparison focuses on changes in the percent distributions to overcome the large size discrepancies between the samples. Unfortunately, this only provides the relative position of each discipline, so we also need to look at the actual numbers to anchor our analysis further. The first point to note is that the number of area courses exclusively on Japan is 11 percent greater in 2012 than it was in 2005, and 40 percent larger than it was in 1995. Hence the pie is growing, and there is room for new disciplines to emerge without producing a corresponding decline in others.

History and literature each comprise about a fifth of all the area courses exclusively on Japan, so their combined impact is 40 percent of the total). The two disciplines together comprise a somewhat smaller fraction of the total than they did in in each of the previous studies. More important is that History's share has been declining and Literature's has been growing slowly but steadily during the past three decades. The four social sciences represented, Anthropol-

Table 5.9. Area Courses Focusing Exclusively on Japan in 1977, 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012, by Discipline*

	1977		1984		1995		2005		2012	
Discipline	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Literature	168	16.8	167	18.6	391	19.5	556	21.9	597	21.3
History	292	29.3	282	31.3	435	21.7	532	21.0	524	18.7
Culture, Civiliz.	–	–	46	5.1	153	7.6	262	10.3	294	10.5
Art, Art History	81	8.2	97	10.8	179	8.9	174	6.9	184	6.6
Relig.-Philosophy	61	6.1	55	6.1	131	6.5	158	6.2	181	6.4
Linguistics	–	–	–	–	–	–	155	6.1	144	5.1
Film Studies	–	–	–	–	–	–	88	3.5	128	4.6
Political Science	87	8.7	71	7.9	90	4.5	125	4.9	106	3.7
Popular Culture	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	79	2.8
Anthropology	23	2.3	24	2.7	72	3.6	75	3.0	70	2.5
Performing Arts	39	3.9	44	4.9	90	4.5	55	2.2	62	1.3
Gender and Women's Studies	–	–	–	–	–	–	35	1.4	37	0.8
Sociology	24	2.4	14	1.6	53	2.6	30	1.2	29	1.0
Economics	33	3.3	20	2.2	40	2.0	33	1.3	21	0.7
Business	6	0.6	–	–	37	1.8	25	1.0	19	0.7
Other	184	18.4	80	8.9	333	16.6	230	9.1	210	7.2
Total	998	100.0	900	100.1	2004	99.8	2533	100.0	2809	100.0

* 1977 figures from 1977 CULCON Report, Table 5, p. 23; 1984 figures from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table 15, p. 35. Percentages for 1984 were recalculated and rounded to the first decimal place. Data for 1977 include only institutions for which enrollments were reported, so this may slightly undercount courses. Disciplines without enrollment data were included in other in 1977, 1984, and 1995 if there were any courses. Data from 1977, 1984, and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 7.3, Chapter 7, p. 172, and republished with 2005 data in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 6.9, p. 127.

ogy, Economics, Political Science, and Sociology, have small enough individual percentages that the patterns are not striking. However, if we combine their percentages the impact is very clear: together these four disciplines accounted for 16.7 percent of area courses exclusively on Japan in 1977, 14.4 percent of such courses in 1984, 12.7 percent in 1995, 10.4 percent in 2005, and are reduced to under 8 percent of the total in 2012. In contrast, the Culture and Civilization category that first emerged in 1984 with 5.1 percent of the area courses exclusively on Japan, has now doubled to account for 10.5 percent. This is greater than all the social science disciplines combined. If we view the Culture and Civilization category in conjunction with the new Film Studies category and the increase in Literature, the impact of the Cultural Studies paradigm becomes very clear.

Recall our earlier characterization of the Cultural Studies paradigm as emphasizing the study of cultural representations within their cultural, social, economic, and political context, but accepting as legitimate the study of any genre of cultural representation from any part of the society. This is combined with a strong effort to explore subcultures, subgroups, and minorities in Japanese society as elements of a rich, multi-faceted and multi-layered culture that is anything but homogeneous. In History and to some extent the social sciences, this leads also to explorations of Japan's colonial history, and to topical and thematic exploration of historical subjects that combine the actual lives of real people with the cultural representations they generated or that were generated about them.

The evidence of the Cultural Studies paradigm becomes even more striking when we look qualitatively at the titles of the new courses in these fields. There are 135 courses on Japanese film, some of which use film to teach language or history. There are also 83 courses on popular culture, some of which are explicitly on anime. Many of the popular culture courses are offered in language and culture programs as vehicles for language study. Although many of the courses related to women and gender were coded under Literature, the course titles clearly reflect the Cultural Studies paradigm through titles such as: "Construction of Gender in Modern Japanese Women's Writing,", "Japanese Literature in the Feminine Domain,""Gender and Intertextuality in the Tale of Genji," "History of Gender and Sexuality in Japan," and "Japanese Film and Gender Theory."

In 2005 I noted the traces of Cultural Studies in new offerings in history and political science and noted that while calling a course simply "The Samurai" may be pandering to the undergraduate imagination, titles such as "The Samurai Warrior in History, Myth, and Reality" and "Constructing the Samurai" display their Cultural Studies orientations very clearly. This time, in addition to the many courses called Japanese Popular Culture, I was struck by new titles reflecting popular culture themes: "The Gothic and the Supernational in Japanese Literature," Mystery and Crime Fiction in Japan," "Genji to Godzilla: Adaptations of the Classics," and "Japanese Ghosts."

In 1995 our study documented that Japan specialists in the United States were beginning to do research on new topics that we would now identify as having a cultural studies orientation. Course topics now demonstrate the deep penetration of that orientation. To some extent the livelier titles and more focused nature of these new courses also suggests an effort by Japan specialists to attract a broader range of undergraduate students to their courses. The flip side of this is the well-known fact that American youth, just like young people all over the world, have grown up with globalized Japanese popular culture as part of their own daily experience. It is clear from our data that it is anime and manga that are attracting young people to the study of Japanese language and culture today, just as zen did in the 1970s and the prospect of economic gain did in the 1980s. Yet reaching such students through Japanese popular culture and courses

on the samurai is not quite the same as attracting them with zen or with the Japanese economic miracle a generation ago. Japan has already come into their own living rooms through its popular culture. For these young people, the study of Japan has indeed become normalized in American culture. To young people who grew up on Japanese anime and manga even if it was subtitled dubbed, or translated, the sound patterns of Japanese, the visual conventions of manga, and even the body language of everyday Japanese social interaction are already familiar.

To balance our analysis of area courses, we use the same analytical strategy to examine multinational courses with coverage of Japan, comparing the data from previous studies using the same set of disciplinary categories plus additional ones that reflect the emergence of new directions in Japanese Studies. One methodological problem affecting the data on multinational courses with Japan content is that many of the largest Japanese Studies programs do not report such courses, while the smallest programs do. Bearing this distortion in mind, we can examine the changes over time in the distribution of multinational courses with Japan content in Table 5.10. Again, the disciplines are arranged in 2012 rank order. Overall, there was a 14 percent increase from 2005 to 2012 in multinational courses with coverage of Japan. The increase has been steady since 1984 and reflects increased general interest in Japan that encourages its inclusion in broader courses, as well as the more specific increase in student interest in Japan. As noted earlier, multinational courses with some Japanese content are typically the way that fledgling programs can begin to offer some content on Japan even if they do not

Table 5.10 Multinational Courses with Coverage of Japan in 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012, by Discipline*

	1984		1995		2005		2012	
Discipline	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Religion-Philosophy	172	20.0	187	20.3	220	17.9	239	17.0
History	169	19.6	156	16.9	187	15.3	214	15.3
Culture & Civilization	59	6.8	86	9.3	111	9.0	180	12.8
Political Science	114	13.2	105	11.4	156	12.7	141	10.1
Art, Art History	66	7.7	80	8.7	133	10.8	126	9.0
Literature	49	5.7	39	4.2	59	4.8	87	6.2
Film Studies	–	–	–	–	22	1.8	46	3.3
Anthropology	29	3.4	31	3.4	45	3.7	41	2.9
Performing Arts	25	2.9	28	3.0	34	2.8	37	2.6
Economics	28	3.2	28	3.0	33	2.7	26	1.9
Women's Studies	–	–	–	–	14	1.1	25	1.8
Sociology	11	1.3	23	2.5	15	1.2	23	1.6
Business	–	–	–	–	37	3.0	21	1.5
Linguistics	–	–	–	–	16	1.3	17	1.2
Other	140	16.2	159	17.2	149	12.1	108	7.7
Total	862	100.0	922	99.9	1231	100.2	1402	100.0

* 1984 figures from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table 16, p. 36. Percentages were recalculated and rounded to the first decimal place. Data for 1984 and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 7.5, Chapter 7, page 175. Business, Linguistics, Film Studies, and Women's Studies were included in "other" in 1984 and 1995 if courses existed. International Relations combined with Political Science.

have the resources to offer courses exclusively about Japan or to mount a Japanese language program.

The disciplinary pattern in Table 5.10 is quite different from that of courses exclusively on Japan, but consistent with the pattern in earlier studies. Religion-Philosophy leads, as it has consistently since multinational courses with Japan content were first analyzed in the 1984 study. History is second, with a steadily declining percentage of the courses. Culture and Civilization is next, which here is represented largely by East Asian Studies courses. The impact of Cultural Studies is increasing a bit in this distribution, while the combined set of social science disciplines is declining. Overall, the pattern in the multinational course distribution suggests a more traditional area studies approach, in which art, religion, and history courses present aspects of something unknown that is broadly conceptualized as Asian or East Asian civilization.

It is also noteworthy that the new disciplines that we have added to the distribution for 2005 and 2012 have considerably smaller representation in multinational courses. This further reinforces the notion that the pattern we see in the multinational courses stems from different factors than those that are producing the current distribution of courses exclusively on Japan. Some part of the difference may simply result from the difference in scale of programs. We will explore this possibility further after first looking at the two basic types of courses on Japan from some different angles: their enrollments, and the range of institutions that offer them.

Enrollments in Area Courses on Japan

Enrollment data were provided for only a quarter of the area courses with Japan content, including 26.6 percent of the courses exclusively on Japan and only 14.4 percent of multinational courses. One likely reason for the discrepancy is that the multinational courses may not have been taught by Japan specialists, and the Japan program may not know their enrollment numbers. For a clearer look at the enrollment figures we need to separate out the courses exclusively on Japan from the multinational ones with some Japan content. Given the relatively small numbers, we cannot further divide this into graduate and undergraduate courses. Table 5.11 shows these comparisons. It is difficult to interpret these numbers given the disparity in the number of courses of the two types included. The safest number is probably the mean enrollment, since it controls for the number of courses offered. For courses exclusively on Japan, for which the sample is more representative, the mean enrollment is highest for Art History courses, which are typically taught in an auditorium setting where slides of art can be shown. Film Studies courses that also would involve viewing films, have the second highest mean enrollment at 35.0. Courses on Anthropology, Political Science, History, and Culture and Civilization all average between 25 and 30 students, while those in other disciplines are smaller. Of course actual enrollments in specific courses may diverge widely from these averages. By contrast, enrollments in many of the multinational courses are higher. Multinational Film Studies courses have the highest mean enrollment, followed by Culture and Civilization, and Religion and Philosophy, all of which have mean enrollments above 50. This suggests that these are introductory level courses offered as part of general education requirements for freshmen and sophomores.

The evidence from all of this detailed data shows unequivocally that the number of both language courses and area courses about Japan has been increasing solidly. Because students in American higher education institutions have great freedom to enroll in language and area courses based on their own interest, this expansion is only possible because there is strong student demand for the courses. While in the past institutions could offer basic Japanese language courses even if the number of students enrolled was small, that logic would not permit

Table 5.11. Enrollments in Courses with Japan Coverage in 2012, by Discipline and Course Type*

	Exclusively on Japan				Multinational with japan			
Discipline	Course #	Enroll. #	Mean Enroll.	% Dist.	Course #	Enroll. #	Mean Enroll.	% Dist.
Art History	19	1122	59.01	3.7	6	225	37.5	0.7
Literature	82	1620	19.8	5.3	16	381	23.8	1.2
Performing Arts	1	15	15.0	0.0	2	40	20.0	0.1
Religion-Philosophy	10	238	23.8	0.7	10	511	51.1	1.6
Anthropology	9	266	29.6	0.9	7	316	45.1	1.0
Economics	–	–	–	–	2	87	43.5	0.3
History	82	2140	26.1	7.0	36	1232	24.2	4.0
Polit. Science	6	164	27.3	0.5	11	314	28.6	1.0
Sociology	5	96	19.2	0.3	2	22	11.0	0.1
Business	3	41	13.7	0.1	1	20	20.0	0.1
Culture-Civilization	54	1608	29.8	5.2	27	1539	57.0	5.0
Linguistics	6	79	13.2	0.3	5	57	11.4	0.2
Film Studies	17	595	35.0	1.9	7	625	89.2	2.0
Women's Studies	1	15	15.0	0.0	1	15	15.0	0.0
Other								
Total	748	23245	31.1	76.1	202	7313	36.2	23.9

* Based on all courses for which enrollment data were provided.

the expansion of language programs to higher levels, nor would it allow the proliferation of area courses solely about Japan if there was no student demand. We therefore need to consider what is driving this high student demand for both Japanese language and for area courses about Japan.

Who Is Attracted to Study Japan?

I contend that except for the short period dominated by the economic competition paradigm when some students entered Japanese Studies for instrumental and economic reasons, most people come to Japanese Studies because they have gotten hooked on Japan. Students get hooked through a combination of attraction to some aspect of Japanese culture, and direct exposure to Japan. Those elements lead them to study Japan. The choice of how to direct that study and whether there is any practical outcome arise later, after the student has already gravitated toward studying something about Japan. This has been true throughout the postwar history of Japanese Studies in the United States. My hunch is that it may be stronger for Japanese Studies than for other area studies, although there is probably some component of attraction and exposure in all of them. I suspect that it is true for Japanese Studies in other countries as well, but it probably points to a significant difference in motivations between non-Japanese who study Japan, and Japanese nationals who do so. It is this combination of cultural attraction and exposure that brings people to Japanese Studies and keeps them there, and provides part of the answer to why the rise of China and Chinese Studies is not a threat to Japanese Studies.

The attractions that have brought students to Japanese Studies and the nature of their

direct exposure have changed over the past several decades, but these two factors continue to explain the staying power of Japanese Studies. In the early years the field was dominated by those with prior exposure to Japan, whether it was military service in Japan or growing up in a missionary family that lived in Japan. Those without such direct exposure (and of course many of those who were exposed) were attracted by some aspect of Japanese culture, whether it was Zen Buddhism or Genji Monogatari or Japanese art. The attraction may have been specific, but it was also fundamentally an attraction to something that was different and exotic. Over time Japan became more accessible, and students might be exposed to Japan through a study abroad experience or having lived in Japan because of a parent's employment, and the nature of the attractions also widened.

Today Japan is much more accessible. For Americans, there are high school student exchanges as well as college study abroad experiences, and the JET program has provided a steady stream of graduate students into Japanese Studies, although only about 10 percent of the program's participants go on to further study of Japan. Students who have early direct exposure to Japan are likely to return to the U.S. with observations and questions about contemporary Japanese society, which may lead them into either the social sciences or the humanities. Some of these students also have entered the specialized training programs that were created during the economic competition paradigm, but their commitment to Japan and Japanese Studies is not just instrumental.

The distinction between these students with direct exposure and others who entered Japanese Studies during the 1990s for instrumental reasons also points indirectly to another aspect of the mistaken perception that people are leaving Japanese Studies to flock to Chinese Studies. Chinese Studies today is experiencing the same sort of economic competition paradigm that Japan went through in the 1980s and 1990s, and I believe it is attracting many students who view the study of China as an economically valuable credential that will help them get professional employment. There is nothing wrong with that, but I submit that precisely because it reflects a rational economic approach to the decision, it is fundamentally different from the factors that motivate most students to come to Japanese Studies. It is unlikely to deflect the great majority of students who get hooked on Japan through a combination of cultural attraction and exposure and then decide to study it more deeply. In short, this is not a zero-sum game but rather reflects different kinds of motivations.

I think we all know that the major attraction that is bringing students into Japanese Studies today is globalized Japanese popular culture. From the perspective of analyzing the nature of the cultural attraction, this is interesting because it is not like the older attraction to things that were exotic and unfamiliar and to a language perceived as extremely difficult. The essential feature of globalized Japanese popular culture is the fact that children in the United States and throughout the world have grown up with it. They watch it on television, play games with its characters, and acquire all sorts of commercial products representing the same characters. Some embodiments of Japanese popular culture are as familiar to them as Mickey Mouse and Big Bird. Japanese popular culture is familiar and yet sufficiently different to be intriguing, not only because of the characteristic Japanese drawing style, but also because of the complex story lines. It is also increasingly accessible online with English support. Yet even if they are watching anime dubbed or subtitled in English, or are reading manga translated into English, foreign fans of Japanese popular culture are exposed to bits of Japanese language: Japanese character names, spoken Japanese in a soundtrack while they read the subtitles, or Japanese characters embedded in a manga drawing outside the translated text. All of this makes the Japanese language seem more familiar, approachable, and accessible than in the past.

This success is due in no small measure to the cultural studies paradigm and the Japan specialists trained within it who now teach in American Japanese Studies programs. It is not simply that Japanese popular culture attracted students who then wanted to study Japan. The cultural studies paradigm resonated with the attractiveness of popular culture for students. It made Japanese popular culture a legitimate subject of academic study, and it provided new tools for such study. From its quiet introduction in the 1990s, it has led to the development of a new generation of Japanese Studies faculty who could embrace the students' interests and build on them for academic purposes. I noted some evidence of this in 2005, but the traces are clear throughout the data in the new study. At the broadest level, it has led to 24 programs that are now named or renamed as "language and culture programs" with a holistic approach that encompasses language, literature, history, and other aspects of Japanese culture. Such programs look similar to European programs in Japanology, but they are relatively new to the American scene and they are clearly different from the older language and area studies paradigm that emphasized the placement of faculty into disciplinary departments.

Traces of the cultural studies paradigm can also be found in course names and course themes. An amazing number of Japanese history courses have been renamed "Samurai and Geisha" or "The Age of the Samurai." As noted earlier, there are also a number of courses about Japanese ghosts and Japanese monsters. Some themes stand out even more in the data. In the current study there are 135 courses related to film, 110 on women and gender, 53 on popular culture, and 30 specifically on anime and manga. In addition there are courses on minorities in Japan, including both ethnic and lifestyle minorities.

To some extent courses on women and on minorities reflect structural changes in American higher education, based on deliberate national policy decisions that promote diversity both in faculty hiring and in student admissions. This has led to higher educational institutions that resemble the diversity within American society to a much greater degree than was true in the past. The first big demographic change that affected Japanese Studies was the steady increase in women, first as graduate students in the 1970s and 1980s and then lagging about a decade behind, as faculty members. The 1970 study consistently referred to Japan specialists as "men" although over 10 percent of those included were women. By 1995 the overall sample was about 30 percent female, and in 2005 that had increased to 37.6 percent. In each of those two studies younger age cohorts were much closer to parity. In the current study, 39.percent of Japan specialists are female, but those appearing in the directory for the first time are 41 percent female and overall the younger age cohorts are over 40% female.

The increased number of women academics in the field legitimized studies of Japanese women, but this was also helped by the introduction of feminist theories and cultural studies more broadly, which focused attention on different subgroups within Japan and provided new intellectual tools for studying them. In each directory study we have had to add more subject categories related to women as respondents wrote in new ones to reflect a specific focus on women in different subject areas. While we do not collect data on the ethnicity of Japan specialists, the American preoccupation with race and ethnicity has also led to research since the 1990s on various minority populations in Japan. I believe that this, too, can be seen as a result of the combined effect of the cultural studies paradigm and the cultural context of American higher education.

In sum, the infusion of the cultural studies paradigm into Japanese Studies over the past two decades coincided with the growing popularity of globalized Japanese popular culture among American youth. This has produced a generation of Japan specialists with the intellectual tools to examine not only popular culture but also many other facets of contemporary

Japan by focusing on subgroups and their cultural products, examined within their specific cultural context. They are able to offer a wide array of courses about Japan that respond to students' interests and build on what students find attractive and intriguing about Japanese culture. The same forces have driven increased enrollments in Japanese language courses, including the incorporation of Japanese popular culture into language learning. The loose structure of American higher education with its combination of general education, basic foreign language requirements, plus a major, all calculated in terms of course credits, has encouraged and supported these developments. Critical financial decisions for academic departments are driven partly by student course enrollments that are largely voluntary decisions by individual students; hence the increased demand for Japan courses, whether they are part of a major or not, enhances and stabilizes Japanese Studies programs and stabilizes employment for the faculty who teach in them.

This complex package is likely to sustain Japanese Studies in the United States for at least the next few years, and it has nothing to do with whatever may be happening to Chinese Studies. The wide availability of Japanese at high schools and colleges suggests that while the numbers of students and courses could decrease, they are unlikely to suddenly dry up. Similarly, Japan will continue to be accessible through student exchanges and study abroad programs, as well as through the JET program and other English teaching opportunities in Japan. And finally, Japanese popular culture is likely to continue to attract young people for some time. When that attraction wanes, some other new aspect of Japan will capture the imagination of another generation of students.

Teaching Conditions

The conditions that make it possible for American academics to offer courses that meet student demand suggest that Japan specialists are likely to feel some satisfaction with what they teach, but we can look more closely at other aspects of satisfaction with teaching conditions. In the past three surveys, Japan specialists have been asked to report their level of satisfaction with the amount of teaching they do about Japan. Table 5.12 shows the results for our current study, compared with responses in 1984, 1995, and 2005. In all four surveys, very few respondents complained that they teach more courses about Japan than they would like. The majority have always been relatively satisfied with the amount of teaching they do on Japan, and that sense is even stronger in 2005 and 2012, with two-thirds of respondents saying that they teach about as many courses as they would like. Less than a third are teaching fewer

Table 5.12. Survey Respondents' Satisfaction with Teaching About Japan, 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

Teaching Satisfaction	1984 %	1995 %	2005 %	2012 %
Teaching more courses than would like	3	5.0	3.2	3.8
About as many courses as would like	56	59.7	67.6	65.7
Fewer courses than would like	41	35.1	29.2	30.6
N of Respondents	676	794	571	612

* 1984 data from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table 10, p. 31. Data from 1984 and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 7.15, Chapter 7, page 190. These data were reproduced along with 2005 data in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 6.18, p. 137.

courses about Japan than they would like to, about the same as in 2005. Within the context of our findings about the increased number of courses now being offered on Japan, the responses seem to confirm that there is sufficient demand for courses about Japan that specialists are able to offer them as frequently as they want to, and that they enjoy their teaching about Japan and do not feel overly burdened by it. This of course also implies that as the demand has risen, institutions have increased faculty, which we will examine in Chapter 7 when we look at staffing.

However, we still need to explore why nearly 30 percent of respondents say that they teach less than they would like about Japan. This, too, has been asked since 1984, so we can add our new data to this series. Since this question is only asked of those who reported that they taught less than they would like, the number of respondents is reduced, but still large enough to analyze. The results are shown in Table 5.13. The most common reason for teaching fewer courses about Japan than respondents would like remains the same as for the past two decades: other demands on their time. Non-faculty cited the fact that they did not have an academic appointment. In comparison with respondents in previous surveys, the 2012 sample was less likely to cite lack of resources or insufficient interest among students, colleagues or administrators.

Of the 488 survey respondents who reported that they are currently teaching a course about Japan or have done so in the past two years, more than half (55.0 %) reported that they also have to teach other courses that are not about Japan. Both their Japan-related courses and their non-Japan courses are offered through a wide range of disciplines. Their courses on Japan were offered at all levels, and the mean enrollments this sample of Japan specialists reported was very similar to the mean enrollments reported by institutions for their courses on Japan.

About a quarter of those currently teaching reported that they require some Japanese language materials in their courses. Those in humanities were far more likely to require Japanese language materials than those in the social sciences. One reason for this discrepancy is that those in the humanities are far more likely to offer courses in which enrollment is legitimately limited to students who have the necessary Japanese language skills. Their courses are specifically designed for students specializing in Japan in a particular discipline, in order to develop their Japanese language skills for research purposes. In contrast, in the social sciences even graduate courses exclusively on Japan are generally open to a wide range of students, many of

Table 5.13. Reasons for Teaching Fewer Courses About Japan Than Respondent Would Like, 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

Reason Given	1984 %	1995 %	2005 %	2012 %
Other demands on time	59	58.8	63.2	51.9
Insufficient student interest	45	15.0	23.0	19.3
Insufficient administration interest	36	23.7	20.1	18.7
Lack of resources	25	29.9	23.9	20.8
Insufficient interest among colleagues	24	14.2	13.9	11.8
Other**	8	23.7	17.2	15.5
N of Respondents	284	274	209	187

* 1984 data from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table 10, p. 31. Data from 1984 and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 7.16, chapter 7, page 191. Data for 2005 from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 6.18, p. 134. Data for all years limited to those who reported teaching fewer courses on Japan than they would like.
** For 2005 and 2012, "no academic appointment" was the alternative possible response.

whom would not have Japanese language skills because they are not specializing in the study of Japan. Such seminars emphasize mastery of the relevant English-language literature on Japan, although faculty may encourage students who do have Japanese language skills to use them in their research papers.

Respondents were also asked for their evaluation of the adequacy of teaching materials on Japan and the results are shown in Table 5.14 with previous study results for comparison. The distribution of responses for 2012 is remarkably similar to that of previous studies. The majority of respondents think that teaching materials for the field as a whole are good, but they are slightly less positive about materials in their own discipline, and only a third think teaching materials for Japanese language are good. For both the field as a whole and one's own discipline, the second most common response was "fair." However, for Japanese language there was a much higher "not sure" response, suggesting that faculty who are not themselves language teachers are either unfamiliar with the materials currently used for Japanese language teaching, or do not feel competent to judge the adequacy of the materials. As a result, the mean response for one's own discipline and the field in general was 2.7, meaning between fair and good, but for language teaching materials the mean was only 1.9, or between fair and poor.

The overall picture is that Japan specialists are relatively happy both with the teaching they do about Japan and the materials they use for that teaching, and that the majority also teach courses that are not about Japan. They also need to feel appreciated and recognized for what they do as teachers and scholars. In that context, their evaluation that students today are more knowledgeable about Japan surely contributes to the satisfaction specialists derive from teaching those students.

The fact that most Japan specialists also teach other courses that are not about Japan, combined with their general satisfaction with the amount of Japan-related teaching they do, reminds us that for most Japan specialists, teaching courses about Japan is a voluntary and satisfying experience. If it were not, in most cases they could teach other courses in their discipline without penalty. The Japan specialists in our sample are where they are because they have chosen to make the study of Japan an important part of their lives. If they sense some hostility or indifference from their discipline, they are in many cases able to counterbalance that through satisfying relations with other

Table 5.14. Adequacy of Teaching Materials for Japanese Studies, by Subject, 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	1984 %		1995 %			2005 %			2012 %		
Evaluation	Lang.	Gen.	Lang.	Own Disc.	Gen.	Lang.	Own Disc.	Gen.	Lang.	Own Disc.	Gen.
Excellent	14	10	13.6	21.5	7.8	12.8	12.6	11.5	15.0	17.7	13.9
Good	35	45	36.0	45.8	54.3	34.9	48.1	56.3	37.3	48.6	55.0
Fair	20	32	19.8	32.5	27.2	13.5	30.5	24.8	13.4	26.1	22.8
Poor	8	9	7.5	9.1	5.1	2.5	7.6	4.0	2.2	5.8	3.1
Not sure	23	5	23.0	1.1	5.6	36.3	1.2	3.4	32.8	1.8	5.2
Base N	569	673	469	661	591	281	341	323	354	399	382

* 1984 data from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table 19, p. 39. Percentages were reported as rounded whole number. Data for 1984 and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 7.17, Chapter 7, page 192. Republished with 2005 data in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada,* Table 6.19 p. 138.

Japan specialists and with Japanese scholars, as well as with their students. The arrangements that have been created to promote, coordinate, and manage Japanese Studies at academic institutions play an important role in sustaining the positive working environment for Japan specialists. We will examine the instructional and non-instructional aspects of these arrangements in the subsequent chapters, beginning with how individual courses are aggregated into Japanese Studies programs.

6

Academic Programs in Japanese Studies

Our aim in this chapter is to see how the language and area courses we looked at in Chapter 5 become organized into degree programs in Japanese Studies at the undergraduate and graduate level. We will use some standard criteria to measure the strength of these programs, and then we will look at their products at the graduate level, and at the patterns of staffing that make the programs possible on a day to day basis.

Since 1984, surveys of Japanese Studies have asked institutions how their Japanese Studies programs are organized. Larger programs may have more than one form of institutional organization, so programs are encouraged to list all of the forms of organization that apply. Unfortunately, for the current study as in the previous one, many of the persons responding on behalf of their institution had difficulty thinking beyond the confines of their own organizational unit. We have responses to the question about program organization for 202 of the 248 programs included in the directory (231 with courses and/or staff), and a few of the largest programs responded only on behalf of their non-teaching center or their own department, rather than reporting on behalf of the institution as a whole. The data we are able to report therefore undercount the real picture, but we offer them in Table 6.1. We use the number of programs responding as the base, so the percentages total more than 100 because of multiple responses to the question.

Previous studies have tracked a shift towards the creation of distinct institutional units for Japan or East Asia. They may be established for Japanese or East Asian Studies, or for Language and Literature, Language and Civilization, or Language and Culture specifically for either Japanese or East Asian languages. Our data show that this trend continues and now just over half of the reported programs have this character. The responses show that there has been a substantial increase in the number of departments that explicitly carry either Japanese or East Asian in their names. We have combined them here to match the data presentations from previous studies, but we found that they were 64 language and literature departments and 41 programs encompassing some form of "studies" or "civilization" or "culture" beyond the scope of language and literature alone.

However, many programs develop and thrive without this sort of institutional separation. This time we found slightly more than half of respondents reporting that they have an interdisciplinary program that is not a department, and some programs have both a department and a separate interdisciplinary program. At most academic institutions in the United States, adding

Table 6.1. Organization of Instruction about Japan at Academic Institutions, 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	1984		1995		2005		2012	
Organization	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Japanese, E.Asia Lang/Area Dept.	36	16	56	28.4	53	50.0	105	52.0
Interdisc. Degree Program	46	21	66	33.5	47	44.3	108	53.5
Non-degree with minor offered	9	4	29	14.7	15	14.2	37	18.3
Coordinating Committee	22	10	21	10.7	11	10.4	14	6.9
Course List but no formal links	51	23	44	22.3	21	19.8	38	18.8
No Coordination between depts.	33	15	20	10.2	5	4.7	14	6.9
Courses only in one department	30	14	38	19.3	4	3.8	32	15.8
Professional Program	-	-	11	5.6	6	5.7	7	3.5
Professional Degree	-	-	8	4.1	5	4.7	5	2.5
Other Organiz.	24	11	7	3.6	13	12.3	21	10.4
[Other Organiz. including Profs.]	[24]	[11]	[26]	[13.3]				
Not applicable	4	-	7	-	3	2.8	8	4.0
Total N	220		197			106	202	

* 1984 data from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table 8, p. 28. Data for 1984 and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 8.1, chapter 8, page 196. These data reproduced and 2005 data reported in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*, Table 7.1, p. 141.

a new course is a relatively simple matter, but adding a new program or department is a major undertaking that can take years to accomplish. And while Japanese Studies programs may aspire to become separate units with greater institutional visibility and fiscal security, institutional pressures may work against those aims. Sometimes the politics is not that the Japanese or East Asia component is too small to warrant separate status, but rather that it is too large, and the smaller programs that ride on the coattails of Japan or East Asia fight to keep it under a broader umbrella.

The write-in responses described additional forms of organization that are not easily captured by the categories that have been in use for the series of studies of Japanese Studies in the United States. The problem here is that in offering descriptions of the sorts of arrangements that the most highly developed programs might have, such as a separate department of East Asian or Japanese Studies, or East Asian or Japanese Language and Literature, we fail to capture the institutional reality of programs that are embedded in broader institutional frameworks, such as a general language department that houses the Japanese language program, or an Asian Studies program that houses a Japanese Studies program. We have expanded our coding to capture these cases, and they are reported as "other organization." We found 21 programs with these characteristics, a substantial increase from the past two studies.

In sum, this time the data show continuation of the trend toward creating named departments for Japan or East Asian programs, whether in language and literature or in a broader area or culture framework. There is also a steady, substantial increase in the percentage reporting an interdisciplinary degree program that is not a formal department. This suggests that Japanese programs are getting more formalized even when they operate through cooperation among faculty housed in different departments. The number of institutions with courses only in one department was larger than in 2005 but on a par with earlier studies. If we view the

2005 absence of such programs as a result of the disappearance of the bubble programs of the 1990s, then this suggests that for various reasons more very small programs are once again emerging. As we have noted repeatedly, these programs are more unstable, but some of them do grow over time.

The data we obtain describing actual degree programs revealed a similar problem with quality. Although we had many more responses describing specific degree programs than for the initial question about how Japanese Studies is organized, we found that while some institutions had scrupulously entered every program variation, others had combined many options into one description, or had simply noted that degrees were available in many disciplines. We have used the program descriptions in the directory entries of institutions, and for that purpose they are perfectly adequate. However, because we did not have the time or information required to restructure all of the program data into a format that would give us reliable counts of the actual numbers of programs of different types, we offer only a very brief overview of these incomplete data: we found 46 undergraduate certificate programs, 153 undergraduate minors, and 231 undergraduate majors. At the graduate level, 13 graduate or professional certificate programs were reported, 59 interdisciplinary MA programs, 42 disciplinary MA programs, 20 interdisciplinary doctoral programs, and 70 disciplinary PhD programs. The latter is an undercount because large programs do not report all the different disciplines within which one could specialize in Japan. These numbers are better evaluated from the analysis of doctoral candidates.

Quite independent of how academic institutions organize and name their Japanese Studies programs and degree options, surveys of Japanese Studies since the 1970s have attempted to develop and apply some standard criteria to evaluate the scale of Japanese Studies programs and follow their progress over time. They have necessarily distinguished between undergraduate and graduate programs, although of course there is considerable overlap in terms of institutions that offer both. As we have noted earlier, Japanese Studies was initially developed after World War II primarily at large, elite academic institutions that already had some infrastructure such as a library collection of Japanese materials and a few faculty members. Those institutions offered undergraduate courses, but much of their focus was on developing graduate programs to train people who would then take their skills to other institutions. Hence initially there was nearly complete overlap between graduate and undergraduate institutions involved in Japanese Studies, except for a few programs at small private colleges. Over the ensuing five decades the number of institutions involved in Japanese Studies at both the graduate and undergraduate levels grew, but undergraduate expansion has greatly outpaced graduate expansion for fairly obvious reasons having to do with the numbers of institutions of both types. We therefore will examine undergraduate and graduate programs separately, before taking up issues of the staffing of programs, which necessarily involves both levels.

Undergraduate Programs

We begin with undergraduate programs, since they now form the broad base on which the smaller number of graduate programs rests. We quote here from the 1995 study, which reviewed the developments in creating and applying criteria for undergraduate programs in Japanese Studies up to that point.

> The 1970 SSRC-ACLS Report listed 61 American institutions with "undergraduate area programs" in Japanese Studies, but did not report criteria

> for inclusion or make any further distinction among programs.[1] Subsequently Elizabeth Massey and Joseph A. Massey, authors of the 1977 CULCON Report on Japanese Studies at Colleges and Universities in the United States in the Mid-1970s[2] developed a categorization scheme for undergraduate programs concerned with Japan that was based on four factors: the availability of Japanese language instruction, the number of disciplines in which courses wholly about Japan are offered, the size of the faculty specializing in Japan, and whether an undergraduate major offering study of Japan is available. Utilizing various combinations of these criteria, they established four program levels: minimal undergraduate program, limited undergraduate program, undergraduate area program, and full undergraduate program.[3]

They applied this scheme to the 1977 study data. The 1984 SSRC-Japan Foundation study made some minor improvements to the criteria and applied it to their data. The criteria as modified and used in 1984 are as follows:

> …a **minimal undergraduate program** offers either disciplinary courses or language courses, or one year of language and only one disciplinary course. A **limited undergraduate program** offers either courses exclusively on Japan in several disciplines but only one year of language, or several years of language but only one disciplinary course, or two years of language and several disciplinary courses, but fewer than two faculty specialists on Japan. The difference between the first two categories is that a minimal program generally offers either language or area courses, but not both. A limited program offers both, but only one in depth. An **undergraduate area program** offers courses exclusively on Japan in two disciplines and two years of Japanese language, and has a minimum of two faculty Japan specialists. A **full undergraduate program** offers courses exclusively on Japan in three or more disciplines and at least three years of Japanese language instruction, and regularly offers a BA for work on Japan, through an undergraduate major in Japanese or East Asian Studies, or by offering a major on Japan as part of an interdisciplinary program (such as international studies). Institutions qualifying for this category also have more than two faculty Japan specialists.[4]

The 1995 study applied the same criteria, and also reported statistics from the two previous studies that used these criteria in 1977 and 1984. We have done essentially the same in 2005 and in the current study. However, in applying the criteria in 2005 and the present study to the data provided by institutions for this study, we had to make minor modifications. In the 1995 study, institutions were encouraged to send program brochures and other materials to the project office, and project staff entered the data, being careful to include all degree programs. Since them we have relied on the institutions to enter the data themselves, through our online data collection system. As we have explained earlier, the response was incomplete. Although we tried to get responses from all the different academic programs related to Japan at each institution, in practice we were lucky to get a response from one of the programs. Consequently,

1 1970 SSRC-ACLS Report, Appendix 21, p. 107.
2 CULCON Report, pp. 29-31.
3 *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* p 197.
4 Ibid, pp. 197-198.

we believe that even the information on academic degree programs in Japanese Studies that was provided by institutions responding to the survey is probably incomplete. This has affected our ability to apply two of the criteria.

The 1984 criteria for a "full undergraduate program" include the presence of a major in Japanese offered through a Japanese or East Asian Studies language or area program, or a major in Japanese offered through an interdisciplinary program. Many institutions could meet that requirement, some of them with two or three different majors offered through a Japanese language department and an interdisciplinary program. However, other institutions have large numbers of courses exclusively on Japan in several disciplines, offer four or more years of Japanese language, and have three or more Japan specialist faculty of professorial rank. The information available to us may describe a major in Asian Studies and perhaps a minor or a strong language requirement that would produce a strong concentration on Japan, but not a major explicitly labeled Japanese or East Asian Studies.

It seemed inappropriate to designate these programs as "undergraduate area programs" rather than "full undergraduate programs" when it was patently clear that a student could easily obtain the equivalent of a major in Japanese Studies at that institution. Indeed, there may even be such an institutionally recognized Japanese major or major track at those institutions, but we simply did not have the information. We have therefore added to the list of "full undergraduate programs" those in which the institution's resources clearly exceeded all of the other requirements, even if we could not verify the existence of a major with the name "Japanese" attached to it. As long as there was an institutional framework for an area major such as Asian Studies or International Studies available and there were sufficient courses to meet the other criteria, we treated the program as offering a major with concentration on Japan.

In addition, for the 2012 study there were programs that clearly had more than enough courses and levels of language instruction to meet the criteria, but they had neglected to submit a staff list, so we could not apply the criterion of having 2 or more Japan specialist staff. For this we used common sense. If the number of courses was very limited and the program would only have met one of the lower levels on that basis, we scored on the basis of the actual staff listed, which meant that they could not go above the "limited" level. However, if there were a

Table 6.2. Classification of Undergraduate Programs in Japanese Studies, 1977, 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	1977		1984		1995		2005		2012	
Program	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minimal	64	41.0	91	46.2	98	40.7	29	15.9	23	10.0
Limited	37	23.7	46	23.4	25	10.4	20	11.0	39	16.9
Area	24	15.4	22	11.2	37	15.4	36	19.8	30	13.0
Full	31	19.9	38	19.3	81	33.6	97	53.2	139	60.2
Total	156	100.0	197	100.1	241	100.1	182	99.9	231	100.1

* Sources: 1977 figures taken from 1977 CULCON report p. 30 and reprinted in 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table 13, p. 33 based on data for 1974-75 academic year. The latter is also the source for the 1984 data, which is based on the 1981-82 academic year. Percentages recalculated for 1977 and 1984 data. 1995 data based on reports for the 1992-93 academic year. Data for 1977, 1984, and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 8.2, Chapter 8, p. 198. Data reproduced and 2005 data taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 7.2, p. 144.

great many courses and three or four years of Japanese language offered, we assumed that they must have sufficient academic staff to offer that program.

Table 6.2 shows the distribution of undergraduate programs in 2012, with the comparative data from 1977, 1984, 199, and 2005. In addition, Appendix B lists the institutions with various levels of undergraduate programs. These lists have been included in all the previous studies, and have proven to be invaluable in tracing the history of specific programs over time. Of the 248 academic institutions with entries in the 2012 directory, all but 17 could be classified into one of the four levels of undergraduate programs. The others had not entered staff or course data and thus could not be evaluated. Following the procedures used in the previous studies, the percentages are based on the total number of programs in the four levels, omitting those that were not classified.

Our classification shows a solid increase in the number of full undergraduate programs, but one that is in line with previous increases. This is the largest number of full undergraduate programs we have ever recorded, but it is consistent with the staffing and course increases we have reported in earlier chapters. Table 6.2 compares the distributions of programs as they were classified in each study, but it does not provide any information about whether programs were classified at the same level in two successive studies, had moved up or down, or dropped off the list completely. In order to see that process more clearly we use a series of turnover tables. We could see part of the picture just by cross-tabulating the cases in the 2012 study and seeing where those programs were in 2005. However, that would not give us any idea about the programs that were in the 1995 study or the 2005 but were not in the current study. To capture the full picture of the turnover between studies, we use the procedure we developed first for the 1995 study, by putting our data for academic institutions with Japanese programs into the broader context of all academic institutions in the United States. Bear with me while I go through the methodological details, since reporting them in each study is what enables us to reconstruct the comparable tables for each successive study.

The list we used in 1995 contained 3,135 institutions. In addition to the classifications of undergraduate programs we developed for the 1995 study, we entered the data that was available from the 1984 study with the earlier classification of the program at each academic institution. That procedure allowed us to account for institutions that appeared in one study and not the other, and also gave us the residual number of institutions that had no undergraduate Japanese program in either study year. That turnover table from the 1995 study is reproduced in its entirety below as Table 6.3, for comparative purposes. The number in brackets in the upper left cell indicates that there was no Japanese Studies program recorded in either the 1984 or the 1995 study for 2,793 of the 3,135 academic institutions in the base population. That number is omitted from the calculation of the remaining percentages for clarity. Table 6.3 shows that although 148 programs were considered for classification in the 1995 study and 142 of them were classified into one of the four undergraduate program levels, 93 programs that had been classified by the same criteria in 1984 were missing in 1995. Most of those had been classified as minimal in 1984. At the other end of the scale, there was considerable stability in programs that were classified as full undergraduate programs in both 1984 and 1995, but there was also an appreciable amount of movement between categories. Of the 8 programs that the 1995 study determined did not meet the criteria for an undergraduate program, two had been in the 1984 study, one classified as an undergraduate area program and one as a full undergraduate program.

This information served as a backdrop to our analysis of the turnover between 1995 and 2005. About the same amount of time had passed between the 1984 and 1995 study data and

Table 6.3. Turnover Table for Undergraduate Programs as Classified in 1984 and 1995*

1995 Program Status	Not Included in 1984	Minimal Program in 1984	Limited Program in 1984	Undergrad Area Prog. in 1984	Full Undergrad in 1984	Total for 1984
Not Included		67	18	4	4	93
	[2,793]	(78.6%)	(40.0%)	(19.0%)	(10.8%)	(27.2%)
No Program	6			1	1	8
	(4.1%)	–	–	(4.8%)	(2.7%)	(2.3%)
Minimal Program	90	7	1			98
	(60.8%)	(7.7%)	(2.2%)	–	–	(28.7%)
Limited Program	19	3	2	1		25
	(12.8%)	(3.3%)	(4.4%)	(4.8%)	–	(7.3%)
Undergrad Area Program	15	5	11	4	2	37
	(10.1%)	(5.5%)	(24.4%)	(19.0%)	(5.4%)	(10.8%)
Full Undergrad	18	9	13	11	30	81
	(12.2%)	(9.9%)	(28.9%)	(52.4%)	(81.1%)	(23.7%)
Total	148	91	45	21	37	342
	(100%)	(100%)	(99.9%)	(100%)	(100%)	(100%)
% Lost to Followup		67	18	4	4	93
		(72.0%)	(19.4%)	(4.3%)	(4.3%)	(100%)

* 1984 program classifications taken from 1984 Japan Foundation Report. Appendix 5, pp. 125-129. 1995 classifications from the present study. Both sets of classifications were added to date on 3,135 academic institutions in the United States, from which the table was generated. Percent of programs lost from 1984 to 1995 added as "% lost to follow-up" to facilitate comparison with 2005 data.

the 1995 study and the 2005 study, so this gave us a reasonable base for comparing how much Japanese Studies programs had shifted over a decade. However, as noted earlier, the national list of academic institutions that we were able to obtain for the 2005 study contained a smaller total number of institutions. Fortunately, very few of the institutions with Japanese Studies programs were missing, and we were able to recover sufficient data to include them all. Our total number of academic institutions in the United States for 2005 was 2,890. For the turnover analysis we analyze the data on all the Japanese Studies programs that were classified in 1995 and compared it with the classifications for 2005. That turnover table is shown below, as Table 6.4.

The results are directly comparable to the equivalent cells in Table 6.3. Out of our base of 2,890 academic institutions for 2005, 2,631 did not have a Japanese Studies program reported to either the 1995 study or the 2005 study. In 2005, we picked up 25 new Japanese Studies programs, but lost 75. Nearly all of the losses were classified as minimal programs in 1995. Although both tables have the percentages running vertically to show the distribution within each 1995 program classification, we have added a row at the bottom of each table with the percentages calculated horizontally, to show the distribution of the programs that were lost from the first study to the second, which is commonly called the loss to follow-up. The numbers are the same as the top "not included" row of each table, but the percentages are calculated to show the percent of each program classification from the earlier study that was not included in the subsequent study. This permits us to compare the data from the two different turnover tables directly. Comparison of the two loss-to-follow-up distributions reveals that nearly 95 percent

Table 6.4. Turnover Table for Undergraduate Programs as Classified in 1995 and 2005*

2005 Program Status	Not Included in 1995	Minimal Program in 1995	Limited Program in 1995	Undergrad Area Prog. in 1995	Full Undergrad in 1995	Total for 1995
Not Included		71	1	1	2	75
	[2,631]	(74.7%)	(4.2%)	(3.0%)	(2.4%)	(29.0%)
Not Ranked		1	1			2
	–	(1.1%)	(4.2%)	–	–	(0.8%)
Minimal Program	7	14	6	2		29
	(28.0%)	(14.7%)	(25.0%)	(6.1 %)	–	(11.2%)
Limited Program	1	6	5	6	2	20
	(4.0%)	(6.3%)	(20.8%)	(18.2%)	(2.4%)	(7.7%)
Undergrad Area Program	6	2	6	13	9	36
	(24.0%)	(2.1%)	(25.0%)	(39.4%)	(11.0%)	(13.9%)
Full Undergrad	11	1	5	11	69	97
	(44.0%)	(1.1%)	(20.8%)	(33.3%)	(84.1%)	(37.5%)
Total	25	95	24	33	82	259
	(100%)	(100%)	(100%)	(100%)	(99.9%)	(100.1%)
% Lost to Follow-up		71	1	1	2	75
		(94.7%)	(1.3%)	(1.3%)	(2.7%)	(100%)

* Data for 1995 taken from 1995 study as recorded in matrix of 3,135 academic institutions in the United States at that time. These data were transferred to the comparable table of 2,890 academic institutions in the United States used as the national base for the current study.

of the programs lost to the 2005 study had been classified as minimal undergraduate programs in 1995, whereas just fewer than three-quarters of the programs that were lost-to-follow-up in the 1995 study had been coded as minimal in 1984. In addition, both of the programs that could not meet the minimal classification standards in 2005 had been classified as minimal or limited in 1995.

What does this part of the comparison tell us? First, that we should not grieve over the loss of 71 programs that had been classified as minimal in 1995 or blame it completely on the bursting of the Japan bubble, because there had been a substantial loss of minimal programs the decade before that, when interest in Japan was rising. As we have pointed out, these fledgling Japanese Studies programs, which consist of only a couple of area courses and maybe a year or two of Japanese language, are highly vulnerable to the vagaries of faculty movement or arbitrary institutional decisions. Some of the missing programs may indeed have disappeared, as we have been able to verify for 23 of those missing in 2005. The rest may still exist, but we could not find the right person or they declined to participate in the study this time around. What is perhaps more significant is that virtually all of the programs lost between 1995 and 2005 were at the minimal level; only two full undergraduate programs and one each at the limited and undergraduate area level were not included in the 2005 study. This gives greater credibility to the rest of the turnover table, because we are indeed tracing the movement of virtually all of the programs that were classified above the minimal level a decade earlier.

Reading the diagonal cells of the table shows us which programs have stayed at the same level for the past decade. We already know that we have lost three quarters of those that were classified as minimal in 1995, but the table shows us that only 14 (14.7%) of those classified as

minimal in 1995 are still classified at that same level in 2005. The rest that have remained active have expanded, mostly into the next level up, as limited undergraduate programs. Three, however, expanded more substantially over a decade and were classified as undergraduate area programs or full undergraduate programs in 2005. At the other extreme, 69 (84.1%) of the 82 programs that were classified as full undergraduate programs in 1995 remain full undergraduate programs a decade later. This is very close to the 81.1 percent stability rate for full undergraduate programs between 1984 and 1995.

Not surprisingly, most of the movement occurred in the two intervening classifications, limited and undergraduate area program. It is worth remembering that this system of classification was developed in 1977, at a time when Japanese Studies programs overall were much more modest in scale than they are today. The difference necessary to move from one category to another may involve one or two faculty members offering area courses in different disciplines, or the same one or two faculty members lost to the institution because they relocated elsewhere or retired. A program can also move up in the ranking because one more year is added to the language program.

Yet it is not simply that minor fluctuations are shifting programs from one level to another; in 1977 and 1984, as we saw in Table 6.2, only one in five undergraduate programs could meet the standards for classification as full undergraduate programs. The percentage had grown to a third by 1995, and by 2005 slightly more than half of all undergraduate programs met that standard. One might conclude that the standards are too low and ought to be revised, but that would miss the point. Ideally, every undergraduate Japanese Studies program ought to be strong enough to offer a major, either in Japanese Studies or Japanese language and literature, or both. While we probably cannot achieve that at every institution, there is still plenty of work to be done to strengthen the programs that are not yet at that level.

We can now add a third turnover table to the analysis, comparing the placement of undergraduate programs in 2005 and 2012. Although less than a full decade intervened between these two studies, there has still been substantial movement, as demonstrated by the fact that sixty percent are now classified as full undergraduate programs. Our base national data for 2012 is very similar to the list used in 2005, and was simply an in-house updating that found some consolidation of institutions plus some upgrading of two year colleges into four year institutions, particularly in public state systems. The full list this time had 2892 institutions.

Reading on the main diagonal reveals how undergraduate programs have expanded just in the past six years. Twenty-eight programs that were coded as area programs in 2005 have been classified as full undergraduate programs in 2012; six moved up from limited undergraduate to undergraduate area program; nine advanced from minimal to limited; and sixteen programs that were not included at all in 2005 now have minimal programs. The numbers above the main diagonal reveal that only four programs actually dropped in their classification between 2005 and 2012. Hence this is most definitely a story of steady growth and development of undergraduate programs in the 21st century, with about 60 percent of undergraduate programs now classified as full programs.

What this analysis does not show for the programs that were already classified as full undergraduate programs is the extent to which so many of them exceeded the threshold of supporting an undergraduate major. Table 6.6 provides some evidence of how strong undergraduate programs have become. It shows the average number of disciplines in which courses were offered by the various classifications of undergraduate programs, plus the mean number of Japanese semester courses offered by each program type and the mean number of faculty of professorial rank (excluding instructors and lecturers). The measure for area courses is not

Table 6.5. Turnover Table for Undergraduate Programs as Classified in 2005 and 2012*

2012 Program Status	Not Included in 2005	Minimal Program in 2005	Limited Program in 2005	Undergrad Area Prog. in 2005	Full Undergrad in 2005	Total for 2012
Not Included	[2551]	4	2	3	1	10
		(17.4%)	(11.1%)	(8.3%)	(1.1%)	(4.1.%)
Not Ranked	–	–	–	–	–	–
Minimal Program	16	4	2	0	1	23
	(23.2%)	(17.4%)	(11.1%)		(1.1%)	(9.5%)
Limited Program	25	9	4	0	0	38
	(36.2%)	(39.1%)	(22.2%)			(15.8%)
Undergrad Area Program	13	4	6	5	1	29
	(18.8%)	(17.4%)	(33.3%)	(13.9%)	(1.1%)	(12.0%)
Full Undergrad	15	2	4	28	92	141
	(21.7%)	(8.7%)	(22.2%)	(77.8%)	(96.8%)	(58.5%)
Total	69	23	18	36	95	241
	(99.9%)	(100%)	(99.9%)	(100%)	(100.1%)	(99.9%)
% Lost to Follow-up		4	2	3	1	10
		(40%)	(20%)	(30%)	(10%)	(100%)

* There are 2892 institutions on the list we used. In addition to the 241 that appear in this turnover table, 17 institutions that submitted program entries did not provide either courses or staff. An additional 83 programs were being tracked because they were listed as "other institutions with Japan specialist staff. The 10 programs listed as lost to follow-up were on that list but had submitted program entries in 2005. Another 43 programs that were on the "other institutions with Japan specialist staff" in 2005 had entries this time.

the number of courses, but the number of different academic disciplines (aside from Japanese language) in which courses of the two types are offered; it is thus a measure of breadth of the program rather than depth within individual disciplines.

The minimal programs have limited area courses, but they do offer an average of four semesters or two years of Japanese language courses and have one faculty member of professional rank. Limited undergraduate programs have an average of two disciplines offering area courses, an average of 4.8 semesters or two years of Japanese language instruction, and 1.7 faculty members of professional rank. However, for these two classifications, the averages may obscure the unevenness that has kept particular programs in the lowest classifications. The undergraduate area programs offer area courses in an average of 3.5 disciplines, and on average offer more than the six semester courses that equates to three years of Japanese language. On average, they also have 2.5 faculty members, just a bit above the required level. On all of these dimensions the averages for 2012 are slightly lower than those for 2005. However, it is among the full graduate programs that we see solid growth. Full undergraduate programs now offer area courses in an average of 7.9 disciplines, and an average of 14.2 language courses, meaning that they offer four years of Japanese plus more specialized courses. Only the average number of faculty of professional rank is lower than in 2005, at 7.8. The difference between undergraduate area programs and full undergraduate programs is clear from these mean figures. The full undergraduate programs clearly offer both depth and breadth in courses, language training, and faculty.

These full undergraduate programs are not strong simply because those institutions have

Table 6.6. Mean number of Disciplinaries and Mean Number of Language Courses Offered by Japanese Studies Programs, and Mean Number of Professorial Rank Faculty, by Undergraduate Program Classification, 2005 and 2012*

Program Type	2005 Mean # Disciplines	2012 Mean # Disciplines	2005 Mean # Language	2012 Mean # Language	2005 Mean # Faculty	2012 Mean # Faculty
Minimal	1.0/1/1	1.0	4.6	1.7	1.5	1.1
Limited	2.9/1.5	2.1	6.7	4.8	2.0	1.7
Area	4.1/3.8	3.5	7.9	7.2	3.4	2.5
Full Undergrad	7.9/5.4	9.7	12.9	14.2	10.3	7.8
Total Sample	5.4/3.9	6.8	10.2	10.5	6.6	5.5

* Data for 2005 from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 7.5 p. 148; Data for 2012 provide a single average for number of disciplines, without dividing into those offering courses on Japan and those offering only multinational courses. Faculty numbers for 2012 based on 195 institutions for which staff levels were available.

graduate programs in Japanese Studies: in fact just over half of them do not have graduate programs. They are simply robust undergraduate programs in Japanese Studies. This in turn provides an answer to why the average number of faculty is lower. There is a huge difference in the average number of faculty of professional rank between programs that have a graduate program in any of our three classifications (11.7) and those that do not have a classified graduate program (3.5). What we are seeing here in 2012 is that the continuing expansion of Japanese Studies programs is proceeding largely at the undergraduate level to four year colleges that do not offer graduate education. As we will see below, expansion at the graduate level develops much more slowly because of the higher requirements and the more limited number of institutions involved in graduate education. With this in mind, we turn now to look more closely at the graduate programs, using the same analytic strategy.

Graduate Programs

The 1977 study conducted by Elizabeth and Joseph Massey for CULCON also developed a classification for graduate programs in Japanese Studies, using a similar set of factors. We quote from the 1995 study's description of the classifications.

> They distinguished three categories of graduate program: MA program, limited PhD program, and complete graduate program. These are best understood in descending order. An institution with a **complete graduate program** has Japanese language library holdings of 25,000 volumes of more; offers courses exclusively on Japan in four or more disciplines; has a minimum of eight faculty specialists on Japan; offers Japanese language instruction at all levels; and demonstrates a commitment to Japanese Studies from at least four disciplines in addition to those offering courses exclusively on Japan. The last criterion presumably means four departments in addition to the requisite minimum of four, and would therefore not apply to institutions that already offer courses exclusively on Japan in eight or more disciplines. Such a program regularly offers both MA and PhD degrees in which there is concentration on Japan.

> An institution with a **limited PhD program** offers the PhD regularly in several disciplines, or else offers an interdisciplinary PhD with concentration on Japan. It is distinguished from a complete graduate program by its relative weakness in one or more of the following areas: less than 25,000 volumes in Japanese in its library collection; Japanese language offered only through the second or third year; courses exclusively on Japan in three or fewer departments; or less than eight Japan specialists on its faculty. An institution is classified as having an **MA program** if it regularly offers an MA degree for work on Japan; has faculty Japan specialists in at least four disciplines; offers courses exclusively on Japan in at least two disciplines; and offers at least two years of Japanese language.[5]

These criteria were first applied in 1977, and then applied in 1995 without modification, but unfortunately the 1984 study did not explicitly apply the criteria. Instead, it simply noted changes in the specific institutions that reported having graduate programs in Japanese Studies. We have used these criteria for the present study, but with the same caveat as for the application of the undergraduate program standards. As with the 2005 study, our data for the 2012 study do not reliably report all graduate programs, particularly those offered in various disciplines that involve substantial concentration on Japan. The data are reasonably complete for graduate degrees offered by Japanese language programs and for MA degrees offered in Japanese Studies either as interdisciplinary degrees or by a freestanding department with either Japanese or East Asian in its name. The data are substantially weaker for doctorates that are administered and awarded through an academic discipline, but which involve research and training in Japanese Studies. We have therefore relied less on whether we have an explicit report of the existence of a doctoral program in a particular discipline, and more on the tangible existence of graduate level courses and doctoral students who are included in our study, in addition to the more easily measured criteria of faculty numbers, disciplinary courses exclusively on Japan, advanced Japanese language courses, and library resources.

Table 6.7 shows the classification of institutions with graduate programs in 2012, compared with the distribution in 1977, 1995, and 2005. Because the 1984 study did not actually apply the graduate program criteria but simply reported changes since 1997 in the total number of programs, the 1995 study adopted the convention of measuring the change in number of graduate programs from the base in 1977. Thus although the number of graduate programs classified in 1995 and 2005 are both lower than the number reported in 1984, both show an increase from the 45 programs identified in the 1977 CULCON report. The point of this comparison was to highlight the fact that a relatively small number of institutions have maintained their position as the major providers of doctoral level training in Japanese Studies, despite all the changes in the field at other levels. Now, however, we can see some new developments that complicate the picture.

In the first four studies, about a third of the sample was classified at the MA program level. It is well to remember that this classification is not based solely on whether the institution presents itself as providing Japanese Studies degrees at the MA level; instead, it is based on whether the institution meets the MA threshold in terms of number of Japan specialist faculty, range of disciplines in which courses are offered, and level of Japanese language instruction offered, in addition to regularly offering an MA degree in Japanese Studies. In fact, most full undergraduate programs in Japanese Studies meet or exceed the faculty and course require-

5 *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* pp. 202-203.

Table 6.7. Classification of Institutions with Graduate Programs in 1977, 1984, 1995, and 2005 Studies*

	1977		1984		1995		2005		2012	
Program	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MA Program	16	35.6	–	–	17	33.3	17	32.7	12	22.6
Limited PhD	14	31.3	–	–	15	29.4	6	11.5	17	32.1
Complete Program	15	33.3	–	–	19	37.3	29	55.8	24	45.3
Total	45	100.2	57	100.0	51	100.0	52	100.0	53	100.0
Change from 1977	–	–	+12	+26.7	+6	+13.3	+7	+15.5%	+8	+17.5%

* Sources: 1977 data summarized from 1977 CULCON Report, Appendix K, pp. 112-114; 1984 data from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Appendix 6, p. 130. Data for 1977, 1984, and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 8.4, chapter 8, page 204. Data reproduced and 2005 data taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*, Table 7.6, p. 150.

ments for the MA classification, but many are located at undergraduate institutions without graduate programs. In 2012 the number classified as MA programs in down substantially and now comprises less than a quarter of the graduate programs, compared to a third in the previous studies. This has occurred basically because more programs meet the requirements of a limited PhD program.

The major change between the 1995 study and 2005 was the shift of many programs from the limited PhD classification to having what is defined as a complete graduate program. As we noted in 1995, most of the programs in the limited PhD category already met the faculty, discipline, and language program levels for a complete graduate program, but were held back because they did not have the requisite library resource of 25,000 volumes in Japanese. Many of those programs were getting close, and in the intervening decade, despite the economic barriers to collection development, they had Japanese collections of at least 25,000 volumes by 2005. Of course, during that same time period the programs that had the largest collections have also grown steadily, so the new entrants were still not competitive with the top libraries, but they do have substantial Japanese language holdings. Ironically, even as the demands on Japanese librarians have increased, our analysis indicates that the research interests of many Japan specialists (and the types of materials they need) make traditional Japanese library collections in the United States less critical to scholarship than they were two or three decades ago. We will take up this issue in greater depth in the next chapter. However, what we have found in 2012 is that some of these programs with the requisite level of library resources no longer meet the criteria of having eight Japan specialists on their faculty, so they have been moved back into the limited PhD program category. Overall, then, the distributed has shifted considerably from the even split into thirds of 1977. In 2012 we have less than a quarter of graduate programs at the MA level, a third at the limited PhD level, and 45percent at the full graduate program level.

Table 6.8 shows the relative strength of graduate programs at each level in terms of the numbers of disciplines in which area courses are offered, the number of Japanese language courses offered, and the number of faculty of professorial rank. We present means for each category, which may obscure some individual unevenness that affected the classifications. All graduate programs have higher means than those without graduate programs. The differences between MA level and limited PhD are not that great when viewed as averages, but there still

Table 6.8 Mean Number of Disciplines Offering Area Courses with Japan Content, Mean Number of Japanese Language Courses, and Mean Number of Professorial Faculty, by Graduate Program Classification, 2005 and 2012*

Program	No Graduate Program	MA Program	Limited PhD Program	Complete Graduate Program	Totals
Mean # Disciplines					
2005	3.7/3.0	6.8/3.6	7.2/4.8	11.9/8.3	5.4/3/9
2012	5.1	7.0	10.1	17.3	7.1
2012 mean # courses	9.0	15.9	24.9	55.1	15.4
Mean # Lang. Courses					
2005	7.5	12.6	13.3	19.0	10.2
2012	7.5	13.5	17.2	28.5	1.2
Mean # Prof. Faculty					
2005	3.8	7.8	8.8	17.9	3.8
2012	3.3	5.1	7.5	16.8	5.2
2012 w/emeritus	3.4	5.7	8.1	20.3	5.8

* Data for 2005 taken from Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities, Table 7.7, p. 151. Data for 2012 based on 209 academic programs for which professorial staff data were available.

is a measurable difference in each of the criteria. The real leap is from the MA or Limited PhD level to the Complete Graduate Program level, where the averages are all substantially higher. It must be emphasized that the metric here for area courses is not individual courses, but academic disciplines in which courses of those types are offered. This is a measure of the breadth of the program in terms of the perspectives of different disciplines. The actual number of courses is even higher and we show these averages for 2012.

The course measure here is semesters, and the very high number for Japanese language courses indicates that the programs offer a rich array of advanced courses beyond the eight semesters that would constitute four full years of basic Japanese language. The average levels for 2012 are higher than for 2005 for every measure except mean number of professorial faculty. While the overall average is higher because of the increased number of programs at the undergraduate level, the average number of professorial faculty is down from 2005 at each level of graduate program. However, these programs also have 113 emeritus faculty listed. If we add emeritus faculty to each category, the average for complete graduate programs and the overall average exceed the 2005 level, but the averages for all of the other categories remain below the 2005 levels. This is because 73 percent of the emeritus faculty members are located at the 24 complete graduate programs. These are primarily the oldest and largest programs, which have experienced the most generational turnover over the past decade or so.

It should also be pointed out that these criteria were developed when Japanese Studies was guided by the language and area studies paradigm, which emphasized the placement of faculty in different disciplines and the provision of an interdisciplinary program through exposure to the study of Japan in different disciplines. The economic competition paradigm did not fundamentally alter that vision, but instead increased focus on professional schools and social science disciplines that could provide economically useful knowledge about contemporary Japan. However, in contrast, the currently dominant cultural studies paradigm de-emphasizes this sort of disciplinary dispersion and instead aims to cluster faculty within a broader language

language and culture program in which the disciplinary identity of both faculty and courses may be obscured. That affects our ability to "count" people and courses according to standard disciplinary categories, but in the long-run, it also tends to reduce the actual disciplinary range of Japanese Studies. As noted earlier, this has a particular impact on the social science disciplines, because such programs consume social science concepts very effectively, but are much less likely to produce scholars with disciplinary credentials that will be recognized by social science disciplines. That in turn has an impact on hiring practices in the social sciences that may reshape potential offerings at Japanese Studies programs in the future. Of course academic disciplines themselves are constructed and reconstructed over time, and in the future our criteria for evaluating Japanese Studies programs may well need to be re-examined. At present, however, having such criteria not only allow us to track what is happening in Japanese Studies programs, but also still aligns with the dominance of disciplinary departments in American academia in general.

We have already noted that there is considerable overlap between undergraduate and graduate programs. Table 6.9 shows graduate program classification by undergraduate program classification for 2012. As the table illustrates clearly, graduate programs are nested as a subset of those programs classified as full undergraduate programs, since the standards even for the lowest graduate classification, MA level, are higher than for the full undergraduate program classification in terms of number of faculty and number of disciplines offering courses on Japan. The MA standard of two years of Japanese language seems a bit outdated, but in fact all programs exceed it, so the low threshold does not have any material effect. More significant is the fact that fully three quarters of Japanese Studies programs in the United States are now undergraduate programs, and that well over half of all full undergraduate programs are at institutions without a graduate program. This is the greatest proportion of undergraduate programs of any study of Japanese Studies in the United States.

Many of these strong undergraduate Japanese Studies programs are located at liberal arts colleges with no aspiration to add graduate programs; others are located at institutions that have well-developed graduate programs in other fields, and thus have the potential to expand into the graduate level in Japanese Studies. Graduate programs are attractive to potential faculty, and they utilize resources in which the institution has already made a substantial investment. The pattern we have seen through this study indicates that well-established Japanese

Table 6.9. Graduate Program Status by Undergraduate Program Classification, 2012

Program Status	None	Undergrad Minimal	Limited Undergrad	Area	Full	Total
None		22	38	29	89 (63.1%)	178 (77.1%)
MA level		1	0	0	11 (7.8%)	12 (5.2%)
Limited Doctoral		0	0	0	17 (12.1%)	17 (7.4%)
Complete Graduate		0	0	0	24 (17.0%)	24 (10.4%)
Total		23	38	29	141	231 (100.1%)

Studies programs are becoming broader and deeper. We have already seen considerable expansion at the graduate level, and there is likely to be some more in the future. However, it seems likely that undergraduate programs in Japanese Studies will continue to grow much faster than graduate programs, in part because of the relatively greater saturation of Japanese Studies graduate programs at higher ranked graduate institutions. We will revisit this issue in the next chapter when we consider infrastructural considerations for Japanese Studies programs.

We have detected evidence of Japanese Studies programs becoming stronger at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and we have documented some movement among categories. In all the studies since the 1970s there has been remarkable stability in the major graduate programs. Since the same classification of graduate programs was used in the 1995 study and the two subsequent ones, we can use turnover tables to examine more precisely how stable the graduate programs have been. The table was constructed in the same fashion as the undergraduate program turnover tables, by placing our data on the classification of graduate programs in Japanese Studies into the list of academic institutions in the United States and comparing the levels of graduate programs in each study year. This enables us to see both gains and losses between the two studies, as well as changes in the internal configuration of programs that participated in two consecutive studies.

Table 6.10 shows the turnover of graduate programs between 1995 and 2005, underscoring the stability of the older complete graduate programs in Japanese Studies. It takes a great deal of time and institutional investment to create a Japanese Studies program of that scale. Once it is in place, it can be damaged by mismanagement or lack of funding, but it also grows roots in the institution that help it survive and flourish. In 1995 we recognized 15 complete graduate programs that had persisted since the 1970s, and identified four new ones that had crossed the threshold to join them. A decade later, those same 19 programs were still thriving, and ten additional programs had met all of the 1977 criteria for complete graduate program status. Hence there was very high stability in the core, but there was also steady expansion as more institutions developed Japanese Studies programs that were strong enough to support graduate training and took the steps necessary to establish graduate level degree programs.

Note that none of the six graduate programs that were present in 1995 and absent in 2005

Table 6.10. Turnover Table of Institutions with Graduate Programs in 1995 and 2005*

2005 Program Status	Not Included in 1995	MA in 1995	Limited PhD in 1995	Complete Prog. In 1995	Total
Not Included	[2832]	5	1	0	6
		(29.4%)	(6.7%)		(10.3%)
MA	6	1		0	17
	(85.7%)	(64.7%)	0		(29.3%)
Limited PhD	1	1	4	0	6
	(14.3%)	(5.9%)	(26.7%)		(10.3%)
Complete Graduate	0	0	10	19	29
			(66.7%)	(100.0%)	(50.0%)
Total	7	17	15	19	58
	(100%)	(100%)	(100.0%)	(100.0%)	(99.9%)

* 1995 study data applied to the base of academic institutions in the United States being used for the 2005 study for this analysis.

Table 6.11. Turnover Table of Institutions with Graduate Programs in 2005 and 2012*

2005 Program Status	No Graduate Program in 2005	MA Program in 2005	Limited PhD in 2005	Complete Graduate Program In 1995	Total
Not Included		2	1	0	3
MA	1	9	2	0	12
Limited PhD	2	6	3	6	17
Complete Graduate	0	0	1	23	24
Total	3	17	7	29	56

* 2005 study data applied to the base of academic institutions in the United States being used for the 2012 study for this analysis.

were full graduate programs, and five of the six were MA programs. The same was true of the seven programs that were new in 2005: six of those were MA programs and one was a limited PhD program. In short, the 19 oldest complete graduate programs were stable, and the fluctuation was among less complete programs, primarily MA programs. The 2005 to 2012 graduate turnover table shown in Table 6.11 completes the picture.

This time there are 23 complete graduate programs that have been stable for the past two studies. These are the 19 programs that had been stable in the 1995 and 2005 studies, plus four of the ten new ones added in 2005. Once again, there are three graduate programs new to the 2012 study, plus three that had dropped off the radar after 2005, and none of those were complete graduate programs. Moreover, most of the classification changes between the two studies were between MA programs and Limited PhD programs. However, this time the other six new programs classified as complete graduate programs in 2005 have slipped back to Limited PhD Programs (their status in 1995). All of them have sufficient library resources, offer area courses in eight or more disciplines, and also offer four or more years of Japanese, but they no longer have the required number of professorial staff. None of the six have any emeritus faculty listed, implying that these losses are due to faculty who have left the program and moved elsewhere.

There are real questions about whether there are sufficient resources to support this many full graduate programs in Japanese Studies at anything like the levels that the older programs have developed and maintained. We will take up this question later. First, however, we need to examine what all these graduate programs are producing.

Production of Doctorates in Japanese Studies

The fact that programs are classified as complete graduate programs in Japanese Studies does not necessarily tell us everything about the production of PhD level Japan specialists in the United States. As we have seen in the past, the volume of PhDs produced by these programs differs widely. Moreover, a substantial number of PhDs with expertise on Japan and dissertations related to Japan are being trained at programs that are not classified as complete graduate programs in Japanese Studies. This is partly due to the nature of graduate education in the United States. Except for degrees in Japanese literature and linguistics, most doctorates are awarded through a discipline where students have a doctoral committee that is not primarily composed of Japan specialists. Hence as long as the student has guidance from a Japan spe-

cialist in the discipline, the rest of the committee may be composed of disciplinary specialists who do not know anything about Japan. Their disciplinary credentials are essential for getting an academic position, since they are unlikely to find a position that is specifically seeking a Japan specialist in their discipline.

Since we collect information about doctoral candidates from both the programs and individual Japan specialists, we also are aware of doctoral candidates working on Japan who are being trained at institutions that do not have Japanese Studies program to speak of. A related factor is that students increasingly come to doctoral programs with sufficient background that they do not need further language training, either because they are native speakers of Japanese, or because they have already developed a high level of Japanese language ability elsewhere and are not dependent on the Japanese language program at their doctoral institution. A further factor contributing to the divergence between institutions with complete graduate program in Japanese Studies and the list of doctoral candidates doing dissertations on Japan is that under the dominant cultural studies paradigm and in the age of the Internet, students are no longer dependent on the Japanese libraries resources of their institution to obtain essential research materials. In fact institutions with complete graduate programs in Japanese Studies still produce the great majority of the new PhDs in Japanese Studies. It is just that they no longer define the outer limits of doctoral level work on Japan.

Let us now look at how many doctoral students in Japanese Studies have been reported to the study at each institution. As described in Chapter 2, the four Japan directory studies have tried to keep track of doctoral candidates in Japanese Studies by asking both Japanese Studies programs and Japan specialists to report doctoral students in Japanese Studies. We have used that information to produce listings for the directories, and also to try to follow these graduate students over time. Here we use the information to examine the contribution that each institution makes to the overall pool of current doctoral candidates in Japanese Studies. We have already pointed out that "program" is now a generic term covering all of the various academic disciplines and interdisciplinary arrangements through which students can earn a doctorate at these institutions for work on Japan. For 2012, we do not even really know how many different possibilities exist at specific academic institutions, because of uneven reporting. Large institutions are no longer able to keep track of all students who are doing doctoral work related to Japan in different disciplines.

Despite this, we feel that our triangulation procedure gives us reasonably good estimates of the number of doctoral students working on Japan at each institution. Typically, faculty report many more students than the institutions do, but many students are reported by only one of the sources. For the 2005 and 2012 studies, graduate students could also register on the project website, although fewer students did so this time. Table 6.12 shows the number of doctoral students reported at each institution that had five or more doctoral students, ranked in descending order based on their 2012 numbers. The table shows the percentage of the total and the cumulative percentage, making it easier to see the degree of concentration in the largest doctoral programs. The left side of the table gives the rank order for 2012, with the comparable rankings for the three previous studies that used the same methodology.

The data are remarkable in several respects. First, 31 institutions have reported five or more doctoral candidates in Japanese Studies. Although this is a little smaller than the 35 institutions with five or more doctoral candidates in 2005, six institutions have joined the list for the first time. The absence of a ranking for 1989, 1995, or 2005 quickly reveals the new additions. Nine additional institutions that ranked in previous studies have dropped out of the rankings this time because they reported less than five doctoral students, but we have kept them on

the list so that the rankings for all three studies are complete. Second, there is somewhat less concentration of doctoral students at a few institutions than there was in previous decades. In 1995 the top six institutions accounted for half of all the doctoral students in Japanese Studies and the top twelve accounted for three-quarters of the students. In 2005, it took the combined doctoral students of the top nine institutions to reach the 50 percent mark, and 19 institutions to account for three-quarters of the students. In 2012, the top eight institutions reported half of the doctoral students, and sixteen are training three-quarters of the students. This is somewhat greater concentration than was reported in 2005, but still more dispersion than in the earlier studies.

What is the relationship between this list of institutions that are producing doctorates in Japanese Studies and the criteria we have used to classify Japanese Studies programs? The classifications have been added to Table 6.12 as asterisks following the institution's name in order to examine this question. Three asterisks means the institution is classified as having a complete graduate program in 2012. Two asterisks indicate that it has a limited PhD program, and one asterisk means it was coded as meeting the MA level criteria. Of the 24 institutions we classified as having a complete graduate program in Japanese Studies, institutions, 23 (95.8%), appear in Table 6.12 as having more than five doctoral candidates in Japanese Studies. Viewed another way, 85 percent of all doctoral students in Japanese Studies are studying at one of the 23 institutions with a complete graduate program in Japanese Studies. The remaining 15 percent are studying at 54 other institutions: this is a curve with high concentration at one end and a very long tail at the other.

There is thus quite a close correlation between having a strong Japanese Studies program and producing PhDs in areas related to Japan, but not an absolute match. Five programs with five or more doctoral students do not meet any of the criteria we use to identify Japanese Studies graduate programs. However, we hasten to add that an institution with good graduate programs in academic disciplines and a Japan specialist in a particular discipline could certainly provide excellent doctoral training and guidance for a student in that discipline, even if the program as a whole did not have sufficient faculty, area courses, or library resources to meet the established general standards. This is true not only for programs classified at the limited PhD level, which may only lack sufficient library resources in Japanese, but also for programs that may have fewer faculty and thus meet only the MA level criteria. The broad dispersion of Japan specialist faculty results in the situation where some institutions without a strong undergraduate program in Japanese Studies may in fact have the specialized resources to support doctoral students in particular disciplines. What is remarkable is that so many of the newest institutions to be classified as having strong graduate programs in Japanese Studies are already actively producing PhDs in the field.

Equally significant is the fact that nearly all of the institutions listed above as offering doctorates in Japanese Studies, and all of those with complete graduate programs, have been classified as doctoral institutions with very high research activity by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which is the gold standard for high quality graduate education in the United States.[6] The classification system was changed in 2005, but the institutions with complete graduate programs in Japanese Studies consistently fall into the top category of research institutions in both the old and new systems. In the new system, all of the 23 institutions with complete graduate programs in Japanese Studies are ranked as Research Universi-

6 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, The Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education. Menlo Park, CA, now accessible through the foundation's website at http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/lookup_listings/.

Table 6.12. Rank Order of Institutions by Number of Doctoral Students in Japanese Studies in 2012, with Number and Percentage of Students, Cumulative Percentage, and 1989, 1995, and 2005 Rankings*

Ranking				Institutions	#	%	Cum. %
2012	2005	1989	1995				
1	2	1	1	University of Hawaii***	59	9.2	9.2
2	13	8	3	Cornell University***	50	7.8	17.0
3	10	2	7	University of Michigan***	48	7.5	24.5
4	1	7	7	Harvard University***	43	6.7	31.2
5	22	–	–	University of Southern California***	42	6.6	37.8
6	5	6	4	University of California at Berkeley***	35	5.5	43.3
6	8	5	6	Yale University***	35	5.5	48.8
8	3	3	2	Columbia University***	30	4.7	53.5
9	10	17	12	Ohio State University***	24	3.8	57.3
10	7	–	14	University of Pittsburgh***	21	3.3	60.6
11	12	10	11	University of Washington***	20	3.1	63.7
12	4	9	16	Princeton University***	19	3.0	66.7
12	18	16	18	University of Pennsylvania***	19	3.0	69.7
14	16	11	10	University of Chicago***	15	2.3	72.0
15	30	–	–	University of California Santa Barbara***	14	2.2	74.2
16	6	4	5	Stanford University***	12	1.9	76.1
17	–	–	–	Pepperdine University	9	1.4	77.5
17	22	–	19	University of California at San Diego***	9	1.4	78.9
19	24	–	–	University of Oregon***	8	1.3	80.2
19	21	–	19	Duke University***	8	1.3	81.5
19	20	13	17	University of Wisconsin***	8	1.3	82.8
19	16	15	23	University of Kansas***	8	1.3	84.1
23	–	–	–	Northwestern University	7	1.1	85.2
23	29	–	–	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	7	1.1	86.3
23	14	14	12	Indiana University***	7	1.1	87.4
26	–	–	–	Boston University**	6	0.9	88.3
26	–	–	–	Michigan State University	6	0.9	89.2
26	28	–	–	Temple University	6	0.9	90.1
26	–	–	–	University of Colorado**	6	0.9	91.0
30	18	19	15	University of Illinois***	5	0.8	91.8
30	9	12	9	University of California, Los Angeles***	5	0.8	92.6
–	14	–	–	Florida International University*	–	–	–
–	16	–	–	Purdue University**	–	–	–
–	18	–	–	University of California, Irvine**	–	–	–
–	20	–	–	University of North Carolina**	–	–	–
–	16	–	–	Georgia State University	–	–	–
–	32	–	–	The University of Iowa**	–	–	–
–	9	–	–	Boston College	–	–	–
–	12	–	–	University of California, Santa Cruz	–	–	–
–	22	–	–	Brandeis University	–	–	–
				27 institutions with less than 5 students	48	7.5	100.1

* Number reported is based on students who were reported by programs or faculty or who registered with the project themselves. Ranks for 1989, 1995, and 2005 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continities and Opportnities,* Table 7.10 p. 155.
** institutions has limited doctoral program
***institutions has complete graduate program

ties with Very High Research Activity, the top category of 108 doctoral institutions. Eight additional institutions that have five or more doctoral students in Japanese Studies also appear on that top list of 108 doctoral institutions with Very High Research Activity. In short, the programs that are training doctoral students in Japanese Studies are all counted among the top graduate research and training academic institutions in the United States. Their graduate programs in Japanese Studies are built upon a very broad and sturdy academic base: their faculty and academic programs must meet rigorous institutional standards, completely independent of their status as programs in Japanese Studies. Graduate training in Japanese Studies is in good hands.

The findings in Table 6.12 indicate that the high concentration of doctoral education in Japanese Studies in a small number of institutions is now broadening out to some extent. However, we still need to put that finding into context. Even if it is now changing, doctoral level study in Japanese Studies has long been concentrated in a relatively small number of programs. This has implications for the field that have been examined in all the previous studies. The previous studies have used two rather distinct methods to analyze the extent of concentration, and sometimes the two approaches have been combined. We need to understand what each one is measuring before we can make sense of the data from this long series of studies.

One approach counts the number of students doing doctoral research on Japan at each institution that has a doctoral program in Japanese Studies, which we have just done. This approach tracks the current production of doctorates in Japanese Studies at the time of each survey. It provides a current and prospective measure of how institutions are contributing to the pool of Japan specialists, but this measure is also imperfect. Institutions may over-count by reporting students who are not yet at the dissertation stage but are in doctoral programs related to Japan, or they may undercount because they are unaware of students who are working on Japan-related dissertations in various departments. There is also a fair amount of attrition in graduate programs even at the dissertation writing stage, so the fact that students are reported to be writing a dissertation on Japan does not mean that they will complete it and will join the ranks of Japan specialist scholars in the future. Moreover, in the present situation it does not necessarily mean that these new PhDs will be entering academic careers in the United States.

The second approach is to ask where Japan specialists currently working in the United States obtained their doctorates. The assumption is that Japan specialists were trained at the institutions offering graduate level programs in Japanese, but that is only partially true; we know that some Japan specialists did not do their dissertation on Japan and came to the field by some other route. Nonetheless, every survey of the field has looked at the array of institutions from which the respondents obtained their doctorates, as a way of understanding the long-term impact of the concentration of graduate level training in Japanese Studies at a small number of institutions. This measure is retrospective and cumulative, so the effect of a small number of institutions thirty to forty years ago still has an impact on the field today. By counting the doctorates of people who are defined by their participation in each survey as the currently active pool of Japan specialists, this measure inevitably includes some people who did not get their degrees in Japan-related fields, and it omits those who may have relevant doctoral degrees but are not captured in the survey for one reason or another.

We use both approaches, but we need to try to keep them clearly distinguished, especially when we combine the reports into a single table. It is not always clear which measure was being reported in the earliest studies, which further blurs the distinction. Actually, the diifference between the two approaches was less relevant through the 1970s, when the field was smaller and both approaches were counting essentially the same people. In the more recent studies the

two approaches have begun to offer rather different perspectives on the state of the field.

In order to appreciate the findings of the current study, we first review the earlier studies, beginning with a quote from the 1995 study's summary of the earlier studies.

> By 1970, eight institutions had each awarded ten or more doctorates to Japan specialists, and another four institutions had awarded between five and seven doctorates related to Japan. The institutions that had awarded ten or more degrees accounted for 70 percent of all Japan specialists in the United States. Adding the slightly smaller programs that had awarded 5-9 degrees brought the total up to 79.3 percent.[7]

The eight institutions that had awarded ten or more doctorates to Japanese specialists by 1970 were Harvard University (54), the University of Michigan (47), Columbia University (46), the University of California at Berkeley (37), Stanford University (19), the University of Washington (17), Yale University (15), and the University of Wisconsin (11). The four additional institutions that had awarded 5-9 doctorates to Japan specialists by 1970 were the University of Chicago (8), the University of Pennsylvania (8), Indiana University (8), and New York University (6). It is worth noting that the original eight universities were evenly divided between public and private institutions, but three of the four in the next tier were private.

The 1995 study continued:

> Just a few years later, the 1977 CULCON report found that the field was opening up in terms of the number of institutions awarding degrees, but students remained highly concentrated at a small number of institutions. Although the 1977 study counted more than twice as many degrees as its predecessor, almost two-thirds of them came from the same 12 institutions. The number of institutions that had awarded ten or more degrees related to Japan increased to 19 in the 1977 study. . . .
>
> The 1984 survey reported a smaller number of doctorates (655) and of institutions that had awarded ten or more degrees (15) in its sample of academic Japan specialist survey respondents, but it found a 77.3 percent concentration of doctorates from those 15 institutions. Moreover, two-thirds of the respondents' doctorates still came from the original 12 institutions that had awarded five or more degrees related to Japan prior to 1970.
>
> By 1995 the number of institutions that had awarded 10 or more doctorates to the current survey's respondents had grown a bit more, to 22, but so had the concentration: over eighty percent of the respondents had obtained their doctorates from those 22 institutions, and the original 12 doctoral institutions still accounted for about two-thirds of all the doctoral degrees awarded to the respondents.[8]

As we noted in Chapter 2, up until the 1990s, most Japan specialists in the United States who had ever existed were still alive, and the field was growing because all the new people were simply being added to the existing number. But as the first postwar cohort of Japan specialists

7 *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* p. 215.
8 Ibid, p. 217.

began to retire and die, the field has taken on a more normal demographic pattern in which newly trained younger scholars replace those who have left the field, rather than simply increasing the pool. Thus since the 1995 study, there should be a weakening of the influence of the small number of institutions that trained Japan specialists in the 1950s to 1970s, and this measure of where current Japan specialists obtained their doctorates should now begin to reflect the expansion of doctoral training institutions in Japanese Studies over the past two decades.

Table 6.13 represents the latest iteration of analyzing the institutions where Japan specialists received their doctorates. The numbers reflect the simple count of the number of doctorates from various institutions reported by Japan specialists in each survey. We have ranked the institutions in their 2012 order to emphasize the current distribution, and show the top 35 institutions in 2012 from which 5 or more Japan specialists obtained their doctorates. This is a substantial increase in number of institutions from previous studies, as there were only 27 listed in 2005.

Of the twelve institutions that dominated the production of doctorates in Japanese Studies in the 1970s, seven are still at the very top of the ranking in 2012. All twelve are still in the top 20, but several have fallen considerably in the current ranking, and the top twelve today include two institutions that have expanded their production of PhDs in Japanese Studies only since the 1980s (University of Hawaii and Cornell University). Thus there is still considerable concentration based on the original doctoral programs, but we also see some fluctuations in the rankings and the inclusion of new institutions. Most, but not all, of the institutions on this list are also in Table 6.11 above, the institutions that are currently producing doctorates in Japanese Studies.

In order to see the changes more clearly, Table 6.14 and 6.15 present a series of summary measures derived both from the long series of studies that examined where Japan specialists had obtained their doctorates (6.14), and from the analyses of doctoral candidates reported by Japanese Studies programs and Japan specialists to the three directory studies (6.15). The summary measures are designed to show the extent to which doctorates and doctoral training in Japanese Studies are concentrated, and to illuminate how this has been changing over time. Table 6.14 should show a slower rate of change both because it measures the earlier doctoral training of people who were surveyed when they were already professional Japan specialists, and because it involves repeated surveys of a pool of Japan specialists that contained many of the same people, even though the pool was growing and gradually changing. Table 6.5 presents the summary measures calculated using the distribution of doctoral candidates reported in each of the four directory studies in 1989, 1995, 2005, and 2012. These capture the prospective members of the Japan specialist community as doctoral candidates, and thus provide more of a current snapshot and future projection for each time period studied.

The number of institutions with 10 or more doctorates in Japanese Studies has grown unevenly in the successive surveys of Japan specialists, in part because of differences in the sample that was reached in each study. The 1984 study was less successful in reaching Japan specialists, while the 1995 study encompassed a broader array of persons who had been drawn to Japanese Studies by the Japanese economic boom and had not necessarily received formal academic training as Japan specialists. The 2005 study reached the core of active Japan specialists in academics and ancillary positions, but was less successful in reaching the non-academics who had participated in the 1995 study. The 2012 study also focuses on the core of active Japan specialists, but has reached a somewhat larger pool. These six surveys of Japan specialists also produced uneven total numbers of institutions at which the specialists had received their doctorates. The findings in Table 6.14 point to the continued concentration of institutions that have produced the great majority of Japan specialists.

Table 6.13. Leading Doctoral Institutions of Japan Specialists Surveyed 1970-2012, by 2012 Rank Order*

Institution	PhD by 1970	PhD by 1977	PhD by 1984	PhD by 1995	PhD by 2005	PhD by 2012
Columbia University	46	101	63	102	105	103
Harvard University	54	102	89	129	103	102
University of Michigan	47	90	60	82	69	76
Univ. of California, Berkeley	37	53	44	64	65	75
University of Chicago	8	31	48	78	58	69
Stanford University	19	38	33	73	60	68
Yale University	15	30	32	58	56	60
University of Hawaii at Manoa	*	*	12	20	41	44
Princeton University	*	13	13	27	39	42
Univ. of California, Los Angeles	*	14	15	27	37	40
University of Washington	17	34	22	33	31	33
Cornell University	*	*	8	23	27	31
University of Wisconsin	11	20	23	32	25	24
University of Illinois	*	16	15	21	22	22
University of Pennsylvania	8	15	10	29	17	22
Ohio State University	*	*	3	10	21	19
University of Minnesota	*	10	7	13	12	17
Indiana University	8	17	14	15	17	16
New York University	6	12	8	16	16	13
University of Southern California	*	13	6	13	14	13
University of Pittsburgh	*	*	*	*	10	13
University of Oregon	*	*	*	5	8	12
University of Texas at Austin	*	*	*	*	*	10
University of Kansas	*	*	*	*	8	9
University of Iowa	*	*	*	*	6	8
SUNY Buffalo	*	*	*	*	*	8
University of Arizona	*	*	*	*	*	7
City University of New York	*	*	*	*	*	6
University of California, San Diego	*	*	*	*	*	6
Duke University	*	*	*	*	*	6
Johns Hopkins University	*	*	*	*	*	6
Temple University	*	*	*	*	*	5
University of California, Irvine	*	*	*	*	*	5
Massachusetts Inst. of Technology	*	*	7	8	7	5
Michigan State University	*	*	*	*	*	5
American University	*	*	7	8	5	*
Northwestern University	*	*	2	7	5	*

* 1970 data from 1970 SSRC-ACLS Report, Appendix 2j, Table 1, p. 102; 1977 data from 1977 CULCON Report, Appendix N, Table 23, pp. 118-119; 1984 data from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table 4, pp. 16-17. 1977 data did not provide number of doctorates at institutions with less than 10 degrees awarded, so those institutions listed as having awarded 1-9 doctorates are marked with an asterisk. Names of institutions with less than five doctorates in any study were not reported. These cases are marked with an asterisk. For 2012, Japan specialists in the directory reported obtaining their doctorates from an additional 60 institutions, with less than five reported from each institution.

Table 6.14. Institutional Concentrations of Doctorates in Japanese Studies, 1970–2012*

Measure	1970	1977	1984	1995	2005	2012
Institutions with 10 or more doctorates	8	19	15	22	20	23
Institutions with 5–9 doctorates	4	14	12	11	8	12
Institutions with 1–4 doctorates	31	58	8	50	32	60
Total # Institutions awarding doctorates	43	91	35	94	61	95
Number of US PhDs* in Sample	348	825	655	1,072	1,031	1,102
# from institutions with 10 or more doctorates	246	638	493	887	845	911
% from institutions with 10 or more doctorates	70.7%	77.3%	75.3%	82.7%	82.0%	82.7%
# from institutions with 5–9 doctorates	30	NA	78	71	39	76
% from institutions with 5–9 doctorates	8.6%	NA	11.9%	6.6%	3.8%	6.9%
% from institutions with 5 or more doctorates	79.3%	NA	87.2%	89.3%	85.7%	89.6%
% from original 8 institutions with 10 doctorates in 1970	70.7%	56.7%	55.9%	53.5%	49.9%	53.2%
% from original 12 institutions with 5 doctorates in 1970	79.3%	65.7%	68.1%	66.4%	60.3%	53.1%
% with 10 or more doctorates that are public institutions	41.7%	50.0%	44.4%	51.5%	52.4%	56.5%
% of PhDs from public institutions with 10 or more doctorates	43.5%	NA	40.1%	37.6%	32.7%	72.8%

* 1970 data recalculated from 1970 SSRC-ACLS Report, Appendix 2j, Table 1, p. 102; 1977 data recalculated from 1977 CULCON report, Appendix N, Table 23, pp. 118-119; 1984 data recalculated from 1984 Japan Foundation Study, Table 4, pp. 16-17. 1977 data did not provide number of doctorates at institutions with less than 10 degrees awarded. Data from 1970, 1977, 1984, and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 8.6, Chapter 8, p. 216. Data reproduced and 2005 data taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 7.12, p. 160. For 2012, the number of US PhDs in the sample includes only those who reported doctorates from American institutions, and omits another 54 who received doctorates outside the United States.

In contrast, the four directory studies (Table 6.15) offer four snapshots show a decline since 2005 in the number of institutions that are currently training 10 or more doctoral candidates in Japanese Studies, but a big increase in the number of institutions that are producing 5-9 doctoral candidates. The overall pool of institutions with doctoral students in Japanese Studies has also decreased. Some of this may be due to underreporting, but it also may reflect an overall decline in the number of doctoral students for economic reasons. Still, If we were to plot this distribution for each of the four directory studies, it would show a large hump for the

Table 6.15. Institutional Concentrations of Doctoral Candidates in Japanese Studies, 1970–2012*

Measure	1989	1995	2005	2012
Institutions with 10 or more doctoral students	14	18	27	16
Institutions with 5–9 doctoral students	5	6	8	15
Institutions with 1–4 doctoral students	32	36	35	27
Total # Institutions with doctoral students	51	60	70	58
Number of US PhD candidates in Sample	445	803	798	639
# from institutions with 10 or more doctoral students	361	701	690	486
% from institutions with 10 or more doctoral students	81.1%	87.3%	86.5%	76.1
# from institutions with 5–9 doctoral students	33	45	47	105
% from institutions with 5–9 doctoral students	7.4%	5.6%	5.9%	16.4
% from institutions with 5 or more doctoral students	88.4%	92.9%	92.4%	92.5%
% from original 8 institutions with 10 doctorates in 1970	54.2%	44.7%	37.0%	28.6%
% from original 12 institutions with 5 doctorates in 1970	60.7%	52.2%	43.9%	37.7%
% with 10 or more doctoral students that are public institutions	57.9%	62.5%	63.0%	43.8%
% of doctoral students from public institutions with 10 or more doctoral students	50.9%	53.5%	46.5%	34.6%

* Calculations are based on counts of doctoral candidates, not degrees awarded. Data for 1989, 1995, and 2005 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 7.12, p. 160.

large producers of Japanese Studies doctorates that drops off sharply, and a long, low tail of institutions that have a much smaller investment in the graduate education of Japan specialists. Even though the 2012 data appear to show a decreased concentration in institutions with 10 or more doctoral students, the critical comparative figures are farther down the table: in 2012, three quarters of doctoral students were studying an institutions with 10 or more doctoral students in Japanese Studies (a drop from over 85% in the two previous studies), but the data still show that about 92 percent of doctoral students in Japanese Studies fields are studying at institutions that have five or more such students. Very few doctoral students are isolated at programs that have few doctoral students and smaller concentrations of faculty.

In the 1990s I described the pattern as being like a high volcano from which a small number of institutions were pumping out a flow of new PhDs who then flowed out primarily to institutions without large graduate programs in Japanese Studies. Since then, the overflow from this volcano has begun to pile up around the caldera, making the whole PhD-producing volcano much broader and larger, but it still drops quite steeply to a much lower level and then spreads out just as far. Despite the increase in the number of institutions training substantial numbers of Japan specialists, there are still just as many other institutions that have only a very few doctoral

candidates in Japanese Studies. That figure remained at around 32-36 institutions in the first three studies, but dropped to 27 in 2012. This suggests that the decrease in the total number of doctoral candidates in 2012 is due to a combination of few doctoral students at the institutions that are the major producers of doctorates in Japanese Studies, plus a reduction in the number of institutions that have just one or two doctoral students in Japanese Studies. Reports at institutions with a very small number of doctoral students are most likely to come from Japan specialist faculty rather than the institutions themselves. This reinforces the picture of continuing concentration, even though the peak of the volcano is broadening out and flattening somewhat.

Given that there are now 23 institutions with complete graduate programs in Japanese Studies, the main difference between the 2005 and 2012 concentration is that while in 2005 virtually all of those programs had more than 10 doctoral students, in 2012 many more of them, both old and new, have between 5 and 9 current doctoral students (although in some cases they may have more but their reporting was incomplete). If we broaden our purview and look at the percent of doctoral candidates in Japanese Studies who receive their training in programs with 5 or more doctoral students, this measure is tapping the fact that Japan specialists tend to be trained where there are other graduate students in Japanese Studies and presumably, also other institutional resources for the study of Japan, human and material. This means that doctoral students in Japanese Studies at these institutions not only benefit from faculty expertise and institutional resources, but they also constitute a critical mass for peer learning and the development of strong networks among Japan specialists.

The more significant measure of residual concentration in the field is the percentage of doctoral students who are being trained at the original eight or twelve institutions that were producing most of the doctorates prior to the 1980s. Those percentages have been steadily dropping, both as a measure of where Japan specialists received their doctoral training (Table 6.14) and as a measure of how current graduate students are distributed (Table 6.15). The percentage of Japan specialists who obtained their doctorates at the original eight institutions dropped from 70 percent in 1970 to about half since then, while the percentage of doctoral students currently being trained at those same original institutions has dropped from over half (57.2%) in 1989 to a just over a quarter (28.6%) in 2012. The percentages are slightly higher if all 12 institutions that had awarded five or more doctorates to Japan specialists by 1970 are included, but the pattern remains very consistent. Those original institutions account for just over a third of all doctoral students in 2012.

The two bottom lines of the two tables measure a rather different phenomenon. There has always been a mix of public and private institutions involved in academic Japanese Studies. The original eight institutions that had trained ten or more of the Japan specialists were evenly divided between public and private institutions, but the slightly larger list of 12 institutions was tilted toward the private side. At different times this has had different implications stemming from the same underlying structural condition. In general, the private institutions have tended to limit graduate admissions to the number of students for whom they could provide financial support, whereas large public institutions are more likely to admit qualified students even if they cannot provide financial support for them. During the 1990s, it appeared that this was going to result in a higher proportion of Japan specialists receiving their doctoral education at public institutions. Initially, most students going to graduate school in Japanese Studies were supported by federally-funded fellowships that were intended to entice qualified students to study a subject (Japanese) with little apparent economic payoff. Those fellowships were available at both the public and private institutions with the major Japanese Studies programs, so students were drawn to the top programs to some extent because of the financial support that was available.

However, the Japan boom beginning in the mid-1980s coincided with heavy reductions in the amount of federally-funded fellowship support available for Japanese Studies, except in select fields where fellowships were still being used to draw students to particular fields—at that time primarily law and economics. Because of the new interest in Japan and the apparent new economic value attached to Japanese language skills and Japanese Studies expertise, the demand for Japanese Studies graduate training exceeded the numbers for whom both private and public institutions were able to provide fellowships. It was no longer a question of using fellowship support to persuade people to study Japanese; suddenly students were willing to enroll in Japanese Studies programs even without fellowship support. Since the private institutions tended not to accept students that they could not support financially, the excess demand went to the public institutions, which felt more of a mandate to meet public demand and were willing to admit qualified students and let them figure out their own financial support. The public institutions also had much lower tuition rates, which made it more feasible for aspiring graduate students to survive financially without generous fellowships.

Our data suggest that the pattern has now shifted in a different direction. While the enrollment figures suggest that there is not the same very high demand for Japanese Studies as there was in the 1990s, at the graduate level the numbers are still solid and the students are spread over a larger array of doctoral training institutions. While federal fellowship programs for Japanese Studies now support only a relatively small fraction of doctoral students, the largest programs, both public and private, have also built up substantial endowments for Japanese Studies. These endowments now provide additional fellowship support for doctoral students in Japanese Studies. The support tends to be considerably more generous at the private institutions, some of which are wealthy enough to support students through their entire doctoral education, including support for field work in Japan and for attendance at academic conferences. At the same time, tuition rates have been rising sharply at public institutions in recent years, and that affects the ability of students without fellowship support to attend the public institutions even if they are more likely to be admitted without support. Consequently, while more of the expanded number of doctoral training programs may be found at public institutions, the percent of doctoral students is tilting back in favor of the private institutions that can provide more generous financial support to graduate students in Japanese Studies.

Another way of conceptualizing this shift would be that while private institutions now provide very generous support to graduate students in Japanese Studies, they still limit admissions to the number of students they can support in this manner. Public institutions are still more willing to admit students beyond the numbers they can support, but in areas where the demand for advanced public education in Japanese Studies is strong, part of the public solution has been to expand the number of institutions that offer doctoral training in Japanese Studies. Certainly in California there have been deliberate policy decisions to develop Japanese Studies at additional institutions in the state's flagship university system. Four public universities in the state of California's top tier University of California system currently have complete graduate programs in Japanese Studies, with two more at the limited PhD program level (one of which has dropped from complete graduate program status because of reduced faculty numbers since 2005).

The State of Japanese Studies Academic Programs in 2012

Our analysis of formal academic programs in Japanese Studies reveals that undergraduate programs are getting deeper and broader, and that this is the area of continued expansion of Japanese Studies, particularly undergraduate institutions that do not intend to develop graduate

programs. In effect undergraduate education is uncoupled from its early concentration primarily at institutions that also offered graduate programs. It is noteworthy that these undergraduate only programs now offer for or more years of Japanese language training to their students, which in earlier decades was only possible at institutions offering full graduate programs. These B.A. level programs do feed into graduate programs by providing students with strong language training that allows them to undertake graduate work using Japanese language materials from the very beginning of their programs, but they also prepare students for careers that do not require advanced post-graduate training. Given the large number of such programs at the BA level, realistically many of them are preparing students for careers in which they will not necessarily make professional use of their knowledge of Japan and Japanese language. This represents the further normalization of Japanese Studies in American society, making it more like other fields in which students obtain a BA but then find employment that uses their general academic skills and ability but not the specific things they have learned in their major.

At the graduate level, we have seen some contraction in the number of doctoral students, but the demand remains generally strong. There is some flattening and broadening of institutions offering graduate training in Japanese Studies, but also continued concentration of doctoral training at a relatively small number of institutions that have the necessary infrastructure and also provide the critical mass of both faculty and students needed for an optimal graduate educational environment. We turn now to look more closely at the staffing and other infrastructure on which Japanese Studies programs depend.

7

Staffing, Infrastructure, and Support

This chapter examines the staffing, infrastructure, and support for Japanese Studies in the United States. In the current economic climate, it has become apparent that the most basic form of infrastructure for Japanese Studies is simply the ongoing commitment of academic institutions to provide the staff to maintain Japanese Studies programs. We thus begin this chapter with an exploration of the staffing levels at Japanese programs of different sizes and their sustainability, which follows easily from our focus on categorizing those programs in chapter 6. This in turn will lead directly into our discussion of other forms of infrastructure support for libraries, museums, and research in general.

Staffing of Japanese Studies Programs

We have demonstrated that Japanese Studies programs at academic institutions in the United States have become broader and deeper, but how are these growing Japanese Studies programs staffed? We saw earlier that the reason for the large discrepancy between the number of Japan specialists listed in the Directory of Japan Specialists and the number of staff listed at academic institutions in the Directory of Japanese Studies Institutions was primarily because of differentiation among staff. Although in looking at job classifications of Japan specialists in chapter 2 we separated out retired persons, we are very reluctant to do so for the academic programs when they have been listed as staff. We know that although sometimes these designations are honorary, retired and emeritus faculty members frequently do teach classes; at institutions with graduate programs they often continue to supervise graduate students. We therefore combine the two faculty categories for this analysis. However, since there is a strong rank system within most universities, we maintain the distinction between faculty of professorial rank and those who are lecturers and instructors. We have separated out visiting and adjunct faculty regardless of their rank in order to show the growing impact they have on staffing. Because many large Japanese Studies programs now have administrative personnel on their staff, we have also kept that category separate. However, faculty status prevails in our coding. If a person is listed as the director of a program but also holds a faculty rank, that person is coded as faculty. This serves to distinguish the group of academic support personnel who now populate the staff lists of large programs.

Our question is how these various types of staff positions may be differentially repre-

sented in Japanese Studies programs of different scale, as expressed by our classifications of undergraduate and graduate programs. Table 7.1 shows the distribution of staff positions by undergraduate program classification. Minimal programs have a higher proportion of lecturers and instructors staffing their programs. This is not because they have quantitatively more lecturers and instructors, but because they have fewer faculty of professorial rank. Full undergraduate programs employ by far the highest number of instructors and lecturers in their large Japanese language programs, but they also have the most faculty of professorial rank, so the balance still favors professorial faculty by more than three to one. There are minor variations of the same story at undergraduate area and limited undergraduate programs, but all three of these program types have about three quarter of their staff in the professorial faculty category. The other major difference is that full undergraduate programs rely much more on administrative staff than the other types. This phenomenon will become clearer when we look at graduate programs. However, to clarify the undergraduate data, we have divided the full undergraduate programs into those at institutions with and without graduate programs.

Taking all three categories of staff, we have constructed overall program staff ratios. The findings are clear: minimal and limited programs have very small numbers of staff, and the situation is somewhat better for undergraduate area programs. The huge jump is for full undergraduate programs, which have an average of 12.4 staff members per program. Since some of this is accounted for by the greater number of administrative staff positions, we also calculate a teaching staff ratio, using only the two categories of teaching staff plus visiting and adjunct positions that presumably are also teaching positions. This has a negligible effect on the minimal, limited, and undergraduate area programs, since they have few administrative staff. For

Table 7.1. Distribution of Staff Positions at Institutions with Instructional Positions in Japanese Studies and Staff Ratios, by Undergraduate Program Classification*

Program	Instructor, Lecturer %	Professor Ranks %	Other Staff %	Adjunct, Visiting %	Total Staff %	Number of Programs (& % Dist.)	No Staff Data	Program Staff Ratio	Teaching Staff Ratio
Minimal	34.3% (12)	60.0% (21)	2.9% (1)	2.9% (1)	100.0% (35)	(19) 9.7%	[4]	1.8	1.8
Limited	32.8% (21)	59.4% (38)	4.7% (3)	3.1% (2)	100.0% (64)	(27) 13.8%	[11]	2.4	2.3
Under-grad Area	19.1% (18)	72.3% (68)	3.2% (3)	5.3% (5)	99.9% (94)	(26) 13.3%	[3]	3.6	3.5
Full UG, no grad	17.1% (93)	74.0% (402)	5.3% (29)	3.5% (19)	99.9% 543	75 38.5%	[14]	7.2	6.9
Full UG, with grad	19.8% (195)	67.4% (663)	10.4% (102)	2.3% (23)	99.9% (983)	48 24.6%	[4]	20.5	18.4
Full UG Total	18.9% (288)	69.8% (1065)	7.9% (121)	3.4% (52)	100.0% (1526)	(123) 63.1%	[18]	12.4	11.4
All Pro-grams	19.7% (339)	69.3% (1192)	7.4% (128)	3.5% (60)	99.% (1719)	99.9% (195)	[36]	8.8	8.2

* Staff (n=17) at institutions listed in the directory without instructional programs have been excluded from the table. Staff data were available for 195 academic programs.

full undergraduate programs, it brings the ratio down a bit, but still leaves them with an average of 11.4 teaching staff. Even full undergraduate programs without a graduate program at the institution have an average of 6.9 teaching staff. Considering that the actual faculty number required to meet the threshold for a full undergraduate program is three faculty members, this is another clear indication of how strong these programs have become.

Table 7.2 gives the equivalent measures for graduate programs. While institutions with all levels of graduate programs have some administrative staff positions (the category includes Japanese librarians), institutions with complete graduate programs in Japanese Studies have a substantially higher number and percentage of administrative positions. Administrators comprise ten percent of the staff at these programs, and they may hold a variety of positions related to research centers and the library. Typically, research centers in Japanese Studies have a faculty director who is supported by an administrative assistant or assistant director who is often a recent PhD in Japanese Studies. Such staff positions are essential to the functioning of highly developed research and graduate programs at major universities. Despite the higher allocation of administrative staff, these programs still have nearly three-quarters of their staff in faculty of professorial rank. In fact the percentage of lecturers and instructors is lower for complete graduate programs than for MA or limited PhD programs. It is the MA programs that appear to be more heavily reliant on lecturers and short on faculty of professorial rank, while the limited PhD programs have a distribution more similar to that of complete graduate programs. These variations, however, may be artifacts of small sample size. We have shown the figures for those programs that do not have a graduate program for comparison. It is clear that those programs on average have only half as many program staff as the MA level programs; complete graduate programs have eight times the staffing levels of undergraduate only programs.

Table 7.2. Distribution of Staff Positions at Institutions with Instructional Positions in Japanese Studies and Staff Ratios, by Graduate Program Classification*

Program	Instructor, Lecturer %	Professor Ranks %	Other Staff %	Adjunct, Visiting %	Total Staff %	Number of Programs (& % Dist.)	No Staff Data	Program Staff Ratio	Teaching Staff Ratio
MA Level	23.9% (16)	70.1% (47)	4.5% (3)	1.5% (1)	100.0% (67)	16.3% (8)	[4]	8.4	8
Limited PhD Program	19.9% (38)	72.2% (138)	5.2% (10)	2.6% (5)	99.9% (191)	34.7% (17)	[0]	11.2	10.6
Complete Graduate Program	15.1% (141)	73.5% (687)	9.6% (90)	1.8% (17)	100.0% (935)	49.0% (24)	[0]	39.0	35.2
All Graduate Programs	19.7% (195)	67.6% (671)	10.4% (103)	2.3% (23)	100.0% (992)	100.0% 49	[4]	20.2	18.1
No Graduate Program	17.1% (120)	74.1% (521)	3.6% (25)	5.3% (37)	100.1% (703)	(146)		4.8	4.6
Full UG Total	18.9% (288)	69.8% (1065)	7.9% (121)	3.4% (52)	100.0% (1526)	(123) 63.1%	[18]	12.4	11.4
All Programs	19.7% (339)	69.3% (1192)	7.4% (128)	3.5% (60)	99.% (1719)	99.9% (195)	[36]	8.8	8.2

* Staff data were available for 195 program, 49 graduate programs and 146 undergraduate programs without any graduate program.

It is obvious that staffing levels lie at the very heart of academic Japanese Studies programs. Staffing levels determine how many courses can be offered in how many disciplines, and how many levels of Japanese language a program can offer. At the higher levels, administrative staff is essential to build and maintain a Japanese library collection and to support graduate instructional and research programs in Japanese Studies. And despite the growth of the administrative, instructor, and lecturer categories, the core element for an academic Japanese Studies program remains the presence of faculty of professorial rank who are Japan specialists. This raises a set of critical questions concerning the stability of the professoriate in Japanese Studies programs. We have seen that some faculty members have moved from one institution to another in the past decade, and that many faculty have retired and left the field.

We asked Japan specialists in our survey about their own plans. Happily, the overwhelming majority (79%) said they plan to stay in the academic world until retirement, and only a tenth of one percent said they planned to leave the academic world before retirement. Another 9.5 percent said they were not sure because it was too early to tell. At the other end of the spectrum, about 6 percent of respondents wrote in responses to explain that they are already retired, but the majority added that they are still active in research or even teaching. The remaining respondents are not in academic positions, but they also tended to be content with where they are. As these responses demonstrate, Japanese Studies is well into a generational turnover as the Baby Boom generation retires. While the presence of a tenured professor occupying an academic position pretty well assures that Japanese Studies will remain in that particular discipline in the institution's program, there is considerably more uncertainty about what happens to Japanese Studies positions when someone retires or leaves, particularly if the position was never "marked" as a Japanese Studies position to begin with.

Our respondents were asked whether they thought their position would be filled with another Japan specialist after they leave. Only a third (32.1%) of respondents were confident that a replacement appointment would be made in Japanese Studies, while slightly fewer (28.9%) thought the position would be filled but not with a Japan specialist. Another third (32.6%) of the respondents were not sure what would happen, but only 6 percent thought the position would simply not be filled at all. This distribution is roughly the same as it was in 2005, with a smaller percentage confident that their position would be filled with another Japan specialist. However, a closer look at the results by disciplinary category confirms our continuing concerns about the future of the social sciences in Japanese Studies. While over a third of those in the humanities and more than two-thirds in the smaller category of languages and linguistics thought their position would be filled with a Japan specialist when they leave, only a fifth of social scientists thought their replacement would be a Japan specialist and just over half (53.3%) thought the position would be filled by someone who was not a Japan specialist. Substantial minorities in all the disciplinary categories said they did not know what would happen to their position, but only a very small minority thought the position would not be replaced at all.

We have additional evidence from another question in the survey. The 1984, 1995, and 2005 studies asked Japan specialist respondents why they thought new PhDs were accepting non-academic employment, which was a bigger concern in earlier decades. This question contains the assumption that new PhDs are in fact taking non-academic jobs, which carries different meaning in different economic climates. In the 1990s the reference point was the money to be made by marketing one's Japanese skills outside the academy, while in the 1980s and 2000s, it is the absence of desirable academic positions that provides the reference point. The responses have changed considerably over time, so we present the results from the current study along with those from the three previous ones in which the questions were asked in Table 7.3.

Table 7.3. Percent Distribution of Perceived Reasons New PhDs Accept Non-Academic Employment, 1984, 1995, 2005, 2012

Reason	Major Reason	Some Importance	Little Importance	Not Sure	# Responding
1984 Survey*					
No tenure track positions available	65	24	4	7	725
No positions available in geographic area	23	42	25	11	676
No academic positions of any sort available	58	23	9	10	712
Low salary compared to non-academic posts	22	43	26	9	692
Lack of security and future in academics	31	44	15	10	696
Family considerations (spouse's employment)	5	37	32	26	638
Prefer non-academic work	6	29	41	25	635
1995 Survey					
No tenure track positions available	39.5	28.5	8.5	23.6	636
No positions available in geographic area	19.8	37.0	13.5	29.8	587
No academic positions of any sort available	20.8	24.8	23.3	31.1	557
Low salary compared to non-academic posts	35.6	30.2	11.0	23.2	626
Lack of security and future in academics	21.8	31.2	20.6	26.4	587
Family considerations (spouse's employment)	9.6	42.2	13.4	34.7	573
Prefer non-academic work	16.0	29.2	18.5	36.3	531
2005 Survey					
No tenure track positions available	53.0	26.4	2.6	18.1	421
No positions available in geographic area	26.8	45.4	5.9	21.9	392
No academic positions of any sort available	18.1	34.0	21.0	26.9	376
Low salary compared to non-academic posts	14.9	39.9	22.2	23.0	383
Lack of security and future in academics	14.2	33.3	25.0	27.4	372
Family considerations (spouse's employment)	16.9	46.9	9.4	26.8	384
Prefer non-academic work	7.6	30.5	26.4	35.4	367
2012 Survey					
No tenure track positions available	61.1	19.7	1.4	17.8	589
No positions available in geographic area	33.1	36.4	0.2	23.6	535
No academic positions of any sort available	34.8	29.1	10.6	25.5	529
Low salary compared to non-academic posts	16.6	32.3	23.2	27.9	535
Lack of security and future in academics	17.4	35.6	20.4	26.6	534
Family considerations (spouse's employment)	16.2	44.3	10.4	29.2	531
Prefer non-academic work	5.9	27.6	24.7	41.8	510

* 1984 data from 1984 SSRC Report, Table 58, p. 88. Percentages were reported rounded to whole numbers. Data from 1995 and 2005 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 7.15 p. 167.

In 1984, the lack of tenure track academic positions was the major reason offered, with lack of any academic positions a fairly close second. Respondents thought geographic location, salary, and a perceived lack of security and future in academics were of some importance as well. By 1995, only 39 percent thought lack of tenured academic positions was a major factor, and two thirds thought the low salary compared to non-academic posts was either of some importance or was a major factor. Concern about spouse's employment also was cited more frequently as having some importance. In 2005, the majority of respondents again thought the lack of tenure track positions was the major reason new PhDs took non-academic jobs. Family considerations and geographic location were cited as having some importance, along with comparatively low salaries. Again in 2012, a strong majority cited no tenure track positions available, with no academic positions of any sort and no positions in the geographic area also cited by about a third of respondents. Family considerations were also cited, but as of lesser importance.

These findings provide some indirect evidence about the state of the job market, based on the combined perspective of Japan specialists at large and small institutions with varying degrees of Japanese Studies programs, and at different stages in their careers. We also have asked Japanese Studies programs about their staffing situation and future prospects. Reports from the Japanese Studies programs about their staff situation paint a mixed picture of faculty gains and losses. Overall, 73 institutions reported losing a total of 148 Japan specialist faculty since 2004. However, they refilled 78 of those positions with another Japan specialist, and another 21 institutions reported that they were currently seeking a Japan specialist. The positions being sought included six in Japanese literature, two in culture and one in film, four in history, three in Japanese language, and one each in anthropology, economics, humanities, and linguistics, plus a director of an East Asian program. In addition, programs reported that 18 additional Japan specialist faculty had been hired on serendipity positions at their institutions. These included seven historians, two each in sociology, language, and performing arts, and one each in anthropology, linguistics, and religion. In response to a question about whether non-faculty staff had been added, programs reported ten new staff positions, but also reported additional seven faculty positions. Several of these positions were supported with Japan Foundation, Freeman Foundation, or other foundation funding, but the majority were funded by the institutions themselves. When all of these positions are taken into account, this is an estimated shrinkage of only 24 positions, or 16 percent.

However, the number of adjunct positions reported to the study this time is 57, and some of the visiting positions reported may also be a disguised form of adjunct appointment. The category of lecturer is also ambiguous, since in many universities it constitutes a temporary position, while in others there are permanent lecturer positions. It is difficult to pursue this analysis any further, but the data do suggest that some of the expansion in academic programs is being handled by hiring qualified Japan specialists into unstable positions rather than more secure tenure track positions. Hence while there is ample evidence that the largest infrastructure contribution to Japanese Studies by academic institutions is support of faculty and staff positions for their Japan programs, the growing tendency for American academic institutions to meet some program needs with temporary or unstable appointments rather than making a permanent investment in faculty careers is cause for concern.

The other missing piece of the puzzle is whether there is an oversupply of new doctorates entering the field. This is very difficult to answer because our data provide a snapshot number of current doctoral candidates at the time of each study, but those candidates finish at different times and many do not finish. Moreover, many of them do not go into the American academic market, which may be either by choice or because there are no positions available for them.

The number of reported doctoral candidates is smaller in 2012 than in 1995 or 2005. Although some of this may be the result of weaker reporting, the number does seem to be down somewhat for programs that have reported consistently in each study. From informal observations and the survey data reported above, we sense that new PhDs are having a harder time finding stable academic employment right out of graduate school, which meshes with the increase in unstable positions reported at Japanese Studies programs.

The hiring data reported earlier suggests that few social science positions are marked for Japan specialists, but some social scientists continue to be hired into serendipity positions. Surprisingly, historians are also being hired into serendipity positions, presumably at smaller programs that do not already have defined Japanese history positions. The demand for literature and language positions, as well as for cultural studies positions, corresponds both to the strong continuing demand for Japanese language courses, and to the attractiveness of Japanese popular culture that we noted earlier. If we relate these traces of current hiring patterns to the current disciplinary distribution of doctoral students in Japanese Studies as reported in Chapter 2, Table 2.14, we can begin to identify areas of potential oversupply. The three largest disciplines represented among the doctoral students are history (128), literature (86), and anthropology (52). If we combine literature with linguistics (18), second language acquisition (7) and cultural studies (22), the total is 133 doctoral candidates who can potentially fill the demand for new positions in language and literature or language and culture positions. And even though this is the area of greatest current demand, some of those positions will be filled with lecturers, instructors, or adjuncts. It may take a while for the market to absorb these new Japan specialists into stable academic positions, but they should find employment.

Hence the biggest area of potential oversupply appears to be in history, which may explain why some Japanese historians are now filling serendipity positions. Anthropology also seems to be potentially in oversupply, which is a more chronic condition in that discipline. Some historians and anthropologists may also compete for positions in language and culture departments, but there are not enough of these departments to accommodate the potential oversupply. The potential supply of new political scientists is down, while the supply in religion-philosophy, art history, and sociology is stable and relatively low. In all of these fields, new PhDs will probably need to market themselves based on their general disciplinary credentials.

Because Japanese Studies is a very small and specialized field, there is frequently a mismatch between the number of new PhDs entering the job market and the number of positions available at that particular time. What is somewhat different now is that the Japanese Studies job market is global. For the past two decades Japan specialists trained in the United States have been taking academic positions in other countries. In some cases these are international students returning to their country of origin, but increasingly their ranks have also included American trained American citizens taking positions in other countries. We saw earlier that there are currently a substantial number of such persons working abroad. Moreover, the flow is now dispersed globally. The majority still may be found in Japan and Canada, but nearly 20 percent are found in Europe, Australia-New Zealand, and other places in Asia. While that may increase the job opportunities for American-trained Japan specialists, the flip side is that some Japan specialists trained in other countries may also be competing in the U.S. academic market.

This situation is by no means unique to Japanese Studies; it is part of our increasingly globalized world. Of course, the increased use of unstable positions in academia is another aspect of the same process of neoliberal globalization, which emphasizes the use of short-term economic metrics to manage labor costs as well as to shift risks onto the individual. We also

know that people come into Japanese Studies out of personal commitments that have been generated through a combination of the attractions of Japanese culture and the opportunities to be exposed to it. They did not choose Japanese Studies because they saw it as a particularly marketable career choice, but rather because they had become personally committed to Japanese Studies. While we welcome these graduate students and share their dedication to the study of Japan, we also still bear some responsibility for what happens to them after they leave our programs. The days of being able to place them in secure academic positions through personal connections and good recommendations are part of the distant past. What we can still do is ensure that we have prepared them as well as we can for this globalized and risky job market. To compete today they need publications and strong credentials in their discipline as well as Japanese Studies credentials, and they need exposure to the field through presenting papers at academic conferences large and small.

That leads us to take a broader look at other aspects of the infrastructure and support for Japanese Studies, focusing first on the Japanese libraries whose holdings have figured directly in the criteria for graduate programs in the previous chapter.

Library Resources

The most basic resource for scholars has traditionally been the library. The growth of Japanese Studies in the United States has been quite dependent on its library collections of Japanese materials. While there are a substantial number of old and large Japanese research collections in the United States, the absence of a strong Japanese collection has long been a barrier to the expansion of new programs at the graduate level. Since the 1980s the rise in the value of the yen relative to the dollar has made it increasingly difficult to maintain and expand existing Japanese collections, and even harder to develop new ones from a modest base. Yet the collections in the U.S. do continue to grow. The standard metric for measuring collection is simply the number of book volumes in Japanese, although the libraries of course have other resources such as newspapers, periodicals, microfilms and material in other formats.

Table 7.4 shows the number of institutions with Japanese collections of various sizes as reported in several studies of the field. Despite the fact that the 1977 CULCON study established

Table 7.4. Japanese Language Collection in the United States, by Number of Volumes in Japanese, 1977, 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

Volumes in Japanese	1977	1984	1995	2005	2012
1,000 to 19,999	31	33	36	26	27
20,000 to 39,999	8	9	9	9	9
40,000 and over	12	16	23	30	31
Total	51	58	68	65	67

* Figures for 1977 and 1984 taken from 1984 Japan Foundation Report, Table 26, p. 49, which calculated the 1977 figures from numbers provided in the 1977 CULCON Report, Appendix V, Table 33, p. 137. The 1977 figures were originally from collection surveys by Japanese librarians. The 1984 figures were from that study's questionnaire, supplemented by 1975 data for institutions that did not return the questionnaire. For 1995, small collections reported size figures on the questionnaire, but figures for the larger staffed collections were taken from the 1984 Annual Report of the Committee on East Asian Libraries to ensure comparability. Data for 1977, 1984, and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 10.1, Chapter 10, page 249. These data were reproduced and 2005 data added in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*, Table 8.1, p. 170. The 2005 table separated academic and non-academic libraries, but they have been combined here.

25,000 volumes as its standard for a graduate research collection for Japanese Studies, that study and all subsequent ones have reported the lower categories with the break at 20,000 volumes rather than 25,000. Both the 1995 and 2005 studies reported the same seven non-academic libraries separately, but they have been combined with the academic libraries in this table. In fact, the present study includes data from 14 libraries not affiliated with academic institutions. Several are public libraries, while many of the others are research collections associated with museums. The present study has collection information from a total of 74 libraries, including seven with less than 1,000 volumes in Japanese. The distribution of the academic libraries has changed as more libraries have exceeded the 20,000 volume and 40,000 volume levels. Although there have consistently been nine libraries in the 20,000 to 39,999 category, they have not been the same libraries. As with academic programs in Japanese Studies, libraries move through the categories as they grow larger and stronger. Three major academic institutions now report data from multiple libraries. Columbia University and the University of Washington both have law libraries with more than 30,000 volumes in Japanese, while Harvard University has both a law library and a fine arts library, each with more than 10,000 volumes in Japanese.

The 1995, 2005, and 2012 studies collected data directly from Japanese librarians, but took the latest collection figures from numbers that these libraries report annually to the Committee on East Asian Libraries. Most libraries report their collection figures very precisely, but a few provided only round numbers. Table 7.5 displays the list of all Japanese collections in the United States that have over 20,000 volumes in Japanese as of 2012. The largest collection in the United States by far is the Library of Congress, with over a million volumes in Japanese, while the largest university collection is at the University of California at Berkeley, with over 390,000 volumes in Japanese. Both of these institutions were at one time designated as national repositories for book acquisition programs that placed one copy of every book published in Japan in each of these libraries. That program was discontinued, but it helps explain why the UC Berkeley collection is somewhat larger than those at other universities. Currently there is an exchange between the Library of Congress and the National Diet Library. About 15,000 items come to the Library of Congress annually, of which about 72 percent are serials, 25 percent are monographs, and 3 percent are in other formats. The comparison with figures in 1995and 2005 demonstrates that the rank ordering of collections by size is not all that stable. Collections can increase substantially because of increased institutional support for Japanese collection development in general, or by the acquisition of one or more special collections by purchase or donation.

Although two non-academic institutions in the United States with very large Japanese collections appear on the list, the Library of Congress and the New York Public Library, one of our primary concerns is the relationship between library resources and graduate programs in Japanese Studies. As explained in the 1995 study,

> Previous surveys of Japanese Studies in the United States have routinely documented the size and location of the major Japanese language library collections. Two different size criteria have been used to rank these collections. The first, established by the 1977 CULCON study as part of its categorization of graduate programs, set 25,000 volumes in Japanese as the minimum library size for a full graduate program. . . . The 1984 Japan Foundation Report noted that the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies regarded 40,000 volumes in Japanese as a necessary minimum for comprehensive research purposes.[1]

1 *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s*, p. 249.

Table 7.5. Japanese Language Library Collections in the United States with Over 20,000 Volumes in Japanese, 1995, 2005, and 2012, in 2012 Rank Order*

Library	1995	2005	2012
Library of Congress	791,156	1,846,859	1,186,029
University of California at Berkeley	297,148	351,067	391,470
Harvard University	224,723	283,958	328,319
Columbia University	222,665	273,522	307,738
University of Michigan	235,092	285,494	303,139
Yale University	198,372	246,652	271,846
University of Chicago	151,588	206,435	236,492
Stanford University	140,806	175,800	212,365
Princeton University	136,000	177,035	197,471
University of California at Los Angeles	127,694	165,055	193,546
Cornell University	87,982	136,720	159,138
University of Washington	106,611	130,281	150,924
University of Hawaii	108,026	121,088	134,194
Ohio State University	56,634	102,345	128,183
University of Pittsburgh	29,336	114,168	127,932
University of Pennsylvania	35,892	65,623	84,067
Duke University	26,243	51,541	82,141
University of Kansas	52,857	70,899	81,669
Indiana University	49,003	67,924	81,150
University of Maryland	31,983	61,730	77,758
University of Illinois	60,000	67,135	77,135
University of Wisconsin	50,000	64,072	77,010
New York Public Library	53,300	75,250	75,250
University of Texas	42,000	57,949	67,611
University of Washington in St. Louis	43,340	50,493	55,113
University of California, Santa Barbara	36,354	46,707	54,694
University of California, San Diego	20,254	51,447	51,617
University of Arizona	36,676	51,273	44,608
University of Minnesota	34,000	34,878	41,971
University of Oregon	41,507	41,507	41,507
University of Iowa	27,200	29,834	40,000
University of Southern California	13,296	27,600	37,922
University of Washington School of Law	–	25,575	32,399
Columbia University Toshiba Law Library	–	23,000	30,090
University of California, Irvine	–	–	28,591
Georgetown University	25,000	27,500	27,500
University of California, Davis	17,403	26,675	26,675
Arizona State University	–	22,483	24,848
Brown University	–	–	23,067
University of Massachusetts at Amherst	–	20,000	20,000

We have used 25,000 volumes in Japanese as the criterion for complete graduate programs in chapter 6, but all of the complete graduate programs except the University of Southern California also exceeded the 40,000 volume level. Five programs with limited PhD programs also have libraries that exceed 25,000 volumes in Japanese. Ironically, it is no longer the size of their libraries, but rather the size and disciplinary distribution of their faculty that limits their movement into the complete graduate program category, as noted earlier.

Support for Japanese library collections in the United States does not rely solely on institutional funds. The federal government provides some support for library collections as part of its National Resource Centers program, which generally awards support on a competitive basis to between 12 and 15 National Resource Centers for East Asia at the graduate level, and sometimes one or two additional ones as undergraduate programs. The awards are now made for four years at a time. Initially, the number of such Centers more or less matched the number of graduate programs in Japanese Studies, so all programs were supported. As new programs have developed, the competition has become quite fierce, and even long-standing programs are sometimes bumped for one grant cycle. The fact that there are now 24 Japanese Studies programs with complete graduate programs demonstrates the limitations of the current arrangements for providing federal support. These awards are for East Asia, so the amount of library support that actually flows to the Japanese collection depends on the priorities at each institution.

Beginning in the 1970s, both the Japan Foundation and the Japan-US Friendship Commission began providing support for Japanese language library collections in the United States. In the early years, most of this support came in the form of block grants to the twelve largest university library collections, at the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Michigan, Harvard University, Columbia University, Yale University, the University of Chicago, Princeton University, Stanford University, the University of California at Los Angeles, University of Washington, and University of Hawaii. As more institutions developed graduate programs, there were increasing complaints that the system was unfair because it provided no support to the newer programs that also had growing Japanese collections and needed library support. The problem was exacerbated by the skyrocketing cost of Japanese language research materials as a result of changes in the exchange rate from the 1980s on, which affected all existing Japanese library collections and made it prohibitively expensive to develop new ones.

The two major funders tried to expand the pool of libraries they could support by creating some competitive programs and encouraging libraries to think beyond their own collections and develop regional plans for sharing resources, but these measures produced limited results. By the end of the 1980s it was clear that more drastic measures were needed to support the Japanese language library resources in the United States with the limited amount of resources available. The funders called a major conference of all the libraries with Japanese collections to try to develop new ideas. As a direct result, a new national organization was created to help coordinate Japanese library resources in the United States and develop new ways to make materials available to a broader array of Japan specialists. Sponsored jointly by the two major governmental funders of Japanese library collections in the United States, The Japan Foundation and the Japan-US Friendship Commission, this group was originally called the National Coordinating Committee for Japanese Library Resources (NCC). It later expanded its scope to include Canada, and was renamed the North American Coordinating Council for Japanese Library Resources. The group worked from the premise that they were coordinating (and thus were in cultural studies terms "constructing") a "national" library collection accessible through inter-library loan. The NCC developed policies and procedures for the equitable dis-

tribution of the limited amounts of available external funding for Japanese library resources, by concentrating the support into cost-sharing for the purchase of expensive multi-volume sets that a single institution could not afford and that otherwise would not be available in the United States. They then worked with other institutions in Japan and the US to open up new vehicles for international inter-library loan, and to develop organized access to Japanese "gray materials" such as reports and other limited circulation documents that are essential for research but are not normally collected by American libraries.

The creative efforts of the NCC coincided with the expansion of the Internet and the availability of library catalogs and full-text databases of Japanese materials online. In addition to supporting initiatives to create online catalogs of some specialized Japanese materials available in the US such as Japanese newspapers, the NCC worked with the Japanese providers of online information resources to ensure that access would be available to users outside of Japan and to reduce the barriers and costs of access. More materials are now available directly from the National Diet Library through document delivery and interlibrary loan. In addition, more materials are available from many Japanese universities, thanks to an arrangement called the Global ILL Framework, which is now administered by the NCC and the Japan Association of National University Libraries. Nearly 200 libraries now participate in this program, which includes document delivery and interlibrary loan. Libraries can join the program without charge, and the interlibrary loan fees are handled through an existing interlibrary loan fee management system. The NCC has also promoted the exchange of Japanese and American art exhibition catalogs, and developed a protocol and instructions to assist scholars who need to obtain permission to use copyrighted Japanese images in their publications.

As part of the broader East Asian library community, they also helped to establish an online resource called AskEASL, (Ask an East Asian Studies Librarian) that for several years allowed anyone with an Internet connection to get reference assistance from a qualified librarian based at a large East Asian collection with access to reference tools for Japanese materials. While some of these Internet-based resources would have developed independently, the NCC deserves credit for working to make access to these resources available to users outside of Japan.

A major worry in the field in the 1990s was how to support the research needs of those Japan specialists who had taken positions at institutions without any infrastructure for Japanese Studies. Although the NCC's original aim was simply to make Japanese library resources more readily available to isolated American scholars, the intersection of their work with the rapid expansion of the Internet and the work of similar groups in the United Kingdom and other places has meant that the fruits of their labors are now available to scholars and students all over the world. It is quite clear that there are still many Japan specialists located at institutions without a Japanese Studies infrastructure, and that most of these institutions are unlikely to develop a strong Japanese Studies program that could provide research support to the faculty. However, these new arrangements for access to distant resources using electronic technology have greatly reduced the problem.

Librarians and libraries have been at the forefront of the digital revolution, and after an initial slow start, the benefits of these changes have now come to Japanese Studies. Twenty-five academic libraries now provide free access to an array of electronic databases from Japan for their users. These are basically the same institutions that provide complete graduate programs, have the largest concentrations of faculty resources in Japanese Studies, and are training the overwhelming majority of new doctoral students in the field. While this is far from offering universal access to such research resources, it does ensure that most graduate students and the faculty at the major Japanese Studies programs have such resources at their fingertips. It is a

far cry from the situation just a decade ago, when only one or two institutions provided such access to Japanese language online resources. It is the NCC's leadership and hard work that has made this possible at costs that American graduate research institutions can support.

Both the two previous studies and the present one have included a substantial number of survey questions that were designed to provide better understanding of how Japan specialists conduct their research, the place of library materials in that research, and how specialists obtain access to the library materials they need. We are therefore in a position to evaluate how the situation has changed because of the two major factors and their intersection: the growth of the Internet and the work of the NCC.

We saw in chapter 3 that Japan specialists use a broad range of materials in both English and Japanese to keep up with their field and also for their specific research needs. Ninety percent reported that they use materials in their own personal collection, but over three quarters also use library materials in either their own institution or another institution's collection. Substantial percentages also reported using document delivery of inter-library loan materials. These ways of obtaining research materials also rely heavily on access to an institutional library as the gateway. We now explore how accessible such materials are and how specialists obtain them. The data we have already presented make it abundantly clear that only a fraction of Japan specialists have direct access to a major Japanese library collection at their own institution or one nearby.

Japan specialists have been asked in all four studies about their access to materials on Japan in library collections either at their own institution or at one that is readily accessible to them. Our questions ask particularly about research needs, but the resources scholars need for their research and teaching may overlap considerably, and both are important. Table 7.6 presents the results for 2012, with results from 1995 and 2005 for comparison. For 2012, only three respondents reported that they do not use English language materials. Two percent of the respondents reported either that they do not use Japanese language materials at all, while one percent said that they do not use Japanese library materials and about the same percentage reported that Japanese materials are not available in their library. A somewhat larger number (4.6%) said their research requires materials that are available only in Japan.

The local or nearby library does not get high marks for meeting Japan specialists' needs for either English or Japanese materials, but users are more likely to be satisfied with the English language resources. On the bright side, the percentage reporting that the library met all or most of their needs for Japanese materials increased in 2012, and the percentage giving the lowest evaluations was lower. We should not regard these responses in too pessimistic a light, since no one expects that the local institutional library resources can meet all of Japan specialists' needs for Japanese or even English language materials. We already know that nine out of ten Japan specialists have their own personal collections that meet many of their needs, and that they also rely on other types of materials. However, library resources remain important, both for the books in the local collections that are available for immediate use, and as the gateway for access to a much broader range of materials. The question then is how do Japan specialists get the materials they need if they are not available locally. This, too, is a question we have asked in 1995, 2005, and 2012, although we have added categories to reflect new forms of access as they have become available.

This is a multiple response question for which 465 respondents gave an average of 2.6 responses each. The two most common responses were that the librarian orders the material for them through interlibrary loan (ILL), selected by nearly three-quarters of the respondents (71.2%), and that they go to Japan to get the materials they need, selected by over half (55.3%)

Table 7.6. Satisfaction with Materials on Japan in Library Collection at Own Institution or One Readily Accessible to Respondent, by Language of Materials, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

	1995		2005		2012	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Satisfaction with English Language materials						
Meets all needs	116	17.2	65	16.2	111	24.6
Meets secondary needs	128	19.0	85	21.2	82	18.1
Meets most needs	307	45.5	172	42.9	199	44.0
Meets half of needs	100	14.8	35	8.7	57	12.6
Sometimes useful	99	14.7	35	8.7	41	9.1
Completely inadequate	16	2.4	3	0.7	3	0.7
# of respondents	675		401		452	
Satisfaction with Japanese Language materials						
Meets all needs	50	8.8	58	7.3	59	13.1
Meets secondary needs	79	13.9	40	10.4	42	9.3
Meets most needs	156	27.4	107	27.7	161	35.6
Meets half of needs	96	16.8	47	12.2	72	15.9
Sometimes useful	172	30.2	95	24.6	86	19.0
Completely inadequate	63	11.1	31	8.0	24	5.3
# of respondents	570		386		452	

* Respondents were permitted to select up to two responses from a list including reasons they did not use the collection at all, so the number of responses slightly exceeds the number of respondents. Percentages based on number of respondents. Data for 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 10.2, Chapter 10, page 251. These data were reproduced and 2005 data added in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*, Table 8.3, p. 174.

of respondents. A quarter (26.5%) said they ask a Japanese colleague to get the materials for them, while others borrow material from colleagues at their own institution or at other institutions. One in eight report that a librarian at another institution orders the material for them through ILL. Smaller percentages of respondents reported that they go to a nearby Japanese collection or the Japanese collection from their doctoral institution or that they buy all the Japanese materials they need.

Japan specialists today use the computer as a fundamental tool for their work, and many of their uses of the computer involve online communication that links them to distant resources and colleagues. To explore this further, we asked respondents about their use of a variety of computerized research aids. A full 90 percent of respondents access their own library's online catalog, and half access the online catalogs of other libraries, presumably from their own computers. More than two thirds (69.6%) report that they access the OCLC/Worldcat online catalog, which tells users what libraries have particular items and also provides access to global ILL for some Japanese resources. Well over a third (37.7%) reported that they access various full-text databases. A follow-up question asked them to specify, and the range included a variety of Japanese full-text databases plus the general databases of journal articles to which most

large American academic libraries now subscribe. Both in that questions and in another asking about reference databases, many listed Japanese resources such as Japan Knowledge to which many of the major Japanese collections now subscribe. In a dramatic turnaround virtually no respondents this time said they did not know how to use such resources, or that they were not available. A quarter of respondents reported using Google, Google Scholar, and other Internet search services, which 30 percent reported using online booksellers including Amazon in both Japan and the United States, Kinokuniya, and a few other sources.

Respondents were also asked about their use of Japanese databases, a resource that is becoming more available through American universities but still is prohibitively expensive for many institutions. Since 2005 the percentage with no interest in using Japanese databases (18.7%) has dropped to ten percent. Over half have now used them in Japan (55.2%) compared to just over 40 percent in 2005 and half (50.5%) have used them in the US, up from the 2005 figure (37.8%). This reflects both a greater familiarity with such resources, and their greater availability. All of these findings suggest that technological developments, coupled with the initiatives of the NCC to make Japanese research resources more accessible to Japan specialists in the United States, are indeed making a real difference. The sole Japan specialist at an institution without a Japanese language library collection is not nearly as isolated as he or she was a decade ago. Many more resources are directly accessible to anyone with an Internet connection, and our responses suggest that includes just about all Japan specialists today.

This certainly does not mean that Japanese library collections are less important, or that Japanese librarians are less essential to the enterprise of Japanese Studies. On the contrary, the Japanese librarians at staffed collections have transformed themselves into information specialists who know how to access an enormous range of resources beyond just the books and periodicals in their own collections. They have become an essential network hub, helping to link Japan specialists all over the United States with the much broader array of research resources they now use. Although some of these changes have come about globally as part of the emerging information society, for Japanese Studies the NCC and Japanese librarians deserve much credit for bringing the information revolution to Japan specialists. In addition to developing infrastructure and opening new ways to expand Japanese research resources in the United States, they also play a continuing role in teaching new Japanese librarians about the many new resources for research in Japanese Studies and helping to train Japan specialists as end-users of these resources. Any American initiatives for open information access, just like such initiatives anywhere else in the world, are instantly not just national but global, because of the nature of the medium. What began with a specifically American problem caused by the geographic expansion of Japanese Studies in the United States has morphed into public goods available to Japan specialists anywhere in our new borderless world.

There is no need to belabor the point that the Internet has fundamentally changed access to information for scholars, students, and the general public all over the world. A number of projects in the US and elsewhere have been making full-text editions of significant Japanese language research resources available online, in addition to those available through both public and commercial sources in Japan. The "cultural turn," as the rise of the cultural Studies paradigm is sometimes called, also has changed the nature of the research resources to which Japan specialists need access. In addition to the continuing need of Japan specialists to do fieldwork in Japan, many scholars now need access to Japanese films and popular culture materials. Still others have begun making research use of material that either originates on the Internet or is posted there for public access, such as organizational websites, blogs, and Internet social sites of various types. While with limited resources there is no way that even the richest of Ameri-

can library collections can meet all the needs of their faculty for very specialized research materials, there have been major strides in making highly specialized materials available through a combination of specialized collection development to meet local needs, and arrangements to share these resources more broadly. The number of special collections reported by Japanese collections at American academic libraries has increased to 71 in this survey. These same libraries reported that they make a vastly increased number of Japanese databases available to their users. Twenty-five libraries report that they make Japanese databases available to their users, which means that they purchase licenses to provide the access on a continuing basis. Fifteen of the libraries provide between one and four Japanese databases, while ten libraries provide between seven and twelve. This represents a large continuing expense that has come to be essential for major Japanese collections.

We conclude our analysis of the role of libraries and librarians in Japanese Studies in the United States by looking briefly at librarians' own views of the situation in Japanese libraries today, as compared with the situation as they saw it in 1995 and 2005. The results are shown in Table 7.7. The results point to a serious deterioration in support for this most essential resource. A much larger percentage of librarians (45.7%) report decreased support for acquisitions, and over half (54.3%) say that their staffing has decreased. Both are about double the percentage that reported decreased in the two previous studies. While very few report decreased infrastructure, only 10 percent say that their infrastructure support has increased, compared to 30 percent or more in the two previous studies.

There has been some movement of Japanese library staff among institutions recently, due to the same generational turnover that has affected academic staff. While this has meant advantageous career moves for a few Japanese librarians, they also report that some institutions have consolidated the library positions and one person is covering both the Japanese and Chinese collections, in many cases a China specialist. This is one of the few tangible pieces of evidence of direct competition between Japanese and Chinese resources. It reflects adminstrators' assumption that since both languages use Chinese characters, one librarian can serve both

Table 7.7. Librarians' Perception of Changes in Library Support in Past Five Years, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

Type of Support	Decreased %	About Same %	Increased %	Total N #
Acquisitions				
1995	21.1	47.4	31.6	57
2005	28.6	38.8	32.7	49
2012	45.7	37.0	17.4	46
Staffing				
1995	23.6	60.0	16.4	55
2005	32.7	53.1	14.3	49
2012	54.3	28.3	8.7	46
Infrastructure				
1995	3.6	66.1	30.4	56
2005	22.4	46.9	36.6	49
2012	3.8	54.3	10.9	46

* 1995 data from *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s,* Table 10.4 p. 262. Reproduced with 2005 data in *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities,* Table 8.5, p. 179.

fields. Obviously, the loss of a Japanese librarian and replacement with a Chinese librarian means a serious loss in the level of professional support for the Japanese collection in terms of knowledge of the relevant materials and resources, ability to provide service to library users, ability to acquire grants and gifts from Japanese sources, and loss of the interpersonal network relations that enable Japanese librarians to share resources and information freely. An even more serious loss has been the elimination of staff support for the large Japanese collection at the New York Public Library, which now is being merged and administered as part of a much larger unit without specialized Japanese library staffing. There are 41 Japanese librarians with entries in the Directory of Japan specialists. Collectively they hold 106 academic degrees, including 36 library degrees, and six PhDs, which serve as an alternate professional qualification for some Japanese library positions. Nearly all of those advanced degrees were earned in the United States. The requirements for Japanese librarians at American institutions now really require either the library and information resource degrees that are offered by American library schools, or advanced training in Japanese Studies at the PhD or near PhD level. There are sufficient well-trained people to fill these positions; the problem now is to ensure that the Japanese collections continue to staff them with trained Japanese librarians.

Ancillary Programs and Services

Our data on the non-instructional aspects of Japanese Studies are less complete in this survey, and will not support detailed analysis. Many institutions maintain study abroad programs, and large institutions typically offer several different programs in which their students may participate. Small programs use study abroad to supplement their limited language offerings, and in some cases also to supplement area courses with content on Japan. Most Japanese Studies programs, particularly language departments, have institutionalized some procedure for giving academic credit within their own system for work students take in study abroad programs. This implies that such programs now have been firmly established within the institution, so that students can participate in study abroad without administrative problems. Several Japanese study-abroad and language programs are managed by consortia of American institutions, which oversee the quality of instruction and provide some faculty on a rotating basis. Other programs are managed by Japanese academic institutions but have long-standing ties with particular American institutions.

For students at public institutions, the major barrier to study abroad remains the high cost of spending a semester or a year in Japan, although for students at private institutions the cost may be about the same as a year on their own campus. The U.S.-Japan Bridging Foundation began as a project sponsored by CULCON to increase the number of American students studying in Japan, which helped to establish appropriate programs at several Japanese universities. Now an independent foundation supported by the Japan U.S. Friendship Commission, the Bridging Foundation has established a national infrastructure for information about study abroad opportunities in Japan, and raises money from corporations and foundations to provide partial scholarships for study-abroad in Japan through a national competition.

Most large Japanese Studies programs maintain a lively program of outreach activities that serve their institution and the wider community. The National Resource Center competition, which evaluates East Asia programs in part on their outreach activities, has spurred this type of activity for decades. Many institutions now provide extensive training programs for K-12 teachers and some also run programs for community college instructors to strengthen their knowledge of East Asia and Japan.

We must also take note of a number of private and public institutions that contribute to the rich array of resources for the study of Japan in the United States. They include museums, libraries, foundations, societies that promote awareness of Japan to the general public, and other organizations that support Japanese Studies in various ways. While some independent research organizations in economic and political policy areas have reduced their involvement in the study of Japan since the 1990s, support for Japanese Studies within the cultural arena remains strong. Many academic institutions maintain collections of Japanese art and artifacts, along with some major museum collections.

Perceptions of the Current State of Japanese Studies

The past four surveys of Japan specialists have all asked about their perception of funding levels for Japanese Studies. In each of the studies, about a quarter of the respondents were unsure, but the responses of the remaining three-quarters track very neatly the situation before, during, and after the Japan boom of the early 1990s. Table 7.8 shows the results for all four studies. Whereas in 1995 a third of Japan specialists surveyed thought that funding levels in Japanese Studies had increased and only a quarter thought funding was less plentiful, the belief that funding for Japanese Studies has become less plentiful has increased steadily and now two-thirds of the respondents hold that view. Virtually no one now believes that funding has become more plentiful, the lowest percentage recorded across the four studies.

Whether this pessimism is warranted objectively depends on one's location and what kinds of funding come to mind. Clearly new funding for Japanese Studies is much harder to come by than it was during the Japan boom of the early 1990s. However, many of the largest Japanese Studies programs built substantial endowments beginning with gifts from the Japanese government in the 1970s and supplemented them with private gifts and corporate donations in the 1980s and early 1990s. It is the practice of American academic institutions to invest their endowments through professional management companies, and to pay out only 4-5 percent of the endowment's value annually to the programs the endowments support. Since the actual investment earnings are usually higher than this, the endowments grow both because of increases in the value of the principal and of income that is reinvested. Despite occasional bad years, these endowments have grown substantially over the years, and they helped to protect and sustain Japanese Studies during the financial crisis of 2008, even though private institutions that are dependent on their endowments for general operating costs were hit very hard by the sudden drop in the stock market. Institutional endowments have now largely recovered from the steep decline, but of course they have lost the steady increases they might otherwise have enjoyed over the years following the crisis.

Nonetheless, the institutions with dedicated endowments for Japanese Studies now have the resources to sustain their Japanese programs for the foreseeable future, even without new

Table 7.8. Perception of Funding for Japanese Studies Research

Funding Level	1984	1995	2005	2012
Less Plentiful	44.0	26.0	51.8	65.2
No Change	16.0	14.6	8.5	11.3
More Plentiful	17.0	34.9	16.8	0.2
# Respondents	831	840	517	600

infusions of external funds. In addition, the growth of Japanese Studies programs and of their libraries at a number of large public institutions over the past decade is evidence of substantial institutional commitment to the field that is largely funded out of regular institutional budgets. On the other hand, the U.S. and Japanese governments are reducing or holding flat their financial support for Japanese Studies in the United States, while the increased number of programs and the relatively large pool of both faculty and graduate students in the field means that competition for that funding is more severe than it was in earlier times. This adds to the perception that funding is becoming much less plentiful than it was in the past. Most faculty and graduate students would view funding not as institutional resources, but rather in terms of their own ability to get funding for a specific research project and travel to Japan, whether through their own institution or through a nationally competitive funding source such as the Japan Foundation, the Fulbright program, or other sources. From that perspective, the combination of high yen, shrinking value of the dollar, and shrinking budgets for the major research funders have definitely made research funding more difficult for individual scholars to obtain.

In the 2012 study we asked Japan specialists two additional relative questions about their perceptions of the availability of research funding: whether they thought funding for international research was more or less available than funding for US projects, and whether funding for Japan-related research was more or less available than funding for other world areas. The results are shown in Table 7.9. While a third thought that there was a level playing field for research funding, just over half felt that international research in general was less well-funded than non-international work, and an even larger majority felt that research on Japan was disadvantaged compared to other areas. This is an understandable perception, but is likely to vary by discipline as well. In disciplines and topic areas in which most research is domestic rather than international, there may appear to be much more plentiful resources for domestic research at both local and national levels. Moreover, within the international area studies community, over the past two decades federal funding has had to accommodate urgent national needs in other world areas with a limited or shrinking overall budget, and this has definitely reduced the share of the pie that goes to East Asia and to Japan.

This is also one place where the perception of the rise of China and Korea may also factor in. It is certainly true that both the Chinese and Korean governments have in recent years established generous foundations that provide research and training support for American students and researchers. What may be less apparent is that both of those moves were simply following the earlier leadership of the Japanese government in establishing the Japan Foundation with its many support programs. It is also certainly true that the Japan Foundation's funding has been shrinking over the past decade or more, even as more Japan specialists and Japanese Studies programs are vying for that support.

The same surveys have also asked Japan specialists their priorities for funding in Japanese Studies. Table 7.10 shows the results for four studies, with priorities ranked in 2012 order. The

Table 7.9. Perceptions of Relative Availability of Funding for Japan-Related Research, 2012

Funding Type	% More Available	% Less Available	% Same Available	N
International versus non-international project	9.4	54.4	36.8	555
Japan project versus another area	4.9	60.6	34.5	551

Table 7.10. Japan Specialists' Funding Priorities, 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012, in 2012 Rank Order*

Purpose	1984	1995	2005	2012
Language Study in Japan, Study Abroad	-	1	1	1
Dissertation Support	2	2	2	2
Additional Faculty Positions	1	3	3	3
Graduate Training (pre-doctoral)	-	4	3	4
Postdoctoral Fellowships	4	8	6	5
Research Grants for Scholars	3	7	5	6
Conferences and Seminars	6	9	9	7
Expanding to Small Schools	-	6	8	8
Library and Museum Acquisitions	5	5	7	9
Outreach and Public Affairs Programs	7	10	10	10

* Data for 1984 and 1995 taken from *Japanese Studies in the United Staes: The 1990s*, Table. 10.9, p. 275. Reproduced and 2005 data taken from *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*, Table 8.7, p. 181.

top four priorities remain the same as in the previous two studies. In 2012, Japan specialists strongly support language study in Japan and study abroad, followed by support for with dissertation research, additional faculty positions, and pre-doctoral graduate training.. Priorities below these top four items have changed, however. Japan specialists now give higher priority to postdoctoral fellowships for younger scholars without jobs, followed by research grants for established scholars. Support for conferences and seminars has moved up two places in the rankings, switching places with support for library and museum acquisitions. Expanding Japanese Studies to smaller institutions remains unattractive, in eighth place for the second time. Japan specialists in 2012 also give the lowest priority to the same item as in 1995 and 2005: outreach and public affairs programs. Overall, the clear priority is to get young people to Japan (language study, dissertation research) and to get them employed (faculty positions).

A related question asked in all three four surveys concerns the balance of funding allocations between larger and smaller institutions. Table 7.11 shows the results for all four studies. Only 20 percent feel that larger institutions should receive a larger proportion of the funds than they do at present, a figure that has remained stable since the 1980s. However, the enthusiasm for providing additional support to smaller institutions has waned since 1995, when as we saw earlier, there had been a sudden increase in small programs during the economic competition paradigm. In 1984 respondents were given a "not sure" option, which has not been offered in the two later studies, thus forcing respondents to choose one of the three options. In the 2005 and 2012 studies, just over a third of respondents felt that a greater proportion of funding ought to go to smaller institutions, while over 40 percent thought the present allocation to larger and smaller institutions was appropriate. There is thus considerably less support for increasing support to smaller institutions than there was in the 1990s; the option of increasing support to smaller institutions has reverted to the level it had in 1984. The results should also be read in light of the responses to the previous question concerning the rank order of funding priorities. Expansion of Japanese Studies to small colleges ranked eighth out of ten options for support.

What should we make of these last survey results? We have seen that most Japanese Stud-

Table 7.11. Preference for Funding Allocation Between Larger and Smaller Institutions, 1984, 1995, 2005, and 2012*

Preferred Allocation of Funds	1984	1995	2005	2012
Greater proportion to larger institutions than at present	20	19.4	20.9	19.8
Same proportion to larger and smaller institutions as at present	22	34.8	43.2	44.2
Greater proportion to smaller institutions than at present	38	45.8	35.9	36.0
Not sure	20	–	–	–
Total	100	100.0	100.0	100.0
# of Respondents	811	623	449	491

ies programs are established at large academic institutions. All of the complete graduate programs are at large, research intensive institutions, and most undergraduate Japanese Studies programs are also located at institutions with quite large undergraduate enrollments. So the question of whether the funding balance should go to larger or smaller institutions is ambiguous about whether this means smaller institutions in overall enrollment or to institutions of any size that have smaller Japanese Studies programs. The priority question quite explicitly refers to expanding Japanese Studies to small colleges. This was the movement that was so strong in the early 1990s, but we have seen that many of those programs did not survive the waning of the Japan boom. In addition, in our analysis of the 1995 findings, respondents from small institutions supported expansion of funding to small institutions, while those from large institutions were less enthusiastic about it.

The message since then seems to be that there is some support for giving more funding to existing smaller Japanese Studies programs, but not much support for expanding further into small colleges that lack the infrastructure to build strong Japanese Studies programs. At the same time, we know from the analysis of program size and staffing that the area of likely growth for Japanese Studies over the next decade is probably by strengthening and expanding Japanese Studies programs at undergraduate institutions. This is most likely to be successful when it is done at institutions that have a relatively large undergraduate student body and already have some Japanese Studies presence: in short, if it follows the existing pattern in which undergraduate Japanese Studies programs become larger and deeper over time. There is now a large pool of over fifty area and limited Japanese Studies undergraduate programs upon strategic investments in new faculty positions could bring them up to the level of full undergraduate programs.

More generally, we can expect continuing decline in the level of external support for Japanese Studies programs in the near future. In general, any funding that is not formally dedicated to Japanese Studies is likely to be diverted elsewhere. The National Resource Centers that fund the largest programs are organized as East Asian National Resource Centers. While they provide some protection for Japanese Studies, the balance between Japan, Korea, and China may shift over time. In addition, the actual number of National Resource Centers that are designated for East Asia fluctuates as the government perceives the need to use a limited pool of funds to support language and area training in other world areas that have become more politically salient. Such areas do not have the level of self-sustaining infrastructure that has been built in Japanese and East Asian studies. However, these national programs actually provide only a small part of the resources that large Japanese Studies programs utilize—and

do not affect the great majority of Japanese Studies programs at all--so these fluctuations are not fatal to Japanese Studies.

Endowments from the Japanese government and Japanese corporations protected large Japanese Studies programs from the full impact of the fiscal crisis in 2008, but administrators are now finding ways to "tax" even dedicated endowments in order to divert some of that wealth to other institutional needs. Korea and now China have followed in Japan's footsteps in developing special national programs to endow their American academic programs, so there is some balance among the East Asian programs at major institutions. As noted earlier, what might appear as a threatening amount of new support for competing area studies is actually just late-comers catching up to what Japanese Studies received in previous decades. It is important to remember that these endowments and federal support apply only to the largest programs. Smaller Japanese Studies programs at both public and private institutions depend primarily on their own institutional budgets, which are increasingly driven by metrics such as student course enrollments. To the extent that the current demand for both Japanese language courses and area courses about Japan is sustained by student interest, programs stabilize, flourish, and even expand. However, if the demand should fall substantially in the future, programs could shrink. The smallest current programs are at greatest risk.

This assessment of the staffing and infrastructure for Japanese Studies in the United States has identified some weak spots in an otherwise positive picture. Despite the size and strength of the largest Japanese Studies programs, and the healthy condition of academic offerings, there are concerns about replacement of existing positions when they become vacant, coupled with concerns about appropriate employment for young scholars. These concerns come through clearly in Japan specialists' perception of the funding situation as well as their funding priorities. While support for language programs and study abroad in Japan is unwavering, the next four priorities in 2012 all concern student support and academic positions, the most basic elements of academic life. In uncertain times, the extras fall to the bottom of the list. Fundamentally, these concerns are not about Japanese Studies in particular, but about the overall climate of American academics in the era of neoliberal globalization. Even as the positive attractions of Japanese culture sustain high enrollments and rich development of Japanese course offerings, and Japanese Studies programs are offering strong undergraduate and graduate programs to large numbers of students, academic life is no longer as stable and secure at it used to be, especially for younger scholars. The consensus on these priorities seems directed both toward stabilizing the career path for young scholars and supporting the elements that sustain student demand for Japanese Studies.

Responses of Japanese Studies in the United States to 3.11

The response of the Japanese Studies community in the United States to the 3.11 triple disaster in Japan can be understood as a direct result of the massive infrastructure for Japanese Studies that has been built up over the five decades. Above and beyond the general public sympathy and support offered by the American people, the Japanese Studies community used its resources, its expertise on Japan and its strong network ties to Japan to respond to the tragedy. The study was just beginning when disaster struck, and the impact on our students, faculty, and programs was soon apparent. We added an open-ended question to both the specialist and institutions surveys in order to try to capture some information about the impact of the disaster on the Japanese Studies community and what people were doing. They invited respondents to comment on both the positive and negative impacts. The questions were added at the very end of both surveys, and about half of the overall sample provided responses.

For Japanese Studies programs, the first and most immediate impact was that many study abroad programs were cancelled and students were sent home for safety reasons. The programs had to scramble to take care of the returning students. Some summer 2011 study abroad programs were also cancelled. However, the programs report that these programs were subsequently restored and this negative impact was temporary. University administrators worried about liability issues and in some cases increased the insurance requirements for students going on study abroad and study tours to Japan. Some study abroad programs were temporarily moved to locations in western Japan. A few schools reported a temporary decline in enrollments in introductory Japanese language courses, but recovered after a semester.

At the same time, programs began reporting a range of positive developments. Programs and students organized fundraising drives. Japanese Studies programs began organizing special symposia and lectures to share their knowledge, connect the disasters to similar events elsewhere in the world, and focus attention on Japan. These events also provided additional opportunities for fundraising for relief efforts. Later, study abroad programs began participating in relief work in the Tohoku area. Schools used partnerships with Japanese institutions in Tohoku and elsewhere to develop or enhance joint activities. MIT created the MIT-Japan 3.11 Initiative in collaboration with Miyagi Prefecture University and the town of Minami Sanriku. Vassar College participates in the Tohoku Earthquake Forum with Ochanomizu University. A faculty member at one university organized a joint subtitling project in which students created English subtitles for a Japanese TV documentary film related to the earthquake. One of the biggest initiatives was Harvard University's digital archive project, now co-sponsored with several other institutions, to collect and archive materials about the disaster and preserve them for future research. The Portland Art Museum reported that it owns a rare set of prints that document the 1923 Kantō earthquake. They put the series online after 3.11 with a link to a site for making donation, and received more than 140,000 hits on the website. All of these program responses could be organized on short notice because Japanese Studies programs already had the faculty expertise and the administrative resources to make them happen.

Japan specialists also offered a wide array of both positive and negative comments. On the negative side, faculty reported not only the difficulties of accommodating students who were forced to leave Japanese study abroad programs in the middle of the semester and return home, but also the fears of parents who did not want their children to go to Japan or to study Japanese. Some reported that parents were urging students to study China instead, but others commented that the students are more interested in Japan and that interest in China tends to be business oriented. Many faculty also reported disruptions in their lives if they were in Japan at the time of the disaster, or had planned to go soon thereafter. Some research projects were cancelled or postponed in the aftermath of the disaster. Some Japan specialists expressed fear of radiation and hesitated to travel to Japan, and that fear was also expressed by parents of students. Commenting more broadly on the impact, some Japan specialists felt that 3.11 would reduce interest in Japan, while others primarily expressed critical comments about the government and administrative responses and decried the stereotypical American news coverage. A Japan specialist at the University of Guam reported a very negative impact because 3.11 had led to postponement of the movement of American military personnel from Okinawa to Guam, which had been anticipated as a big boost to the economy. Consequently university budgets were negatively impacted and Japanese Studies was in danger of being consolidated with East Asian Studies.

On the positive side, many Japan specialists reported that they have incorporated something about 3.11 or related issues into their courses and their pending publications. Some have

added new units to language courses and to area courses in anthropology, history, and political science. They have been asked to comment on the disaster itself and to contribute their expertise in many ways. Some report having done translation work in relation to the disaster aftermath, giving public lectures, participating in symposia, and helping to organize events. They have participated in special panels at the regional and national Association for Asian Studies meetings, and at many local public events. A number of scholars report that they have shifted their existing research interests to incorporate some aspect related to 3.11, whether it is an interest in energy policy, in nuclear issues, in community response to disasters, civil society, or Japanese politics. Those who previously had ties to Tohoku have used them to reach out to friends and colleagues, while others have created new ties by leading student groups to do volunteer work. Those who have gone to Tohoku have written about it, or given talks on their return. The disaster has produced both a greater general public awareness of many issues concerning Japan, and an increased interest in Tohoku as a place.

Many specialists also felt that 3.11 had increased student interest in Japan. Some thought it was temporary, but others saw it as connecting students to the reality of contemporary Japan and felt the results would be more enduring. While programs reported programmatic activities and the effect of 3.11 on enrollments and study abroad programs, Japan specialists wrote much more about the human connections. They expressed their own personal ties and emotional responses to the disaster, and also reported the concerns of students and parents. These are people who have spent their lives studying Japan, living in Japan, and interacting with Japanese people. They were not only experiencing the events of 3.11 and its aftermath very personally, but they were also the individuals that others turned to for information and assistance. It is clear that many of them felt a strong sense of responsibility to contribute not just to fundraising and volunteer efforts, but to use their skills and expertise in whatever ways they could. Some Japanese literature specialists participated in a project to translate poetry about the disaster by Tohoku poets, while historians began to research and write about Japanese earthquakes of the past. Social scientists already working with Japanese colleagues on the Kobe earthquake expanded their purview to include the Tohoku earthquake as well.

Most view 3.11 as having a lasting impact on Japanese society, and consequently, many see it as something that they need to incorporate into their own teaching and research on Japan. A few Japan specialists were uniquely positioned with directly relevant expertise and background and have made 3.11 the center of their research activity. Others have a more tangential interest, but still have used it to refocus their attention either on the Tohoku area or on issues that were previously a less central part of their expertise. While the responses to our survey questions captured immediate responses in the first year after the disaster, there are going to be long-term positive impacts on Japanese Studies in the United States in the form of increased ties with counterparts in Japan, and new topics for teaching and research that will bring different perspectives on Japan to students for many years to come. The involvement of American students in responding to 3.11 will be a lasting memory that reinforces their sense of personal connection to Japan.

8

Japanese Studies in the Twenty-First Century

In the preceding chapters we have worked through a massive amount of data, trying to understand the present situation of Japanese Studies in the United States by placing it into appropriate contexts. In many cases we found simple continuation of patterns that had previously established, but we also identified some new issues and directions. This concluding chapter highlights our key findings, covering the general health of the field and its sustainability, the concerns about competition from Chinese Studies, and the impact of 3.11 on Japanese Studies in the United States. These findings rest not only on quantitative data from the survey, but on my overall analysis of the growth and development of Japanese Studies in the United States and the context of American higher education as outlined in Chapter 1.

Japanese Studies is Alive and Well in the United States

On a wide variety of quantitative measures, Japanese Studies appears to be healthy, despite persistent rumors that it is declining. In fact, it has grown substantially just since 2005.

1. The number of Japan specialists has increased nearly 11%, the number of doctoral candidates has increased 12.2%, the number of Japanese Studies academic programs has increased 6.5%, and the number of professional staff at Japanese Studies programs is up 8.1%. This is very impressive growth over a rather short time.
2. Japanese Studies programs have become steadily larger and deeper. Nearly half of all programs have sufficient Japan specialist staff to offer a full undergraduate program with a major, and many offer both Japanese Studies and Japanese language majors. Many undergraduate programs have become stronger since the previous study, and have moved up in our standard rankings. The greatest instability, as always, was among the smallest and weakest programs. Separate from these formal rankings using criteria developed in earlier studies, the study found 361 undergraduate major or minor programs related to Japan. There were 140 minors and 221 majors reported. The degree of emphasis on Japan is strong. Nearly two-thirds of the minors and over half the majors were on Japan or Japanese language. The rest were on East Asia or Asia in general but included a Japan component.
3. An increasing number (20%) of programs have 12 or more staff, which enables them to

offer graduate programs in Japanese Studies. Doctoral students in Japanese Studies were reported at a wider range of institutions than ever before, and MA programs continue to thrive. However, the great majority of doctoral students continue to be studying at 23 institutions with complete graduate programs, which have rich human and infrastructure resources for Japanese Studies. The infrastructure at larger programs continues to develop and resources for the study of Japan are more widely available, even as the resources specialists want and need have also diversified.

4. The number of courses on Japan is up more than 25%. Such courses are taken by many students who are not pursuing a Japanese Studies major, and provide a better assessment of the overall impact of Japanese Studies on students than the count of formal Japanese Studies program at the undergraduate level. Japanese language courses have increased more than 35%. Area courses with Japan content have increased 14.5%. Courses exclusively on Japan have increased 17%. Although our data on enrollments are very incomplete, it does appear that enrollments are up both for language courses and for area courses on Japan.

Current Conditions Appear Sustainable in the Near Future

These current conditions in Japanese Studies appear sustainable for the next several years for a number of reasons.

1. Students come to Japanese Studies through a combination of their attraction to Japanese culture and direct exposure to Japan. The specific nature of these forces changes over time, but they produce a steady flow of new entrants to the field. The current attraction is Japanese popular culture, to which American students are exposed as children. Courses are now offered that use that attraction to build knowledge of Japanese language, history, and culture.
2. Students now have high school exchanges and college level study abroad opportunities for exposure, and the JET program provides additional exposure. As long as these exposure opportunities are sustained, they will bring a steady flow of students into the study of Japan in the United States. Hence as a matter of policy, these programs need to be protected and expanded because of their long-term impact on Japanese Studies.
3. Japanese language training and specialized exams for college entrance are now available at the high school level, and 15% of students enter college Japanese language courses with prior Japanese language training. Japanese has become the second most commonly taught foreign language in the United States, with an infrastructure to support both a broad base of elementary level instruction and more advanced courses.
4. College Japanese language programs provide advanced language courses to both undergraduates and graduates, steadily raising skill levels. Four years of Japanese are now offered at 116 institutions, and many large programs now provide extensive offerings above the fourth year level. These programs provide a pool of Japanese language teachers for high school courses, as well as supporting the training of professional Japan specialists at the doctoral level.
5. A wide variety of courses about Japan are offered to undergraduates, making some basic level of knowledge about Japan part of a general college education at a growing number of institutions. While this does not necessarily produce Japan specialists, it serve to institutionalize the study of Japan in the curriculum. Strong student demand for language

and area courses on Japan protects faculty positions and allows programs to stabilize and expand.

6. In the contemporary United States, the overall scale and broad distribution of Japanese Studies programs no longer serves just to produce a small number of professional Japan specialists with doctorates. As part of normal knowledge, it contributes to the skills of people at the BA and MA levels who enter a range of occupations. More broadly, it raises the level of knowledge about Japan in American society as a whole.

Economic Issues and Problems on the Horizon

Although the field as a whole is self-sustaining, there are economic issues in American higher education that impact Japanese Studies, producing differential effects on particular programs and specialists.

Doctoral Training and Hiring of New Japan Specialists

1. Japanese Studies programs have grown from the top down and the center out, with large programs at elite graduate institutions producing the great majority of new PhDs, who then seek employment at a much broader range of institutions.
2. Except for Japanese language and literature, most doctoral level training takes place in disciplinary departments that produce PhDs with disciplinary credentials who also have a research specialization in Japan. Because of the particular nature and structure of American higher education, the majority of these new PhDs seek and find employment in disciplinary departments, where they teach courses in their discipline and are evaluated by the standards of the discipline and not specifically as Japan specialists.
3. Much of the expansion in Japanese Studies has been serendipitous rather than programmatic. While some institutions did deliberately create Japanese Studies programs and staff them with specialists, many more people have been hired at colleges and universities because of their disciplinary credentials, for jobs that are not "marked" as being for a Japan specialist. As clusters of such faculty develop at institutions that also start to teach Japanese language, they coalesce into programs that offer undergraduate minors and majors in Asian Studies, East Asian Studies, or Japanese Studies, and eventually also may support graduate programs. Consequently, at any particular time, the field includes large and very stable programs, middle range programs that are stable and growing, plus small programs whose stability rests on a very small core of faculty. In addition there are institutions that offer only a few courses related to Japan, plus a substantial number of Japan specialists who teach at institutions with no program in Japanese Studies at all. Japanese Studies is quite stable at large or middle-sized programs, but much more fluid at the smaller end.
4. It has become much more difficult for new PhDs in Japanese Studies fields to find stable employment in the United States right out of graduate school. The current production of substantial numbers of new doctorates in Japanese Studies with excellent credentials coincides with neo-liberal fiscal trends in American higher education. These larger trends produce few entry level tenure track positions and increase reliance on contingent academic employment such as temporary lecturers, instructors, and adjunct faculty. Postdoctoral fellowships provide opportunities to develop a publications record, but they also increasingly provide contingent teaching staff to institutions reluctant to hire tenure track staff.

5. At the same time, the labor market for English speaking Japan specialists is global, which means that American-trained new PhDs are finding employment all over the world, but also that new PhDs trained elsewhere are now competing for jobs in the American Japanese Studies market. Of course, it is also true that American institutions are training Japan specialists from all over the world, and not all of those students enter the American academic market. Programs reported that they are hiring and are replacing Japan specialists who leave, but overall there are more Japan specialists currently employed in insecure positions than at any time in the past.
6. The resulting instability at the beginning of careers may lead some people to leave academics and perhaps Japanese Studies. Some, particularly social scientists, may find their Japan skills valued more in non-academic positions in government or the private sector. Within academics, this lag in initial stable academic employment leads to much more movement between institutions. In the American context that can mean that young scholars who take positions at small institutions without strong Japanese Studies programs may later move to bigger programs on the basis of their strong publication records. Others may have such heavy teaching loads that they cannot keep pace and gradually become less active as Japan specialists, although they may continue to teach courses about Japan at their institution.
7. The competition for stable academic employment also falls differentially on young Japan specialists with different forms of credentials. On one hand, there is substantial demand for specialists who have the credentials to teach Japanese language, even if that is not their primary area of specialization. On the other hand, Japan specialists with strong disciplinary credentials, particularly in the social sciences, may have more opportunities to obtain "serendipity positions" in their discipline, which may or may not allow them to teach courses related to Japan.

Impact of Fiscal Austerity on Japanese Studies Programs

1. While Japanese Studies programs that enjoy high student demand as measured by course enrollments may have opportunities to expand, fiscal concerns can also take a toll even on very strong and stable Japanese Studies programs. In general, any funding that is not formally dedicated to Japanese Studies is likely to be diverted elsewhere. The National Resource Centers that fund the largest programs are organized as East Asian National Resource Centers. While they provide some protection for Japanese Studies, the balance between Japan, Korea, and China may shift over time. In addition, the actual number of National Resource Centers that are designated for East Asia fluctuates as the government perceives the need to use a limited pool of funds to support language and area training in other world areas that have become more politically salient but do not have the level of self-sustaining infrastructure that has been built in Japanese and East Asian studies. At present such federal funding only is awarded to about two-thirds of the main doctoral producing complete graduate programs in Japanese Studies. Even at those institutions, the national program actually provides only a small part of the resources that large Japanese Studies programs utilize. Loss of such funding is not fatal to Japanese Studies, but it does have a direct impact on fellowship support for graduate students at the pre-dissertation stage.
2. Endowments from the Japanese government and Japanese corporations protected large Japanese Studies programs from the full impact of the fiscal crisis in 2008, but adminis-

trators are now finding ways to "tax" even dedicated endowments in order to divert some of that wealth to other institutional needs.

3. These endowments and federal support apply only to the largest programs. Smaller ones at both public and private institutions depend primarily on their own institutional budgets, which are increasingly driven by metrics such as student course enrollments. To the extent that the current demand for both Japanese language courses and area courses about Japan is sustained by student interest, programs stabilize, flourish, and even expand. However, if the demand should fall substantially in the future, programs could shrink. The smallest current programs are at greatest risk.
4. In the area of library studies, there is some concern about consolidation of Japanese and Chinese Studies positions, which reduces the level of library support for Japan specialists at that institution if a China specialist is hired to cover both fields. However, that has been the norm at some libraries for decades and there is a stable continuing supply of Japanese librarians.

The Perception of a Threat from Chinese Studies

The perception that Chinese Studies threatens Japanese Studies is an urban legend or myth that is not supported by the data. The conditions sustaining current growth in the two fields are somewhat different and do not produce a zero-sum game.

1. Chinese Studies as a field of professional specialization in the United States has historically always been larger than Japanese Studies, as measured by membership in the Association for Asian Studies and the relative number of faculty at large institutions offering Japanese and Chinese Studies, either separately or combined into East Asian Studies. The fields co-exist at most institutions and have often been mutually reinforcing. This has not changed.
2. Korea and now China have followed in Japan's footsteps in developing special national programs to endow their American academic programs, so there is some balance among the East Asian programs at major institutions. What might appear as a threatening amount of new support for competing area studies is actually just late-comers catching up to what Japanese Studies received in previous decades.
3. Chinese Studies is currently experiencing the sort of economic competition boom that Japanese Studies experienced in the 1980s and 1990s. We know from Japan's experience that such a boom brings an influx of students into the field because of their perception of potential economic value. Such students are concentrated in particular disciplines and professional fields and they tend to move into the general economy rather than becoming academic specialists. An economic competition boom also may attract the attention of scholars who have not previously studied the area, and lack language skills for research. Because their choices were opportunistic, many of these people later move away to pursue the next economic boom and do not become permanent area specialists.
4. Japanese Studies is sustained by student attraction to Japanese culture and direct exposure to Japan, which then leads students to take language and area courses and deepen their understanding. The decision to study Japanese language or to take courses about Japan emerges first as a personal interest, which for some students then builds into a lifelong commitment. It is rarely an opportunistic choice based on a perception of potential economic value, although those who gain enough skills and knowledge do find ways to

utilize it productively. The opportunities for exposure to Japan and its cultural attractions are now so widely available that even if only 10-20% of the students go on to become professional Japan specialists, this will sustain the profession while serving the general educational needs of the broader population.

5. While parental perceptions of economic advantage may affect their encouragement of high school students to study Chinese rather Japanese, and post-earthquake fears may have led some parents to discourage their children's participation in student exchanges, this is less of a factor at the college level. American students generally make their own decisions about what courses to take and what major to pursue, perhaps after an initial year of complying with parental demands and doing poorly. If anything, parental pressure to study a particular language is likely to decrease the student's interest in pursuing it. The only exception would be the effect on heritage learners, which at present affect primarily Korean and Chinese language enrollments in the United States rather than Japanese and might lead to a perception that interest in these languages has grown simply because there are currently more heritage learners of Korean and Chinese entering college. We also know from earlier experience with heritage learners in Japanese, that while it may affect enrollments in elementary level courses, it does not necessarily translate into continued progression into more advanced courses. While there was some parental concern about study abroad in Japan in the immediate aftermath of 3.11, it does not appear to have had a lasting impact.
6. Hence overall, current interest in China is not really in competition with what brings people to Japanese Studies. There continue to be students who are drawn to the study of China by the same kinds of forces that bring others to the study of Japan. This is the core of both fields at the professional academic level, which requires sustained commitment to many years of language study in addition to mastery of a discipline using both Japanese and English sources.

The Impact of 3.11 on Japanese Studies in the United States

The study asked both specialists and programs about the impact of 3.11 on Japanese Studies in the United States and on their own activities.

1. Both programs and specialists initially reported disruptions as a result of the 3.11 disasters. Programs had to scramble to take care of students in study abroad programs that closed suddenly and some faculty reported initial declines in student enrollment as a result. Research activities of some specialists were also disrupted. Things soon reverted to normal, although some institutions imposed increased demands for insurance protection on study-abroad students that increased the already high cost of participation.
2. Faculty reported that radiation fears led some American parents to discourage their children from going to Japan, or even from studying Japanese language. Some Japan specialists also reported that radiation fears had led them to postpone or give up research projects in Japan, or to refrain from visiting Japan during the summer months. Since these comments were reported within the first year after the 3.11 disaster, it is not clear whether they will have any lasting effect. However, similar fears have been reported in Japan among some segments of the population such as mothers of small children.
3. Both programs and specialists have reported a great outpouring of support for Japan in the wake of the disasters. Many organized fundraising activities and participated in organized volunteer activities. Some of these activities have led to the creation of more

enduring ties between residents of Tohoku communities and American students and Japan specialists who had little or no prior experience in the area. New consortia between American academic institutions and Japanese academic institutions in Tohoku have developed to pursue research and exchanges on a more formal and enduring basis.

4. Many Japan specialists have either initiated new research topics, or have extended existing areas of research to focus particularly on the Tohoku area. The number of specialists claiming some expertise on the Tohoku region has increased. In the wake of the disaster, some Japan specialists found that their expertise on a previously obscure topic had suddenly become much more significant. Those who initially felt their research agenda had been rendered irrelevant by the disaster soon discovered new ways to pursue their interests. They were already well prepared with the background to deal with new problems that arose, or to examine the impact of the disaster on particular parts of the population. Even if the things that attracted their attention were not in Tohoku at all, Japan specialists have been close observers of the ramifications of 3.11 throughout Japan, with new studies of social movements, food safety, and other concerns. It is not just that Japan specialists have suddenly become interested in these topics; an additional factor is that the current intellectual paradigm for understanding Japan provides tools and academic legitimacy for exploring topics that would not have been considered worthy of study two or three decades earlier.

Revisiting the Challenges of 2005 and Presenting New Ones for the Current Decade

In the previous monograph, *Japanese Studies in the United States and Canada: Continuities and Opportunities*, the analysis of Japanese Studies in the United States concluded with a review of the challenges for the 1990s and updating them for the first decade of the new century. We reproduce them here and update them for the current second decade of the 21st century.

I. The Challenge of Providing Japanese Library and Information Resources for Japanese Studies in the United States

The Japanese library community in the United States, in cooperation with its major funders, has made great strides in this area. The problems of providing access for isolated scholars have largely been overcome by new electronic technology coupled with new arrangements for borrowing materials globally through Interlibrary Loan and obtaining them through document delivery services. Many of these arrangements still require institutional access to an academic library, if not to a specialized Japanese librarian, but Japan specialists are increasingly able to obtain needed resources directly through the Internet. A new generation of Japanese librarians has been trained in the use of the many new technological resources, and now the concern is that for fiscal austerity may be eliminating some dedicated Japanese librarian positions, which greatly reduces the support available to both faculty and students. The existence of new technologies does not obviate the continuing need to maintain the books and periodicals that are the traditional lifeblood of Japanese library collections, even as more scholars are using research resources outside the normal collection range of these collections.

Thus the challenge remains: while great progress has been made in overcoming specific problems, there remaining a continuing need to provide support both for collection development and for the library community infrastructure that has been created through the NCC.

II. The Challenge of Supporting Japanese Studies and Japan Specialists at Smaller Academic Institutions

While this challenge remains to some extent, it certainly does not loom as large as it did earlier, and has dropped to a very low priority with the Japan specialists in our survey. Our findings suggest that there is likely to be continuing instability among the institutions with minimal Japanese programs, and that resources should be focused more on programs with greater potential for success.

However, the challenge remains: there still must be a commitment to support Japan specialists who are located at smaller programs or are more isolated. Their library resource needs may be somewhat less severe than they were a decade ago, but they must not be forgotten in the competitions for research and instructional support. Since some of the Japan specialists at these institutions are likely to be precisely the young, promising scholars who have taken such positions because of the unpredictable job market in Japanese Studies, their research opportunities need to be supported so that they can continue to be productive as Japan specialists and maintain their network ties to the Japanese Studies community.

III. The Challenge of Integrating Japanese Studies in the Social Sciences

This challenge is just as great today as it was when the previous study identified some of the factors exacerbating the situation. There have been serious new declines in the number of doctoral students in both political science and economics, reflecting the waning of the economic competition paradigm and probably also the negative incentives for studying Japan in those disciplines. There may be an oversupply of anthropology doctoral students for the job market, but the supply of sociologists seems to be stable. Japanese Studies is now quite clearly operating within a cultural studies paradigm, although larger and older programs retain strong elements of both the original language and area studies paradigm and the short-lived economic competition paradigm.

This remains a challenge without obvious solutions. However, as long as Japanese Studies can retain a basic level of faculty expertise in the various social science disciplines and some doctoral programs continue to train a basic core of new young scholars with solid disciplinary credentials in the social sciences, we can adapt to the overall reshaping of the field that is taking place. About all that can be done is to ensure that social science doctoral students have access to whatever research and training support is available, and that the social sciences are included in any programs to create new positions.

IV. The Challenge of Supporting Larger Numbers of Students to Reach Higher Standards of Achievements in Japanese Studies

Our findings indicate that many aspects of this challenge have been met. The levels of achievement in Japanese Studies programs have been rising, as indicated by the scale and depth of programs and the increased language proficiency of students. The scope of this challenge is also broadening because of the increased number of institutions now offering doctoral programs in Japanese.

There remains a continuing strong need for support for language training in Japan at the undergraduate (study abroad) and graduate (Inter-University Language Center) levels, and for pre-dissertation and dissertation support for graduate students. These remain the highest funding priorities of Japan specialists in our survey.

V. The Challenge of Adjusting to the Normalization and Internationalization (Globalization) of Japanese Studies in the United States

The issue of providing training for professionals in fields that are not well-served by traditional academic Japanese Studies programs seems to have been largely resolved. There are now several strong programs in place that can provide specialized professional Japanese Studies training to those who need it. Their graduates find employment in the mainstream economy and most are not identified as Japan specialists, unless they are employed as academic faculty. The current issue of Globalization is quite different. The impact of globalization on American academic institutions affects the job market for Japan specialists in two ways: first, through the tendency for programs to fill some Japanese Studies positions with contingent faculty (lecturers, adjunct faculty, and postdoctoral fellows with teaching responsibilities) rather than through stable tenure-track positions; and second, through the globalization of the job market so that Japan specialists trained in the United States and elsewhere are now competing for the same positions in many countries.

The challenge now is to prepare doctoral students as well as possible for this uncertain global job market while at the same time trying to create in the United States both new faculty positions and postdoctoral positions to serve as way stations to more stable academic employment.

Reviewing these challenges once again reveals how much has been accomplished through the concerted efforts of the Japanese Studies community with the support of the Japan Foundation and other funders. It also reveals the extent to which changes in the broader environment have altered both the problems and the priorities of the field. The challenges of library resources and of supporting isolated scholars have been transformed by new technology, but still require support and attention. The core challenges of improving research and training opportunities in Japanese Studies remain central, and now extend to providing more employment opportunities for our well-trained young Japan specialists.

Appendix A

Methodological Note

The data for this study were collected as a combined enterprise for producing the fourth edition of the *Directory of Japan Specialists and Japanese Studies Institutions in the United States and Canada* and providing survey data for analysis, as was the case with the 1995 and 2005 directory and monograph. For this project we used online data collection forms and to carried out virtually all communication about the project through e-mail. We tried to make the process of updating earlier directory entries as painless as possible, but the lengthy survey still required a substantial expenditure of time for most respondents. As a result of the combination of collecting data for a directory publication containing detailed information plus the survey data for statistical analysis, there was much more interaction between the project and its respondents than would be the case with a normal survey. We describe the data collection procedures in considerable detail in part to provide a guide for anyone who attempts to carry out a similar project in the future.

Contact Lists

The first two editions of the directory were produced at the Association for Asian Studies offices in Ann Arbor. The Association has not been able to accommodate the project since then, although it agreed to continue its co-sponsorship and to provide its mailing lists for our use. Consequently, the 2005 project and this one were carried out at the University of Hawaii's Department of Sociology under my direct supervision.

The first task for the directory was to find the relevant people and programs to include. Our baseline was the list compiled for the 2005 directory, which was six years out of date when we began the present project. The Association for Asian Studies provided its most current membership lists for members listing Japan as an area of specialization, which contained e-mail addresses for all current members. Only about half of the directory entrants are members of the AAS, but we cross-checked and added any new names and also updated e-mail addresses from this source. The websites of academic institutions offered a second resource, both for identifying whether Japan specialists had moved, and for obtaining clusters of e-mail addresses. It might have been faster just to search for them individually in Google, but we feared that simple searching on names would produce erroneous matches, which we hoped to avoid by locating individuals through known institutional affiliations. Later, when institutions provided their staff lists, these were also cross-checked to provide new specialists and new affiliations and e-mail addresses for ones already in the database.

For the 1995 directory we had located and included a substantial number of Japan specialists who were working outside of traditional academics, either in cognate areas such as libraries, museums, and research institutes, or in professional fields such as government, law, business, and mass media, where knowledge of Japan had become important. For the 2005 directory and even more so for the current one, our ability to track people outside the confines of academia is limited. If these individuals belonged to the AAS or were still employed at the same company or institution, we were generally able to locate them, but we could not track them if they had changed employers or were no longer linked to academic networks.

To identify institutions with Japanese Studies programs, we relied primarily on our existing database, since this time the AAS told us our list of programs was probably more complete than theirs! Since we already had a pool of institutions that went well beyond the parameters of existing programs as a result of the three previous studies, we concentrated on trying to locate someone to contact by e-mail at every institution with some trace of Japanese Studies activity, past or present.

For the first directory in 1989 we had supplemented the AAS list of academic institutions through a library search of museums, libraries, research institutes, and other organizations related to Japanese Studies. This list was expanded in 1995 with the addition of other non-academic institutions that employed Japan specialists and again in 2005. This time we used our existing list, supplemented by a handful of new organizations that support Japanese Studies.

Database and Forms for the Directory and Survey

The 1989 and 1995 directory projects had been managed with an R:Base relational database programmed by the AAS programmer, Ronald Peterson. However, by the time I needed to analyze the 1995 data, we were able to convert it to the initial version of Microsoft Access, which gave me much more independent control over the data. For the 2005 study and the current one, the UH College of Social Sciences systems manager, Harry Partika, housed and provided critical oversight for the project's web server, through which the data were collected. He initially provided space on his SQL server, and the project's programmers upgraded the 1995 Access database to SQL so that our staff could work on it from several computers and locations simultaneously. Despite our migration to a "grown-up" database system, we have continued to manage the project through an MSAccess "front-end" that provides a familiar, easy-to-manage user interface to the SQL database. For the current study we have our own web server and SQL server, housed under the watchful eye of Harry Partika and behind his strong firewalls. We also still had the College of Social Sciences url from the previous project and a project e-mail account. Even though the tools are basically the same, we had to revise and update everything in order to keep up with the rapidly changing technologies.

Using the 2005 directory entry and survey questionnaires as the base, Canadian Associate Julian Dierkes and I solicited input from various quarters and used our own sense of the field to determine questions that needed to be added or revised. We were reluctant to eliminate many questions because a major strength of this project is its ability to compare data from previous studies. While the directory questions remain basically the same, we made some changes in the surveys. Many questions that we had asked in the 2005 study were updated with additional response categories, and the librarians provided technical information about how to word questions concerning a whole host of resources that have changed in the past few years. We did cut out a few questions, but the survey remains inordinately long.

As in the previous studies, the directory portion was designed so that people who had

participated in the previous study could simply update their entry, but in each study the survey portion is a completely new blank form. While in the original two studies we relied on academic program staff to distribute and collect the specialists' paper questionnaires, with the move to an online data collection system we rely on the programs to report their staff, but we communicate directly with both programs and specialists by e-mail.

Doctoral student Trang Phan Thu and her husband Skol Watanawongskul re-programmed both the SQL server and the data collection website, which had separate sections for Japan Specialists, Japanese Studies Programs, and Japanese Studies Librarians. For each of the three components, the directory portion came first, followed by the clearly marked survey section. Respondents in all three categories received an invitation to participate in the study by e-mail, giving them the url of the website and a username and password to gain access to the appropriate directory entry form and survey. However, each of the various entry points also included a registration system for people who were missed by our invitation system. Once the data collection was underway, we sent out announcements to major Japanese Studies list serves, but most of the participants in the list serves had already received invitations with their own username and password to enter the site.

As in the three previous studies, we collected data about doctoral candidates in Japanese Studies from both the Japanese Studies programs and from the Japan specialists who supervise their studies. However, for the past two web-based studies we have also added a place on the website where doctoral candidates in Japanese Studies could register to ensure that they would be included. Nearly all of the doctoral students who registered were also reported either by their program or their advisor, but we were also able to verify the authenticity of the ones who were not reported by others.

The data from the 2005 directory was already loaded into the SQL database. When persons who had participated in the 2005 study (or even the 1995 one) entered their username and password, the directory entry portion of the online data collection forms displayed their old information so they could update it. The survey portion was blank and required that all questions be answered anew. Most questions were in standard survey format and required only a click of the mouse to answer, but we did repeat questions from the previous survey that asked for numbers of publications and other quantitative measures of Japanese Studies activity, and included a few open-ended questions.

Online Data Collection

To send out the e-mail invitations, reminders, and formatted entry proofs, we used an e-mail "blaster" program from FMS that works as an add-in to our Access system. This permitted us to write a standard message formatted to accept personalized data from records in the database, and send it out in large batches. The project has its own e-mail account through the University of Hawaii and since the university's accounts are now managed by Google, I was able to send out the batch messages without difficulty, as the program builds in periodic pauses. The e-mail program automatically recorded in our database the time that the e-mails were sent out. It was quite easy to adapt messages and send new ones to specifically tailored groups. The e-mail program's audit logs reveal that I sent out 48 different standard e-mail messages over the course of the project: 10,435 to Japan specialists, 672 to librarians, and 2,626 to Japanese Studies programs. This of course does not count individual e-mails sent by staff in response to questions and comments.

The e-mail program would immediately notify us if some error prevented the e-mail from

being sent. Usually this was a simple typo in the e-mail address that could be easily corrected. The return address for the e-mails was the project's e-mail account, which we monitored closely after sending out a blast of e-mails. Typically, despite our careful work to get updated e-mail addresses, about 10-15 percent of the e-mails would bounce back as undeliverable within the first day or two. We then would try to track down a new e-mail address and send the invitation out again. We also had to monitor the project e-mail account closely to answer questions and troubleshoot any difficulties that respondents had with the website.

One particular difficulty with this project is the need to time the data collection to strategic points in the academic calendar. We first tested our data collection system with the Japanese Studies librarians. They were a relatively small group of information specialists who are very comfortable with online data collection, since their work involves considerable use of online databases. This time we sent those invitations out in May 2011, on the assumption that most of the librarians worked year round. However, we did not realize that most of them take their book buying trips to Japan in the summer. Eventually, we received responses from virtually all of the librarians who participate in the Committee on East Asian Libraries, the primary organization of professional Japan Studies librarians plus a smaller number of other libraries with Japanese collections.

Next we began online data collection for Japanese Studies programs, beginning with the largest programs so we could also get further information from them about their current Japan specialists. We sent invitations to programs in fall 2011 and reminders in winter and spring 2012. While we continued to send reminders to programs, we moved on to begin the data collection from Japan specialists in the spring of 2012. The overlap between the two types of data collection caused some confusion, since often the same person received invitations to participate both as a Japan specialist and as the director of a program. The username for both invitations would be the same (the individual's e-mail address), but the respondent needed to enter a different part of the website and use a different password for each one, which corresponded to the ID number for the correct record in the database. Since we did not expect our reminders would be very effective over the summer, we went back to both programs and specialists in fall 2012 to try to maximize participation, even as we began sending out formatted proofs to those who had already responded.

Increasing the Return Rate

It has become increasingly difficult to get good return rates from any type of survey, whether mailed or online. Typical return rates for professional mail surveys are now around 15-20 percent after the standard two or three follow-up reminders. Although online surveys enjoyed a higher return rate initially because of their novelty, they are already suffering from the same kind of respondent overload and fatigue as more traditional ones. The Japan Directory project has always enjoyed much higher return rates than most surveys, because of the personal network relationships among the members of the sample and the nature of the project itself. This, plus new technology, has enabled us to employ a variety of techniques to increase the return rates for the study. Data collection and processing of directory proofs also overlapped throughout the study in a manner that would be quite unconventional for a standard mailed survey.

By late fall 2012, 1,493 persons had participated in study and were sent proofs, including those in Canada and overseas. The majority (844) either sent back corrections or said the proof was okay as is. Another 649 did not send the proof back or respond to it, but they were

all included because they had done the study. While this was proceeding, I identified known specialists who had not responded but for whom there was existing data available. As we had done in 2005, we sent them a proof of their old data and ask them to approve or correct the proof. Proofs were sent to 300 additional people who had participated in the 2005 directory, using their old data and any updated e-mail addresses we had located for them, of whom 22 responded, and 10 were inactive. The remaining 12 were added. Of the remaining 278 who had been sent proofs but had not responded, 131 were located by cross checking staff lists and six were deceased or no longer active, leaving 141 unaccounted for. Thirty-four of those did not have an institutional affiliation in the US or Canada in 2005 and thus could not be traced further, leaving 107. These were checked first against the program proofs to look for missed people on staff lists or name variations. Eight had previously been removed from an institutional affiliation because the institution had reported that they were no longer there, leaving 99. Many were at institutions for which we did not have an updated staff list or which did not participate in the study. Those were checked against the institution's website and 77 additional persons were identified and two deceased. A Google search on their names produced more people who were actually located at universities but not picked up in their searches. Ultimately only seven people were coded as "L" for lost. There were recent traces for most of them, but without definitive evidence they are not included in the directory. Including only those who were verified as still being where our data said they were, this intensive follow-up procedure added 200 more specialists for whom we already had directory data.

The final result was 1,693 Japan specialists included in the directory, 1,435 of whom were in the United States and are included in the study. Along the way, among people in our original database with U.S. addresses, we had identified 41 who were deceased, 68 who were still graduate students and thus ineligible for inclusion, and 276 who had noted in the online data collection site that they were unqualified. We identified 356 who were no longer active, and eliminated four with very incomplete data who did not respond to inquiries asking them for additional information. A total of 259 people on our mailing lists were coded as lost because we were unable to locate them by existing e-mail addresses or through our intensive tracking procedures.

A similar procedure was used for the programs that did not respond to our invitations. The initial return rate was directly correlated with the size of the program. We had complete coverage of the largest programs, and solid responses from the next tier, but the rate decreased below that level. After multiple e-mail entreaties, we realized that in some cases we were probably trying to reach the wrong person. We either verified that we had been trying to reach the correct person, or located a new person or part of the program to try. Our logic for the largest programs had led us to focus on area studies programs, but in many cases the language department was the more appropriate hub of Japanese Studies activity. The response also was weaker if the person in charge was not a Japan specialist. It was difficult to target someone other than a program director or department chair, but that person might be a China or India specialist, or even a French professor.

After exhausting our e-mail efforts to get the remaining programs that had participated in the 2005 study to fill out the online form, we prepared page proofs of their old data and sent them off by e-mail asking them to update it or we would print the old version. This finally generated a strong response, with many people complaining that the data was terribly out of date and finally giving us the requested updates (and often insisting that this was the first notice they had received although our message records said otherwise). The resulting corrections were very extensive, and took a great deal of time to enter. At a very late stage we were

still receiving and entering corrections and working with some institutions to get last-minute changes into the directory part.

Unfortunately, when we encouraged specialists and programs to provide corrections to their old directory data, we lost all hope that they would complete the survey portion of the online entry form. Our survey data therefore necessarily is based on a smaller sample. Even among those who did respond, many stopped either when they reached the survey or at some point gave up on responding. This is normal for survey data, and I simply used the maximum amount of data available for every question.

Data Preparation

The project's graduate student staff did a fair amount of data cleaning in preparation for producing the directory, but much of it involved simply standardizing data formats and eliminating blank records for parts of the data that would appear in individual directory entries. After the directory was well underway I began working with the data to write this volume, cleaning sections as I needed to analyze them. We had a number of standardized codes that had been developed for the earlier directory projects, some as adaptations of existing Association for Asian Studies codes. Some of these were presented to respondents to code in the online system, but for other purposes I had to code the data manually. For example, specialists had entered their own disciplines using a standard discipline code, but the same code had to be applied manually to the doctoral candidates and later to the courses and the staff lists. I later developed many simple codes to facilitate the analysis, and coded the data as needed. This is very easy to do in an Access database by adding a new field, sorting an existing field in a query if needed, and then adding the new code to all the records.

We had created a very complicated dataset with multiple tables for each of the three surveys (specialists, programs, and librarians), so in order to analyze the data various components had to be combined in queries. Access is very convenient for basic data management and can even be used for quick tabulations, but it is awkward for any sort of crosstabulation or calculation of percentages. I therefore would work with the Access database until I had sufficient numerical codes and then pull segments of the data into SPSS for more intensive analysis. Given the nature of this study, I did not do anything more sophisticated than simple crosstabs and comparisons of means, but the data contained many multiple response variables for which SPSS also provided efficient tools for analysis. For simple data, it was often faster to get the numbers in an Access query or pivot table and calculate percentages with a hand calculator.

Many parts of our data were collected making full use of the relational database structure, which meant that there were a variable number of responses for each person or program (the many-side of a one-to-many relation), linked to a single parent record (the one-side of a one-to-many relation). Sometimes these data could be analyzed in their existing form, by adding some other fields from the one-side in a query. In other cases, the data needed to be transposed so that there would be multiple fields in a single record, using a procedure available in SPSS. Once the data were in an SPSS file, additional recodes could be added to simplify the output.

The beauty of an online data collection system is supposed to be that the respondents code their own data, but this also produces unexpected errors that only come to light when the numbers in an analysis do not look right. It still requires judgment and a sense of what the data might reasonably be in order to avoid misinterpreting results that have been labeled incorrectly! Because of the complexity of our dataset and the need to manipulate it in unusual ways, I have described some of these data manipulations in excruciating detail in the chapters. I felt that such information was most relevant in the context of how that particular analysis was car-

ried out, and it would not be useful if relegated to the appendix. I have reported all that detail because in doing this study I found myself relying heavily on similar detailed information that I had included in the 2005 study, without which I would not have been able to produce data in the same format for comparison.

Nonetheless, I am not at all sure that the project can be repeated in the future, despite its success in the past and the high level of cooperation we receive from Japan specialists and Japanese Studies programs. Although the digital divide has pretty much vanished in our highly educated sample, respondent fatigue will only worsen. Ironically, the Internet revolution will probably make it easier for a staff to collect much of the information on Japanese Studies programs directly from the Internet, and simply submit it to the institutions for verification. However, there is no guarantee that programs update their websites regularly. If we reach the point where virtually all faculty post their curriculum vitae on their websites, it might even work for the directory information for specialists. However, response rates for surveys will continue to decline, and at some point the data become too unreliable to make the survey worthwhile. For this study I have used only the parts of the data about which I had sufficient confidence. Some items that were analyzed previously could not be used this time because the response rates seemed too low or the quality of the data was inadequate. This is a chronic problem in survey research and it is unlikely to improve in the future.

Appendix B

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS IN JAPANESE STUDIES

Minimal Undergraduate Program

Brookdale Community College
Clark University
Coastal Carolina University
Gonzaga University
Illinois Central College
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Johns Hopkins University
Los Angeles Harbor College
Loyola University
Mary Baldwin College
Mississippi State University
Northeastern Illinois University
Salisbury University
Santa Barbara City College
Seattle Central Community College
Southwestern University
Tulane University
University of Montevallo
University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown
University of South Florida, Tampa
University of St. Thomas
University of West Georgia
Wheeling Jesuit College

Limited Undergraduate Program

Auburn University
California State University, Northridge
Chaminade University of Honolulu
Dartmouth College
East Los Angeles College
Everett Community College
Fort Lewis College
Indiana State University
Kansas City Art institute
Leeward Community College
Lincoln University
Louisiana State University
Marietta College
Maryville College
Metropolitan State University
Middle Tennessee State University
Missouri Southern State University
Oakton Community College
Purdue University Calumet
Rhodes College
Rio Hondo College
Southern Methodist University
University of Arkansas
University of Guam
University of Hawaii West Oahu
University of Illinois at Chicago
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
University of Mount Union

University of North Texas
University of Northern Iowa
University of Richmond
Western Carolina University
Whatcom Community College
Whitworth University
Willamette University
William Jewell College

Undergraduate Area Program

Bridgewater State University
California State Univesity, East Bay
California State University, Fresno
California State University, San Bernadino
Clemson University
East Carolina University
Eastern Michigan University
Elizabethtown College
Foothill College
Hope College
Illinois Wesleyan University
Kapiolani Community College
Knox College
Lake Forest College
Loyola University Chicago
Monterey Institute of International Studies
Northern Kentucky University
Saint Cloud State University
Texas A & M University
The City College of New York, CUNY
University of Alabama
University of Findlay
University of Georgia
University of Kentucky
University of Nebraska
University of New Mexico
University of the Pacific
West Texas A & M University
Whitman College

Full Undergraduate Program

Amherst College
Arizona State University
Augustana College
Bates College
Boston University
Bowdoin College
Bowling Green State University
Brandeis University
Brigham Young University
Brown University
Bucknell University
California State University, Chico
California State University, Los Angeles
Case Western Reserve University
Colby College
Colgate University
College of St. Benedict and St. John's University
College of William and Mary
Columbia University
Connecticut College
Cornell University
DePaul University
DePauw University
Dickinson College
Duke University
Earlham College
Emory University
Florida International University
Florida State University
George Washington University
Georgetown University
Georgia State University
Gustavus Adolphus College
Harvard University
Hawaii Pacific University
Illinois State University
Indiana University
John Carroll University
Kalamazoo College
Lehigh University
Macalester College
Manhattanville College
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Miami University
Michigan State University
Middlebury College
Montana State University
New York University
North Carolina State University

North Central College
Northeastern University
Northern Illinois University
Northwestern University
Oakland University
Oberlin College
Occidental College
Ohio State University
Old Dominion University
Pennsylvania State University
Pomona College
Portland State University
Princeton University
Purdue University
Queens College, City University of New York
Rice University
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
San Diego State University
San Jose State University
Skidmore College
Smith College
St. Olaf College
Stanford University
State University of New York at Albany
State University of New York at Binghamton
State University of New York at Buffalo
State University of New York at New Paltz
Stoney Brook University (SUNY)
Syracuse University
Temple University
Trinity College
Union College
University of Arizona
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Riverside
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Barbara
University of Chicago
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado
University of Delaware
University of Florida
University of Hawaii at Hilo
University of Hawaii at Manoa
University of Illinois
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of Massachusetts, Boston
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
University of Missouri-St. Louis
University of Nevada Las Vegas
University of New Hampshire
University of North Carolina
University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
University of Puget Sound
University of Rochester
University of Southern California
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
University of Texas at Austin
University of Toledo
University of Utah
University of Vermont
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin at Madison
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Ursinus College
Vanderbilt University
Vassar College
Wake Forest University
Washington and Lee University
Washington University of St. Louis
Weber State University
Wellesley College
Wesleyan University
West Virginia University
Western Michigan University
Western Washington University
Williams College
Wittenberg University
Yale University

Appendix C

GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN JAPANESE STUDIES

MA Programs

Arizona State University
DePaul University
Florida International University
George Washington University
Georgetown University
Johns Hopkins University
San Diego State University
University of Florida
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of Oklahoma
University of Virginia

Limited Graduate Programs

Boston University
Brigham Young University
Brown University
New York University
Portland State University
Purdue University
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Temple University
University of Arizona
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of Colorado
University of Iowa
University of Minnesota
University of North Carolina
University of Texas at Austin
Washington University of St. Louis

Full Graduate Programs

Columbia University
Cornell University
Duke University
Harvard University
Indiana University
Ohio State University
Princeton University
Stanford University
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Barbara
University of Chicago
University of Hawaii at Manoa
University of Illinois
University of Kansas
University of Michigan
University of Oregon
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
University of Southern California
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin at Madison
Yale University

Index