Disaster, Diversity and Emergency Preparation
L.I. Magnussen (Ed.)

doi:10.3233/NHSDP190028

Developing Diversity Leadership in the Japan Self-Defense Forces: How Can We Develop Diversity Leaders?

Prof Dr Hitoshi KAWANO [1]
National Defense Academy of Japan

Abstract. This paper explores the issue of diversity leadership development within the sociocultural context of contemporary Japan, in particular, focusing on the Japan Self-Defense Forces (JSDF). To effectively develop the diversity leaders who are well aware of the importance of promoting diversity and inclusion within their organizations, what are the key requirements for being a JSDF diversity leader? What cultural differences do we need to take into account? What sorts of cultural awareness are required? What types of knowledge, skills, abilities, and other personal characteristics (KSAOs), attitudes, and mindsets are required that can be "trained" or developed? These questions will be discussed based on a literature review and good practice cases both in the civilian and military sectors, while drawing on the latest policy developments in other countries such as the United States.

Compared to other advanced democratic countries, including NATO member countries, Japan is an underdeveloped country in terms of gender mainstreaming and diversity management. One of the key requirements for any effective diversity leadership development program in Japan is that the JSDF diversity leaders need to be well aware of the historical and sociocultural contexts in which the JSDF exist. It is also required to know the advancement of gender policies and related organizational initiatives promoted by the Government of Japan, the Ministry of Defense, and the JSDF. Diversity leaders also need to know about changing social values, family structure, labour markets, cultural and gender norms, etc. so that the JSDF can effectively adapt to the changing pace of the civilian social world. Challenging policy issues for developing diversity leaders are discussed in the last section of the paper.

Keywords. Diversity, inclusion, diversity leadership, gender mainstreaming, strategic plan

1. Introduction

This paper[2] explores the issue of diversity leadership development within the sociocultural context of contemporary Japan, in particular, focusing on the Japan Self-Defense Forces (JSDF). To effectively develop diversity leaders who are well aware of the importance of promoting diversity and inclusion within their organizations, what are the

[1] Corresponding Author, Hitoshi Kawano, *National Defense Academy of Japan. Japan.* E-mail: hkawano@nda.ac.jp.

[2] The views and opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of any agency of the Japanese government, the Japanese Ministry of Defense, the Japan Self-Defense Forces, or the National Defense Academy of Japan.

key requirements for being a JSDF diversity leader? What cultural differences do we need to take into account? What sorts of cultural awareness are required? What types of knowledge, skills, abilities, and other personal characteristics (KSAOs), attitudes, and mindsets are required that can be "trained" or developed? These questions will be discussed based on a literature review and good practice cases both in the civilian and military sectors. In conclusion, a challenging issue of updating current JSDF diversity and inclusion policies toward the ideal "Diversity 2.0" paradigm is identified. In addition, a theoretical framework for understanding different diversity management perspectives and strategies is provided.

Compared to other advanced democratic countries, including NATO member countries, Japan is a relatively underdeveloped country in terms of gender mainstreaming and diversity management.[3] After World War II, a remarkable post-war recovery and subsequent decades of high-growth economy in the 1960s and '70s, a new type of family system emerged. It is so-called "the post-war family system" and consists of a working father, or "salaryman", and a full-time housewife who takes care of the household and childcare. This new ideal-typical nuclear family had been a dominant model of gender roles in Japan throughout the bubble-economy era of the 1980s. Therefore, contemporary Japan remained one of "the most impenetrable patriarch[ies]" among the major developed countries until the early '90s, though the following decades of economic crisis and recession significantly challenged the dominant salaryman–housewife ideal and replaced it with a double-income family model in the 21st century[4] [32].

To catch up with global trends, the Japanese government encourages both the public and civilian sectors to promote gender empowerment in their workplaces by introducing new legislation and policy initiatives. The Ministry of Defense and the JSDF are no exception. In fact, following new legislation, The Act on Promotion of Women's Participation and Advancement in the Workplace, which took effect in April 2016, the Ministry of Defense issued a JSDF Female Empowerment Initiative in April 2017. This initiative provides current guidelines for gender policies as well as diversity management in the JSDF. However, detailed strategic plans as to how effectively this initiative can be implemented are yet to be developed. Therefore, I would like to explore possible policy options to develop diversity leaders in the JSDF based on a literature review and observations of developments in terms of diversity management practices in the public and private sectors in Japan.

Before proceeding to the discussion, the concept of "diversity leader" needs to be clearly defined. According to the Military Leadership Diversity Commission in the United States, "diversity" is "all the different characteristics and attributes of individuals that are consistent with Department of Defense core values, integral to overall readiness and mission accomplishment, and reflective of the Nation we serve" [21]. Although the concept of "diversity" traditionally includes demographic characteristics such as race, ethnicity, gender, religion, age, etc., the new definition of "diversity" incorporates not

[3] According to *The Global Gender Gap Report 2018*, Japan is ranked 110th out of 149 countries. The ranking in 2006 was 80th among 115 countries, so the gender gap situation in Japan is getting worse, mainly due to extremely poor political empowerment and relatively poor economic participation and opportunity [37].

[4] However, Japan is the only postindustrial country that does not have a high level of gender equality, and younger generations of women tend to have decreasing egalitarian beliefs about the importance of work for women [14].

only *demographic diversity* but also *cognitive, structural, and global diversities*, including differences in terms of cognitive ability of individuals, organizational affiliations and military occupations, service statuses of active or reserve duties, and nationalities of military organizations [21]. As the global threat environment continues to evolve, and we all face challenging "complex, asymmetric operational environments", the notion of diversity has developed into "a strategic imperative, critical to mission readiness and accomplishment, and a leadership requirement" [33]. Although the issue of sexuality is deliberately excluded from the discussion by the Military Leadership Diversity Commission because the issue was examined by other working groups, it is natural to include sexual orientation under demographic diversity. In September 2011, the Obama administration ended the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy in order to fully integrate homosexual personnel within the military services. In addition, transgender personnel were also allowed to serve openly in the U.S. military beginning in June 2016, under the Obama administration.[5]

Given this broad definition of "diversity", "diversity leadership" can be defined as leadership that "deals with ways in which people and groups relate to one another and how leadership decisions are made in the midst of the differences, similarities, and tensions among groups" [22]. In other words, diversity leadership refers to specific leadership practices at the group level, whether the groups are small or large—wherever people interact to achieve an outcome. Thus, it refers to how leaders influence the ways in which people and groups under their command relate to one another. Diversity leadership also requires the leader to understand diversity dynamics: how human differences affect interactions between people[6] [23].

In the following sections, I will summarize the demographic, sociocultural, and political developments in terms of gender mainstreaming and diversity management in Japan, before arguing how we can effectively develop diversity leaders in JSDF, and what needs to be done in the near future.

2. Changing Demographic and Sociocultural Contexts in Japan

2.1. Demographic Change

A serious demographic change Japan is currently facing is a declining population coupled with a growing aging population and a decreasing number of children. It is projected that the current total population of 127 million in 2015 will fall to 99 million in 2053, of

[5] However, the Trump administration set back the transgender policy in 2017, trying to deny enlistment of transgender personnel to the U.S. military. Despite several lawsuits, the issue of the administration's transgender military ban still continues. The U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) currently maintains the Military Equal Opportunity policy that protects service members from "unlawful discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex or sexual orientation" [13].

[6] In order to enhance readiness and mission accomplishment, according to the recommendation by the Military Leadership Diversity Commission in the US, leading diverse groups effectively must become a core competency across the DoD and the military services. To implement this recommendation, 1) leadership training at all levels shall include education in diversity dynamics and training in practices for leading diverse groups effectively, and 2) DoD and the services should determine the framework for how (e.g., curriculum, content, methods) to inculcate such education and training into leader development, including how to measure and evaluate its effectiveness [23].

which about 40% will be 65 years or older, while the labour force population (15–64 years of age) of 77 million in 2015 will decline to 50 million in 2056 [26]. Due to a relatively improved economic situation in Japan, it is an increasingly challenging task for the JSDF to recruit high-calibre personnel, in particular at lower enlisted ranks. As a result, the age range for new enlisted recruits was expanded in 2018[7] from 18–26 to 18–32 years of age. "Age" can be, thereby, another important dimension of demographic diversity in the JSDF.

Another demographic change that has affected gender and personnel policies is types of household income. A once dominant type, the single-income household, typically with a working husband and housewife, has declined since the 1980s, while an employed couple is becoming the dominant type of household in the 2000s [2].[8] As female labour force engagement has increased, so has female participation in the security sector job market, including the JSDF. However, Japanese working women tend to have part-time jobs, and even if they have full-time jobs, they typically earn significantly less than men, and they are likely to quit their jobs when they have children [3].[9]

2.2. Development of a "Gender-Equal Society" and Gender Empowerment in the JSDF

On the other hand, we can recognize a significant development of gender equality legislation over the last three decades.

In 1986, the Law for the Equal Employment Opportunity of Men and Women was enacted. The law aimed to ensure equal employment opportunity for both men and women, while making it clear that any discrimination on the basis of race, sex, age, physical or mental disability, religion, and national origin would not be tolerated. It was the first step toward a "Gender Equal Society" in later decades.[10]

Another important piece of legislation was the Basic Act for a Gender Equal Society in 1999. The law stipulated that Japan shall take necessary measures for promotion of international cooperation related to creation of a gender-equal society. It was the second step toward promoting gender equality in Japan, and paved a way to implementing the United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325 in early 21st century Japan. In fact, a basic idea of "gender mainstreaming" was already included in this law by advocating not only gender equality in terms of political, economic, and social aspects of human life, but also equal participation in decision-making processes in national and local governments and private organizations. In 2002, a few female Ground Self-Defense Force (GSDF) personnel took part in the UN peacekeeping operation in East Timor, for the first time as members of the GSDF unit. In 2004, dozens of female SDF personnel also took part in humanitarian assistance and reconstruction support operations in Iraq by SDF.

The JSDF tried to recruit female personnel intensively during the economic recession of the 1990s. As a result, the percentage of female personnel in the JSDF increased

[7] It took effect in October 2018. The lower limit of 18 years remained the same.

[8] In 2013, there were about 10.65 million "employed couples" and 7.45 million "employed husband and housewife" in Japan [2].

[9] In 2014, the female (15–64 years old) employment rate in Japan was 63.6%. About 44% had part-time jobs, while another 44% had full-time jobs in 2016 [3].

[10] In 2006, the law was amended to expand the concept of sexual harassment to include female-to-male and same-sex harassment.

from about 2% of total personnel until the 1980s to about 6% in the last few years. However, according to a NATO report on gender policies in member and partner nations, the average percentage of women in NATO militaries was 10.9% in 2016, while it was 10.7% in Norway and 6.1% in Japan [22]. Although some forms of a "quota system" still remain, the Action Plan to Promote Women's Participation and Work-Life Balance set forth by the Ministry of Defense in 2016 intends to increase the female ratio of all JSDF personnel to more than 9% by 2030. In order to reach the target, more than 10% of newly recruited JSDF personnel have to be women after 2017. In addition, the percentage of female JSDF officers is expected to surpass the current ratio of 3.1% by 2020 [19].

Although Japan recognized the global significance of UNSCR 1325 in the early 2000s, it was only in 2014 that a female JSDF officer was assigned as an advisor to the NATO Secretary General's Special Representative for Women, Peace and Security. The move was a direct result of a strong political will based on the Individual Partnership and Cooperation Program between Japan and NATO, which was signed by Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and NATO Secretary General Anders F. Rasmussen in May 2013. It was the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that took initiatives in implementing UNSCR 1325. In the following section, I briefly describe the developmental process of the national action plan for implementing UNSCR 1325 in Japan.

2.3. Implementing UNSCR 1325 in Japan: National Action Plan and the JSDF

In 2013, the "Women Shine" Initiative was also adopted as a new gender empowerment policy by the government of Japan. Prime Minister Abe made a pledge at the UN General Assembly that Japan will empower women for the growth of the Japanese economy and to further strengthen cooperation with the international community. He added that Japan will work closely with UN Women and develop a National Action Plan (NAP) on Women, Peace, and Security. As a result, the NAP of Japan was formulated in 2015, and the NAP Evaluation Committee was organized in 2016. In 2017, the first evaluation report was published [8]. Although a detailed analysis and evaluation of the NAP is beyond the scope of this paper,[11] it is important to note that promotion of gender mainstreaming and ideas for diversity management are clearly stated in the 2015 NAP.[12] These views were further institutionalized in the Act on Promotion of Women's Participation and Advancement in the Workplace in 2016.

In April 2017, as mentioned above, the Ministry of Defense issued the JSDF Female Personnel Empowerment Initiative (*2017 Initiative* hereafter), as stipulated by the act. It provides current guidelines for gender policies and diversity management within the JSDF. The 2017 Initiative emphasizes the value of promoting more active roles for

[11] For preliminary evaluation of the Japan's NAP, in comparison with the US and Australian NAPs, see Prescott, Iwata, and Pincus [31].

[12] The Japan's NAP states: "In particular, attention should be paid to *the expansion of women's active participation in all levels of decision making in the prevention and resolution of conflicts and peacebuilding*. It should be noted that women and girls are not all the same, and some of them may become more exposed than others to discrimination and violence due to their various attributes. This National Action Plan should be implemented with due consideration given to *the diverse and unique needs* and vulnerabilities of groups such as refugees and internally displaced people due to armed conflicts and heightened tensions; *ethnic, religious, or linguistic minorities; people with disabilities; senior citizens; unaccompanied minors; single mothers; LGBT persons etc.* (emphasis added by the author)" [20].

women in the JSDF and clarifies human resource management policy for women, focusing on improved work-life balance, with the goal of making the JSDF more attractive and committed to gender equality. It also aims at increasing the percentage of female JSDF personnel and opens virtually all positions in the JSDF to women.[13]

The 2017 Initiative also mentions challenging issues for enlightening male gender ideology within the JSDF, which has been a male-dominant organization for more than half a century. In order to promote gender mainstreaming in the JSDF, one difficult but important task is to reform the organizational culture and organizational values as well as the individual outlook on gender and sexuality. Some enlightenment seminars on gender issues for top leaders and executive officers of JSDF have been held, but the opportunities are limited. As Prime Minister Abe told the top JSDF leaders in 2016, the most challenging issue is "the persistent male-dominant working culture" within the JSDF. The key is how we can change the existing organizational culture effectively [24].

In order to effectively develop diversity leaders in JSDF, what strategies and tactics are required? In the following section, I explore possible courses of action for future policy development based on a literature review and recent best practices in other countries, in particular in the United States.

3. Developing "Diversity Leaders" in the Japan Self-Defense Forces

In 2011, the Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC) in the United States made the following recommendation for promoting diversity leadership in the US military [21]:

> "DoD and the Services must resource and institute clear, consistent, and robust diversity management policies with emphasis on roles, responsibilities, authorities, and accountability".[14]

In addition, the MLDC final report also urged each of the services to make their own "strategic plan" which highlights "the creation of cultures that value equity and inclusion as a fundamental aspect of successful diversity management", and "diversity leadership as a core competency of the Armed Forces" [21].

Subsequently, then-President Barack Obama issued an Executive Order (EO 13583) calling for a government-wide initiative to promote diversity and inclusion in the federal

[13] Prior to the 2017 initiative, the JSDF already took some actions to increase recruitment of women. The Air Self-Defense Force abolished the gender quota system for virtually all recruitment categories, and the Ground Self-Defense Force increased the number of female recruitments for non-commissioned officer candidates and SDF personnel candidates from 770 to 930 in total in 2016. At the National Defense Academy (NDA), the female recruitment quota of 40 was increased to 60, out of 480 in total new recruits in 2016. As a result, the percentage of female cadets at the NDA increased from 8% to 13%.

[14] Detailed recommendations are as follows: a) The DoD and the services shall implement diversity strategic plans that address all stages of a service member's life cycle. Each strategic plan shall include a diversity mission statement that prioritizes equity and inclusion and provides a purpose that is actionable and measurable; and a concept of operations to advance implementation. b) The DoD must revise (if appropriate), reissue, and enforce compliance with its existing diversity management and equal opportunity policies to define a standard set of strategic metrics and benchmarks that enables the Secretary of Defense to measure progress toward the goals identified in the strategic plan, including the creation of an inclusive environment; establish standards that allow for the collection of data needed to generate these metrics and the analysis needed to inform policy action; provide oversight of, and support for, the services' respective diversity initiatives and metrics to ensure that, at a minimum, they align with the end state established by the DoD [21].

workforce in August 2011 [13]. In 2012, the DoD issued a "DoD Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan" to implement the President's Executive Order 13583 [36]. The US DoD Strategic Plan also states that "(A)s demographics change, we are in a 'Battle for Talent' to ensure we are able to recruit and retain the best our nation has to offer" [36].

In Japan, the 2017 JSDF Female Personnel Empowerment Initiative can be the guiding principle for further strategic planning for developing diversity leaders in the JSDF. Facing a demographic change of a shrinking youth population and labour force shortage, we are certainly in a "Battle for Talent", and effective diversity management is a strategic imperative. As the U.S. DoD strategic plan points out, we can gain a strategic advantage by "leveraging the diversity of all members and creating an inclusive environment in which each member is valued and encouraged to provide ideas critical to innovation, optimization, and organizational mission success" [36].

3.1. Conceptual Framework for Developing "Diversity Leaders" in the JSDF

In 2010, the U.S. Army issued the "U.S. Army Diversity Roadmap" to follow the 2009 "U.S. Army Policy on Diversity" [35]. The U.S. Army's strategic plan expects the following strategic outcomes to be key to sustainment of the long-term benefits of success: 1) leader commitment, 2) high-quality, diverse talent, 3) integrated diversity and leader development, 4) enhanced cultural competency, 5) expanded human dimension of leadership skills, and 6) army-wide inclusive culture, while making clear statements on a "Diversity Mission", that is, to "develop and implement a strategy that contributes to mission readiness while transforming and sustaining the Army as a national leader in diversity," as well as a "Diversity Vision", aspiring to be a "national leader in embracing the strength of diverse people in an inclusive environment…investing in and managing talent, valuing individuals, and developing culturally astute Soldiers and Civilians who enhance our communities and are prepared for the human dimension of leadership and global engagement" [35].

Although each JSDF service has not yet come up with a comprehensive and coherent strategic plan and conceptual framework to develop diversity leaders, making an overall strategic plan with a clear vision as to why diversity is so important is the first step to develop such leaders. In order to do so, creating a task force to evaluate the current state within the JSDF may be a policy option. For instance, in the case of the U.S. Army, before coming up with the strategic plan, the Army Diversity Task Force was established in 2008 to make a holistic assessment of the Army's diversity policies, practices, and progress, and to report directly to the Secretary and Chief of Staff [33]. However, we need to keep in mind that the U.S. Army's notion of diversity consists of, in large part, the racial/ethnic dimension of diversity. In contrast, gender is the most important aspect of diversity management in JSDF, though the LGBT issue was much less focused in the 2017 JSDF Female Personnel Empowerment Initiative. This initiative, thereby, can be considered as the Japanese version of a "diversity and inclusion" policy initiative.

3.2. The "3C-3M" Framework

In 2013, researchers at the RAND Corporation in the U.S, published a report to provide a framework that the DoD can use to organize its strategic initiatives outlined in its 2012

Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan. The framework, called "Change Through Accountability", consists of "3Cs", which are the three pillars of "Compliance, Communication, and Coordination".[15] The framework provides "an enduring accountability system" that supports the new vision and helps implement the strategic plan [15]. This framework can be adopted, with some modifications, by any countries which seek to have a solid framework to build on their diversity and inclusion strategic plan.

In addition, according to a study conducted by the Hague Center for strategic Studies in 2014, "3Ms" (Mainstreaming, Managing, and Measuring[16]) can be integrated as "strategies for inclusion" in order to further promote diversity and inclusion policies, including the inclusion of LGBT military personnel [30]. Combining the 3C and 3M frameworks, we may come up with a more comprehensive strategic framework to implement the Japanese version of a diversity and inclusion initiative.

3.3. Compliance and Measuring (Monitoring)

Compliance is at the core of accountability. All military organizations are subject to external and internal legal obligations. Illegal acts by military organizations are not tolerated, of course, but when it comes to compliance with international norms, which sometimes contradict rather than accord with domestic laws, a challenging issue arises. In Japan, in compliance with UNSCR1325 and other related resolutions, the NAP has been in place and making progress toward further gender mainstreaming, as mentioned above.

However, in terms of inclusion of LGBT personnel, the JSDF has only started efforts to comply with changing international and domestic norms and legislation. Although there never were policies or laws explicitly prohibiting LGBT people from joining the JSDF, there was no pronounced policy for inclusion of LGBT personnel until 2017. The JSDF Female Personnel Empowerment Initiative, issued in April 2017, included the following passage:

> Personnel Management Policy for Empowering Female SDF Personnel (1) Ensuring Equal Opportunity
>
> SDF is a meritocratic organization. It is required that all SDF personnel aspire to do one's best according to an individual's high motivation, ability, and aptitude. This is an important principle for a meritocratic organization that is to maintain effective personnel selection system while keeping the high-calibre personnel motivated.
>
> It is unacceptable to exclude opportunities for SDF personnel to advance their careers only based on gender, *sexual orientation, and gender identification*. [Italics added by the author] [24].

This was the first time the JSDF recognized its accession policy to include LGBT personnel. However, it should be noted that this statement is in compliance with the amended legislation on sexual harassment in Japan. In December 2016, the National Per-

[15] The 3 Cs mean that the DoD must "Comply with U.S. laws and regulations as well as DoD's own directives and policies; Communicate its diversity vision to both internal and external stakeholders; Coordinate formally among organizations that are responsible for various aspects of personnel policies and practices to sustain momentum required for lasting diversity efforts to achieve the mission" [15].

[16] The 3Ms are defined as follows. Mainstreaming: developing new policies of inclusion and making existing policies more inclusive; managing: making inclusion an increasingly concerted effort and introducing accountability for its successful implementation; measuring: tracking and evaluating progress [30].

sonnel Authority, a government organization that oversees national public servants including JSDF personnel, changed its rule on sexual harassment to include "harassment based on prejudices regarding sexual orientation or gender identity".[17]

Prior to this rule amendment, the Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare amended the definition of sexual harassment in August 2016 to include harassment based on sexual orientation and gender identity. The guideline for employers regarding countermeasures to deal with sexual harassment issued by the Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare required corporate employers to comply with the official guideline to keep their workplaces free from any types of sexual harassment. The amended guideline is based on the Law for the Equal Employment Opportunity of Men and Women, first adopted in 1986, which prohibits discrimination based on "gender" and requires employers to keep the workplace free from sexual harassment. The interpretation of "sexual comments and behaviours" has expanded from heterosexual ones to those related to homosexuality and gender identity.

The MoD and JSDF are government institutions, and thus they need to comply with those rules and guidelines to keep the workplace free from sexual harassment, including those based on sexual orientation and gender identity. In April 2018, the Inspector General's Office of Legal Compliance issued a Compliance Guidance for SDF personnel, which clearly shows a revised definition of "sexual harassment" including harassment based on prejudice against "sexual orientation and gender identity, or LGBT individuals" [10,11]. This is a step forward to further diversity and inclusion within the MoD/SDF.

As for measurement issues, it is important to set forth specific metrics and systematically monitor how the initiatives and guidelines are actually implemented. Closely monitoring whether numerical goals are achieved, for example, targeted percentages of female SDF personnel at induction or the mid-career level, will be necessary to further implement the policy initiative. Although measuring is necessary to evaluate progress in terms of gender mainstreaming, it will be a different story for inclusion of LGBT individuals. "Headcounting" of LGBT people does not mean that inclusion is effectively implemented. Instead, a general survey on perceptions of inclusion for all members of the given organization can serve as a better metric [30]. Taking into account various types of organizational climate surveys, including those used by the U.S. military, the JSDF can develop its own organizational climate survey focusing on gender mainstreaming, diversity, and inclusion.

By the way, the Hague Center for Strategic Studies offers the LGBT Military Index, using multiple metrics to show the level of inclusion in the armed forces of different countries. According to this ranking, New Zealand is No. 1, followed by the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Sweden, Australia, Canada, Denmark, Belgium, Israel, and France. Norway is ranked 13th, Japan 29th, and the U.S. 40th [30]. With continuous efforts to improve the diversity climate within military organizations, the ranking will eventually reflect the results of organizational change.

One of the challenging issues for improving the JSDF's ranking in the LGBT Military Index is to update the current policy of "admission" to a policy of "inclusion". Under

[17] The National Personnel Authority Rules (NPAR) 10-10 on Prevention of Sexual Harassment require all government institutions, including ministries and government agencies, to establish explicit policies and guidelines to prevent any type of sexual harassment from happening within their workplaces, and oblige them to educate and train their employees to develop awareness of sexual harassment. The amendment to NPAR10-10 was issued on December 1, 2016.

the policy of admission, according to the report by the Hague Center for Strategic Studies, "LGBT individuals are de jure allowed to serve, but their differences are not necessarily acknowledged, valued, or integrated into the way the organization functions", most typically exemplified by the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy in the U.S. adopted by the Clinton Administration in 1994 [30]. In contrast, a policy of full-fledged inclusion means not only explicitly valuing and integrating LGBT individuals into the military, but also recognizing same-sex marriages and offering them the same benefits as heterosexual marriages, while explicitly stating support for LGBT individuals and ensuring an anti-discrimination policy. Given that such inclusion policies are not yet fully recognized in Japanese civil society, it will be extremely challenging for the JSDF to move beyond the current policy of admission in the near future.

3.4. Communication and Mainstreaming

Nonetheless, compliance alone would not suffice for further implementation and active promotion of the new initiative by the members of military organizations. Diversity leaders are accountable for convincing their subordinates that diversity is "a strategic asset to be managed in order to deliver maximum benefits for the military" [30]. It is important to emphasize the positive effect on military effectiveness, in addition to compliance with changing social norms and notions of human rights. In other words, an equal opportunity (EO) approach needs to be supplemented by a diversity and inclusion approach that clearly recognizes improved organizational effectiveness. The 3Cs framework proposed by RAND researchers recommends that diversity leadership training should be different from EO training, which focuses on being sensitive to cultural and gender differences. Instead, diversity leadership training should focus on "how human differences affect interactions between people and utilize these differences to improve mission effectiveness". Diversity leaders need to see diversity as "equivalent to many other resources that good leaders must learn to manage and leverage" [16].

"Soldiers need to understand the distinction between equal opportunity (EO) and diversity leadership. EO is narrow in scope and aims to eliminate discrimination, whereas diversity leadership has a broader scope and aims to achieve mission effectiveness", says Lt. Gen. Becton, U.S. Army retired, who was vice chairman of the Military Leadership Diversity Commission [1]. He further recommends that 1) leadership training at all levels shall include education in diversity dynamics and training in practices for leading diverse groups effectively, and 2) the U.S. DoD and the services should determine the framework (e.g. curriculum, content, methods) for how to inculcate such education and training into leader development, including how to measure and evaluate its effectiveness.

However, what kinds of KSAOs are required for diversity leaders may differ from one country to another, according to the sociocultural context in each. According to the RAND report, one of the most common KSAO categories mentioned in interviews of DoD and non-DoD diversity leaders is interpersonal skills, which include communication, influence/persuasion, collaboration/teamwork, intercultural interactions, and political savvy. The second most important KSAO category identified by DoD diversity leaders is "Equal Employment Opportunity, Affirmative Action, and diversity knowledge and skills," which include "compliance and legislation, knowledge of Diversity and Inclusion" [17]. It is also noted that strategic leadership (creating and implementing a stra-

tegic vision for diversity and inclusion, engaging in strategic planning, developing policies and programs/initiatives, and advising senior leadership on policies) and stakeholder engagement (educating internal stakeholders about diversity initiatives and general diversity-related issues, as well as representing the organization to the community, engaging with external stakeholders, and promoting a diverse, inclusive, and respectful work environment) are identified as the most important roles and responsibilities for diversity leaders [17].

Although we have no relevant information available from Japan, these KSAOs identified by American diversity leaders help clarify what kinds of KSAOs will be required for Japanese diversity leaders. Nonetheless, it is important to emphasize that the role of strategic diversity leadership should be mission driven rather than focusing on "Equal Employment Opportunity/Military Equal Opportunity-related compliance" [17]. Following the U.S. DoD Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan, which clearly recognizes that "diversity is a strategic imperative" and "a leadership requirement", the JSDF will need to ensure "leadership commitment to an accountable and sustained diversity effort" [36].

Mainstreaming diversity and inclusion within the military organization means that the organization views policies addressing the challenges faced by female/LGBT personnel not as optional or accessory but instead as integral parts of the functioning and decision making of the organization [30]. In the JSDF, gender mainstreaming is on the way to being further promoted, but mainstreaming LGBT personnel is far from implementation. As long as the JSDF continues its policy of admission for LGBT individuals, LGBT mainstreaming is quite a challenging issue.

To promote gender mainstreaming, an office for gender equality promotion was established in the Defense Agency of Japan in 2001. Fifteen years later, in 2016, the office was renamed the Work–Life Balance Promotion and Planning Office, Ministry of Defense. Since 2015, improving the work–life balance for female SDF personnel has been a policy issue for the JSDF so that retention of female personnel can be improved. In contrast to gender mainstreaming, there is virtually no viable strategic inclusion plan to implement the 2017 initiative except for the 2018 Compliance Guidance mentioned above. LGBT mainstreaming efforts are yet to be seen in the JSDF.

In contrast, LGBT mainstreaming is making progress in Japanese civil society. In 2017, the Japan Business Federation (*Keidanren*) formulated its first guidelines on diversity and inclusion for its member business corporations. The guideline focuses on "inclusion of LGBT individuals" [12]. Citing an estimated LGBT population of 7.6% in Japan, the guideline urges the necessity for the inclusion of LGBT individuals so that diversity and inclusion will improve business performance and productivity, promote innovation, and enhance global competitiveness.[18] A Japanese non-profit organization, *work with Pride,* developed a PRIDE[19] index to evaluate corporations' diversity and inclusion policies and practices since 2016, and recognized best practices by giving business corporations gold, silver, and bronze awards each year. Fujitsu was among the top 10 best practice companies in 2018. According to the company's published document, Sustainability Report 2018, the Fujitsu Group is a signatory of the UN Global Compact's

[18] According to a large-scale online survey of 70,000 people by *Dentsu* in 2015, it is estimated that LGBT people comprise about 7.6% of the total population [4]. Another online survey of 100,000 individuals conducted in 2016 estimated the LGBT component at 5.9% [25].

[19] PRIDE stands for Policy, Representation, Inspiration, Development, and Engagement/Empowerment.

10 principles in the areas of human rights, labour, the environment, and anti-corruption. The IT company also clearly states that "we respect diversity and support individual growth" in the "Fujitsu Way" corporate values and makes its strategic communication regarding diversity and inclusion policies very clear to its 150,000 employees across the world by identifying LGBT as one of nine attributes of diversity. By setting up a Diversity Promotion Office within the company, Fujitsu has tried to improve its organizational culture and committed to the promotion of diversity and inclusion [9].

Certainly, public sectors in Japan can learn from the private sector's diversity and inclusion policies and practices. For instance, the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry issued a report on diversity management in June 2018. The report, Diversity 2.0,[20] tries to overcome the shortcomings of Diversity 1.0, which was a passive reaction to the requirement by the government and larger society to promote gender mainstreaming that failed to see positive results unrelated to business performance. Diversity 2.0 aims to improve corporate values and performance in the long run by promoting diversity management and recognizing that increased diversity improves organizational effectiveness and accelerates innovation [19].

3.5. Coordination and Managing

In order to ensure that diversity and inclusion policies are properly implemented across the various MoD/SDF workforce, inter-organizational coordination is required. In addition, committed leadership is critical for inter-agency collaboration. According to a handbook on human rights and fundamental freedoms of armed forces personnel, "(the) minister of defence should undertake special measures so as to ensure that no gap exists between de jure and de facto policy. Such measures include an information policy, education and awareness training, and complaints and sanction procedures for harassment and discriminations" [239].

However, there are some difficulties in making inter-organizational coordination efforts. The lack of a common framework can be one of the major difficulties. It would be a good idea to create a position of chief diversity officer who reports directly to the Minister of Defense, while coordinating with other chief diversity officers in each service branch [16].

Further effort can be made by establishing a formal coordination structure for the defense diversity management system, which consists of a senior task force, joint working group, and special issue groups [16]. If creating a new organization is impractical, accommodating a new section into an existing office can be an option.

In the case of the MoD in Japan, there is an office of Work-Life Balance Promotion and Planning. Assigning a diversity officer to the WLB office may be a viable option. However, if a chief diversity officer can be assigned to the Minister's Secretariat, it will send a much more powerful signal to the internal and external stakeholders in terms of a significant MoD leadership commitment to the issue of diversity and inclusion within the MoD/SDF. The MoD diversity officer can coordinate implementation processes of the MoD diversity and inclusion policies along with Ground, Maritime, and Air Self-Defense Forces.

[20] Diversity 2.0 is defined as a company-wide and consistent management action which aims to continuously create added value by maximally leveraging the diverse attributes and skills of each individual [19].

In the U.S., "ensuring leadership commitment to an accountable and sustained diversity effort" is one of three major goals stated in the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan, 2012–2017, issued by the Department of Defense [36]. In order to "reinforce strategic direction to make leadership aligned, committed, and accountable to diversity and inclusion", the strategic action should "develop and update policies and procedures to ensure diversity and inclusion is an institutional priority". The plan encourages the following actions: "leadership issues diversity policy statements, roadmaps, and/or strategic plans; resource and institute clear, consistent, and robust diversity management policies and directives that ensure decisions are merit-based; assess and modify, as necessary, DoD policies as they relate to diversity". In addition, the plan also stipulates the establishment of an "accountability review construct" such as a "senior level body to oversee and monitor key diversity and inclusion initiatives" [36].

It is also important to ensure intra-organizational coordination. For instance, the GSDF alone has 15 professional schools, including an officer candidate school and the staff school that includes the Command and General Staff program for junior officers and the Advanced Staff program for senior officers. Five area armies have divisions and brigades and other operational units. A MoD diversity and inclusion policy needs to be implemented throughout the service organizations, including the National Defense Academy and Joint Staff College. It is a challenging issue as to how diversity and inclusion training and education can be integrated within the existing curriculum in practice.

If the MoD/SDF were to offer training and education for future diversity leaders, the following points need to be considered: 1) course development, 2) time requirement for courses, 3) quality of instruction, 4) venue (online, face-to-face, small-group seminar/large-audience lecture, etc.), 5) insourcing (e.g. a train-the-trainer program with outside experts training MoD/SDF instructors), and 6) outsourcing (lecture or seminar by outside experts).[21]

However, in compliance with existing laws and government regulations, the MoD and JSDF are obliged to ensure a workforce environment in which all personnel can achieve their best performance without sexual harassment, including harassment based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Educational seminars for the prevention of sexual harassment are required to be held by each government institution. Therefore, outsourcing expert seminars will be the most practical measure. Improving current e-learning programs for gender policies by integrating diversity and inclusion policies can be another optional measure.

4. Conclusion

4.1. From Diversity 1.0 to Diversity 2.0: Challenges for the JSDF

Among the G7 countries, Japan is the only country that has not yet legalized same-sex marriage[22] [25]. In terms of diversity and inclusion, Japan can be considered to be a

[21] These points of consideration are included in the recommendations made by the RAND Corporation for diversity leadership development within the U.S. Department of Defense [17].

[22] However, the Shibuya and Setagaya wards in Tokyo as well as a few other municipalities in Japan have recognized same-sex partnerships [25].

Table 1. Diversity Paradigm.

Paradigm	Diversity 1.0	Diversity 2.0
Policy Rationale	Equal Opportunity	Diversity & Inclusion
Policy Objectives	Representation, Admission	Inclusion
Policy Focus	Compliance	Mainstreaming
Key Issues	Anti-discrimination, Equality	Mission Effectiveness
Mode of Action	Passive/Defensive	Active/Proactive

developing country in compliance with changing norms of human rights, equality, and newly emergent norms of diversity management, including the dimensions of gender and sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI).

However, the MoD and JSDF have been making steady progress in promoting gender mainstreaming in the last few years. The 2017 JSDF Female Empowerment Initiative was a stepping stone in terms of SOGI inclusion. It reflected the revised definition of sexual harassment stipulated in the national government's personnel management regulation. Compliance is the priority of the MoD/SDF. In this sense, current diversity and inclusion policy can be considered more or less within the "Diversity 1.0" paradigm, characterized as passive compliance in preventing harassment and focusing on equal opportunity, although gender mainstreaming has shown a certain progress. Table 1 shows contrasting ideal types of "Diversity 1.0" and "Diversity 2.0" paradigms.

Challenging issues for the MoD/SDF in the near future are developing a coherent strategic plan with a vision to update it into the ideal Diversity 2.0 concept in later years. As a partner country of NATO, Japan is expected to develop Diversity 2.0 leaders in the SDF. This is a demanding objective but well worth trying as a nation proactively contributing to world peace and security. The need for a paradigm upgrade, however, is common to all NATO members and partner countries as long as they have not yet achieved ideal diversity and inclusion.

4.2. Diversity Management Strategies for Organizational Change

In this final section, I explore further theoretical implications for changing organizational cultures within the NATO member and partner countries. Given diversity within NATO itself, varied diversity and inclusion policies and implementation situations among member countries can be observed. Despite continued efforts by the Office of NATO Secretary General's Special Representative for Women, Peace and Security to encourage and promote cultural changes in NATO military institutions, many challenges remain [4]. The latest NATO/EAPC Policy on Women, Peace and Security (2018) stipulated a "3Is" framework: integration, inclusiveness, and integrity [28].[23] Nonetheless, there is no one best way to implement the policy objectives [18: 10].

[23] According to the 2018 policy, the 3Is are defined as follows. Integration: making sure that gender equality is considered as an integral part of NATO policies, programs, and projects guided by effective gender mainstreaming practices; inclusiveness: promoting an increased representation of women across NATO and in national forces to enhance operational effectiveness and success; and integrity: enhancing accountability with the intent to increase awareness and implementation of the women, peace, and security agenda in accordance with international frameworks [28].

Table 2. Diversity Perspectives and Strategic Responses.

Diversity Perspectives	Problem Statement	Internal Definition	Prescription	Desired Outcome	Strategic Response
Resistance	Diversity as non-issue or threat	Not "us"	Sustain homogeneity	Protect the status quo	**Reactive**
Discrimination and fairness	Differences cause problems	Protected groups	Assimilate individuals	Level the playing field for members of protected groups	**Defensive**
Access and legitimacy	Differences create opportunities	All differences	Celebrate differences	Access to employees and consumers (citizens)	**Accommodative**
(Integration and) Learning	Differences and similarities offer opportunities and bear costs	Important differences and similarities	Acculturate; pluralism (mainstreaming)	Individual and organizational learning for long-term effect	**Proactive**

(Source: [5,7], some additions by the author).

Each country may have its own perspective on the issue of diversity and inclusion. As a result of perceived external and internal pressure, as well as priorities given to diversity and inclusion management by the leaders of military organizations, strategic responses to diversity issues vary from one country to another. According to Dass and Parker [5], along with an argument by Ely and Thomas [7], a military organization's strategic responses for managing diversity can be classified into four types: reactive, defensive, accommodative, and proactive, depending on four different types of managerial perspectives, respectively: resistance, discrimination and fairness, access and legitimacy, and (integration and) learning, which are shown in Table 2. Even within the same military organization, the leadership's view on diversity issues could differ, for instance, from the resistance perspective on SOGI inclusion to the learning perspective on gender mainstreaming.

The ideal-typical paradigms of Diversity 1.0 and Diversity 2.0 roughly correspond to the discrimination and fairness perspective and the (integration and) learning perspective. Any given country's strategic responses on diversity issues may differ depending on the nature of an issue. For instance, in the case of Japan, dominant military leaders' perspectives on SOGI inclusion can be considered in transition from resistance to discrimination and fairness, and thus their strategic responses are reactive or defensive at best. On the other hand, in terms of gender integration within the SDF, the current perspective is moving toward access and legitimacy from discrimination and fairness, and thereby, updating the strategic response from defensive to accommodative by eliminating institutional barriers for female SDF personnel in terms of job assignments, including ground combat positions, fighter jet pilots, and submarine crews.

However, no matter what the current situation is, effective diversity management requires self-reflection of one's own diversity perspective on a given diversity issue and continuous efforts in moving toward a proactive strategic response with the integration-and-learning perspective, in compliance with the 3Is framework stipulated in the 2018 NATO/ EAPC Policy on Women, Peace and Security.

References

[1] Becton, J. (2013). Time to implement training for diversity leadership. *ARMY*, June, 18–19.

[2] Cabinet Office, Japan. (2014). *Male's work and life in transition. White paper on gender equality*. Tokyo: Cabinet Office. Retrieved from http://www.gender.go.jp/english_contents/about_danjo/whitepaper/pdf/ewp2014.pdf.

[3] Cabinet Office, Japan. (2017). *Women and men in Japan 2017*. Tokyo: Cabinet Office. Retrieved from http://www.gender.go.jp/english_contents/pr_act/pub/pamphlet/women-and-men17/pdf/1-3.pdf.

[4] Carreiras, H. (2006). *Gender and the military*. Abingdon: Routledge.

[5] Dass, P., & Parker, B. (1999). Strategies for managing human resource diversity: From resistance to learning. *Academy of Management Executive*, *12*(2), 68–80.

[6] Dentsu News Release, April 23, 2015. LGBT survey 2015 was conducted by Dentsu Diversity Laboratory. Retrieved from http://www.dentsu.co.jp/news/release/pdf-cms/2015041-0423.pdf.

[7] Ely, R., & Thomas, D. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *46*, 229–273.

[8] Evaluation Committee of the National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security. (2017). *Annual report on the national action plan on women, peace, and security, January–December, 2015.* Tokyo: Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Retrieved from https://www.mofa.go.jp/files/000264424.pdf.

[9] Fujitsu. (2018). *Sustainability Report 2018*. Tokyo: Fujitsu Group. Retrieved from http://www.fujitsu.com/global/about/ resources/reports/sustainabilityreport/2018-report.

[10] Inspector General's Office of Legal Compliance. (2018). *Compliance guidance, ver. 5*, *for SDF personnel*. Tokyo: Ministry of Defense. Retrieved from http://www.mod.go.jp/igo/compliance/digest/pdf/cg5_taiin-full.pdf.

[11] Inspector General's Office of Legal Compliance. (2018). *Compliance guidance, ver. 5*, *for managers*. Tokyo: Ministry of Defense. Retrieved from http://www.mod.go.jp/igo/compliance/guidance/pdf/cg5_kanri-full.pdf.

[12] Japan Business Federation (*Keidanren*). (May 16, 2017). *Toward a diversity and inclusion society*. Retrieved from https://www.keidanren.or.jp/policy/2017/039_honbun.pdf.

[13] Kamarck, K. (2017). Diversity, inclusion, and equal opportunity in the armed services: Background and issues for Congress. *Congressional Research Service, 7-5700*.

[14] Lee, K., Tufis, P., & Alwin, D. (2010). Separate spheres or increasing equality? Changing gender beliefs in postwar Japan. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *72*(February), 184–201.

[15] Lim, N., Cho, M., & Curry, K. (2008). *Planning for diversity: Options and recommendations for DOD leaders*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

[16] Lim, N., Haddad, A., & Daugherty, L. (2013). *Implementation of the DoD diversity and inclusion strategic plan*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

[17] Lytell, M., et al. (2016). *Diversity leadership in the U.S. Department of Defense*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

[18] McDonald, D., & Parks, K. (2012). *Managing diversity in the military*. Abingdon: Routledge.

[19] Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI), Japan. (2018). *Toward further enrichment of diversity 2.0: Outline of the collection of recommendations by the study group for ideal approaches to diversity management as a competitive strategy*. Tokyo: METI. Retrieved from http://www.meti.go.jp/english/press/2018/pdf/0608_006a.pdf.

[20] Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan. (September 29, 2015). *The national action plan on women, peace, and security*. Provisional Translation. Tokyo: Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Retrieved from https://www.mofa.go.jp/files/000101798.pdf.

[21] Military Leadership Diversity Commission. (2011). *From representation to inclusion: Diversity leadership for the 21st century military, Final report*. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.

[22] Military Leadership Diversity Commission (2010). *Effective diversity leadership definition and practices [Issue Paper #29]*. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission.

[23] Military Leadership Diversity Commission (2011). *Decision paper #6: Diversity leadership*. Arlington, VA: Military Leadership Diversity Commission. Retrieved from https://diversity.defense.gov/Portals/51/Documents/Resources/Commission/docs/Decision%20Papers/Paper%206%20%20Diversity%20Leadership.pdfhttps://diversity.defense.gov/Portals/51/Documents/Resources/Commission/docs/Decision%20Papers/Paper%206%20-%20Diversity%20Leadership.pdf.

[24] Ministry of Defense, Japan. (2017). *The JSDF female personnel empowerment initiative: Toward more attractive SDF adapting to the era and environment*. Tokyo: Ministry of Defense. Retrieved from http://www.mod.go.jp/j/approach/others/jinji/worklife/keikaku/pdf/initiative.pdf.
[25] Nakanishi, E. (2017). *LBGT no Genjo to Kadai* [Current situation and issues of LGBT]. *Rippo to Chosa* [Legislation and Investigation], 3–17.
[26] National Institute of Population and Social Security Research. (2017). *Population projection for Japan: 2016–2065.* Tokyo: National Institute of Population and Social Security Research. Retrieved from http://www.ipss.go.jp/pp-zenkoku/j /zenkoku2017/pp29_ReportALL.pdf.
[27] North-Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). (2016). *Summary of the national reports of NATO member and partner nations to the NATO committee on gender perspective*. Retrieved from https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2018_01/1801-2016-Summary-NR-to-NCGP.pdf.
[28] NATO/EAPC. (2018). *Women, peace and security: Policy and action plan, 2018*. Retrieved from https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2018_09/20180920_180920-WPS-Action-Plan-2018.pdf.
[29] OSCE-DCAF. (2008). *Handbook on human rights and fundamental freedoms of armed forces personnel.* Warsaw: OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. Retrieved from https://www.osce.org/odihr/31393?download=true.
[30] Polchar, J., et al. (2014). *LGBT military personnel: A strategic vision for inclusion.* The Hague: The Hague Centre for Strategic Studies. Retrieved from https://hcss.nl/sites/default/files/files/reports/HCSS_LGBT_webversie.pdf.
[31] Prescott, J., Iwata, E., & Pincus, B. (2016). Gender, law, and policy: Japan's national action plan on women, peace and security. *Asian-Pacific Law & Policy Journal*, *17*(1), 1–45.
[32] Steger, B., & Koch, A., eds. (2017). *Cool Japanese men: Studying new masculinities at Cambridge*. Münster: LIT Verlag.
[33] Stevens, C. (2012). Diversity policies across the Department of Defense. In D. McDonald & K. Parks (Eds.), *Managing diversity in the military* (pp. 33–54). Abingdon: Routledge.
[34] United Nations Development Program. (2018). *Human development indices and indicators: 2018. Statistical update*, Table 5, Gender inequality index. Retrieved from http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/2018_statistical_annex.pdf.
[35] U.S. Army. (2010). *United States Army diversity roadmap.* Retrieved from http://www.armydiversity.army.mil/document/Diversity_Roadmap.pdf.
[36] U.S. Department of Defense. (2012). *The Department of Defense diversity and inclusion strategic plan, 2012–2017.* Retrieved from https://diversity.defense.gov/Portals/51/Documents/DoD_Diversity_Strategic_Plan_%20final_as%20of%2019%20Apr%2012%5B1%5D.pdf.
[37] World Economic Forum. (2018). *The global gender gap report 2018.* Geneva: World Economic Forum. Retrieved from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2018.pdf.