

BOOK/JOURNAL REVIEW

**Book Review: *Hosetu to haijo no kyoikugau zouho shinban*
(*Inclusion and Exclusion of Educational Studies: From Minority
Studies to Social History of Educational Welfare. 2nd ed.*)**

Jinichiro Saito* and Yoshihiro Hosaka**

*Professional Licensing Training Center, Tokai University, Japan

** Professional Licensing Training Center, Tokai University, Japan

*Hosetu to haijo no kyoikugau zouho shinban (Inclusion and Exclusion of Educational
Studies: From Minority Studies to Social History of Educational Welfare 2nd ed.)*

Author: Ichiro Kuraishi **Publication Year:** 2018 **Publisher:** Seikatsushoin

Page: 344 **ISBN:** 978-4-86500-077-1 **Price:** ¥ 3600 (excluding tax)

Suggestions Regarding the Theory of Inclusion and Exclusion in the History of Social Studies in Japan

Emergence of the Term “Citizenship Education” in Japan

The term “citizenship education” has been frequently used of late in the field of educational studies in Japan. Although regular educational studies in Japan is described in similar terms, such as “civic education” (*komin kyoiku*, *simin kyoiku*) and “national education” (*kokumin kyoiku*), the trend of researchers using “citizenship education” (*shitizunshippu kyoiku*) is recent. The meaning of citizenship education has been argued and interpreted variously by researchers, with these definitions differing depending on researchers’ educational and political viewpoints; however, all such definitions broadly agree that civic engagement and political participation by citizens (rather than the elite) is important. These movements for the emergence of citizenship education have influenced research on social studies education in Japan since the 2000s.

The term “citizenship education” is derived from citizenship, which was introduced as a subject in the UK around the year 2000. In the UK, the popular Crick Report was published in 1997 (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 1998), and the national curriculum on citizenship was announced in 1999. The background for the introduction of the subject of citizenship in the UK includes new social problems such as high unemployment rates among the youth, the apoliticism of the youth, and social exclusion. Citizenship was originally introduced by the Labor Union to resolve problems of social exclusion (Weller, 2007).

Japanese researchers have considered citizenship education from various perspectives, such as political

literacy, caring diversity, and the empowerment of minority people. However, they have often focused only on the contemporary nature of citizenship education. This perspective is similar to the structural outline in which social exclusion was considered a “new” social problem that arose in Europe after 1980. However, some researchers in Japan have historically considered citizenship education to be synonymous with civic education (Ikeno, 2011).

Perspective on Exclusion in the History of Social Studies Education

The relationship between citizenship education and problems of exclusion are not limited to the present. For example, the history of social studies education is broadly related to social exclusion, especially social studies education practices in the early postwar years of poverty and economic discrepancy. Attempts at exclusion are seen in famous practices such as Yamabico Gakko and fukuoka eki. Educational organizations, such as the Rekishi Kyoikusya Kyogikai (History Educators Council), which were influenced by the principles of Marxism, drew up educational practices to strengthen the critical consciousness of the working class.

However, after the late 1950s, the number of social studies of social exclusion, in the broad sense of the term, decreased. In fact, between 1960 and 1990, articles in the journals of the Academic Conference (e.g., the Japanese Educational Research Association for the Social Studies’ *Journal of Educational Research on Social Studies* and the Japanese Association for Social Studies’ *The Journal of Social Studies*) scarcely referred to the problems of minority people.

We may assume that some historical factors were related to these trends. First, Japan witnessed high economic growth in the 1960s and an expansion of academic careers when cultural differences between the social classes became no longer noticeable. At the same time, views on inequalities in education were focused on inequalities in academic careers (Kariya, 1995; Kimura, 2017). This apolitical phenomenon might have been related to schemes of the welfare state, which made the poverty problem invisible. Second, social studies research after the 1960s weighed heavily on scientific and academic research in the field. This trend could be attributed to the government’s increased control of the course of study nationally, during which academic researchers had to counter the role of the conservative Ministry of Education, Science and Culture (Monbu Syo). As a result, researchers in the field of social studies maintained their distance from the educational movement and ideological confrontations.

Between 1960 and 2000, educational practices focusing on socioeconomic discrepancies and contradictions began to increase steadily, as is evinced by the work of various practitioners and activists on topics such as educational practices concerning pollution, the problem of Okinawa, and peace education in Hiroshima and Nagasaki (Miyahara, 2008). Thus, problems of exclusion and contradiction among members became contentious in the field of education in postwar Japan.

The problems of the inclusion and exclusion of minority people were not directly discussed in academic journals on social studies, at least until 2000. The term “citizenship education” began to influence research on social studies only in the background of globalization and a simmering nation-state. The term “citizenship education” has returned the focus to the problem of inequality, and minority people have become visible again. However, since the term is used nowadays only in relation to its contemporary character, its historical background remains unclear.

Implications of Inclusion and Exclusion of Educational Studies

The book *Inclusion and exclusion of educational studies*, however, makes some valid points that lead to a rethinking of the history of citizenship education and social studies education, the most important being the “embedded structure of inclusion and exclusion” (Kuraishi, 2018, p.13).

According to Kuraishi (2018), exclusion has historically been paired with inclusion; in other words, exclusion contains the seed of inclusion. As exclusion takes precedence, inclusion appears. Kuraishi also establishes a distinction between the recent perspective on social exclusion and his own perspective on inclusion and exclusion, viewing it from a historical perspective (Kuraishi, 2018). The book focuses on the historical discourse and texts of minorities—such as those of outcasts (*Burakumin*) and Korean residents in Japan (*Zainichi Koreans*)—and education in their schools and communities between 1950 and 1980. One historical incident mentioned in the book is claimed to reflect the ambivalence of containing exclusion and inclusion. For example, this book considers reports A and B of 1965 in which the way of caring for *Zainichi* Korean students was announced. The book claims that these reports had both inclusive and exclusive aspects.

When we focus on the unique nature of education in the globalized age, we tend to regard education in the pre-global age as consisting of homogeneous national education. However, in the pre-global age, varied interest groups and people from different socioeconomic backgrounds still influenced educational programs. Further, inclusion and exclusion have always been problematic. This book reveals the structure of inclusion and exclusion from a historical perspective.

The Position of This Book in the Field of Sociology of Education

Minority Studies in the Sociology of Education

So far, we have examined the significance of this book based on discussions in the field of social studies education research. However, Kuraishi states that he considers himself to be a sociologist of education (Kuraishi, 2009, p. 331). Therefore, I would like to discuss the significance of this book in relation to the discussion in the field of sociology of education. This book explores educational issues for minorities in Japanese society. Hence, I would first like to review the characteristics of minority studies in the sociology of education to date.

The accumulation of research on minorities in the sociology of education in Japan is not very long. In *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, the official journal of the Japan Society of Educational Sociology, a review article with the word “minority” in the title was published for the first time in Vol. 94 (Shimizu, Takada, Horike, & Yamamoto, 2014). In this article, it was pointed out that research on the education of minorities has been positioned as marginal in Japanese sociology of education and that research has been accumulated mainly after 2000 (Shimizu et al., 2014).

Our next question then is, what is the background for the accumulation of research on minorities? In the aforementioned review article, it is pointed out that the progression of inequality since the mid-1990s has prompted research focusing on the socially vulnerable (Shimizu et al. 2014, p. 134). In other words, it can be said that the background to the accumulation of minority studies can be ascribed to the fact that social interest has been focused on minorities as those who are at high risk of facing the problem of inequality.

In minority studies, which focus on inequality, the problems faced by minorities have been discussed in

the context of social exclusion. The concept of social exclusion focuses on the problem of lack of participation in various socially desirable activities due to the combined experience of various disadvantages. This problem is said to have arisen in the context of globalization and neoliberal trends (Iwata, 2008). In order to deal with social exclusion, the question of how minority children can be included in education has been examined. It can also be said that research aimed at such inclusion has been developed under the influence of clinical approaches that aim to return research findings to practice.

The development of minority studies in the field of sociology of education has been influenced not only by the focus on the problem of inequality and the accompanying social exclusion theory, but also by the development of qualitative research in the sociology of education.

Many of the minority studies that have been accumulated since 2000 have been qualitative studies based on fieldwork. Such research has clarified the meaning-making of educational experiences of minority children and their teachers, and the process of interaction between minority children and those around them in educational settings. These research interests have been influenced by the influx of “new sociology of education” perspectives, mainly from the United Kingdom, into Japanese educational sociology since the late 1970s. The “new sociology of education” is an approach that targets the internal processes of schools, which had not been included in the scope of research as a black box before the 1970s, and focuses on the distribution of educational knowledge, curriculum composition, and the interaction between teachers and students (Shimizu & Uchida, 2009, p.104).

This “new sociology of education” perspective has emerged to shed light on how inequality in education is achieved due to internal school processes. In the early days of the influx of this approach into Japan, qualitative research through fieldwork was not necessarily the main focus in relation to the issue of education and inequality. However, with the establishment of qualitative research and the aforementioned social conditions such as the emergence of inequality issues, it can be said that qualitative research on the educational experiences of minorities has been accumulating.

The Significance of This Book for the Sociology of Education

Through an examination of the background to the accumulation of minority research in the field of sociology of education, I have confirmed the characteristics of minority research, such as interest in inequality issues and fieldwork research. In this section, I would like to discuss the originality of this book compared to the conventional minority studies in the sociology of education.

First, as already mentioned, exclusion and inclusion are viewed as “embedded structures.” This is different from the perspective of exclusion and inclusion as represented by the conventional “social exclusion” theory. This “embedded structure of inclusion and exclusion” perspective is the basis of the entire book. This perspective is particularly clear in the second part of the book, which examines the practice of education of “*Zainichi*” Koreans in public schools after WWII.

For example, other than the analysis on the report A and B of 1965, the author examines the shift in discourse on education for *Zainichi* Koreans from the records of educational practices around 1970. On account of this, Kuraishi is able to reveal a shift from a discourse that excludes *Zainichi* Koreans as uneducable by drawing a line between Japanese as rational beings and *Zainichi* Koreans as irrational beings, to a discourse that includes *Zainichi* Koreans as educable beings by finding rational aspects inside them. However, even in the

inclusive discourse after the shift, the boundary between educable rational beings and uneducable non-rational beings is still maintained, which means that the inclusion still includes the exclusionary aspect.

The embedded structure of inclusion and exclusion is made possible by taking a stance that abandons the practicality and clinical nature of inquiring into the effects and outcomes of educational practices (Kuraishi, 2018, p. 260).

Another point of originality of this book is that it examines how alternative education that differs from the current logic of school education is possible in educating minorities. This point of view, of course, also appears in the second part of the book, which examines the education of *Zainichi* Korean. However, it is more evident in the first section, which examines the practice of “*Fukushi kyoin* (social work teacher)” who were established in post-WWII Kochi Prefecture to deal with the problem of prolonged absences of children from “*Buraku*.”

For example, in Chapter 2, Kuraishi focuses on three records of welfare teachers’ practices from the early 1950s to the late 1960s, and examines the transition of welfare teachers’ practices in relation to the social situation. He clarifies the process by which the practice of *Fukushi kyoin* shifted from one based on values different from those of the school to one based solely on the values of the school. These changes in the practices of *Fukushi kyoin* indicate a situation in which alternative values of school education are disappearing. Consequently, Kuraishi questions how education based on alternative values of school education is possible.

In this way, it is possible to examine the need for alternative perspectives on schools in minority education because this book is based on a perspective such as the social history of education and welfare, rather than on fieldwork as in conventional minority studies. The perspective of how to include minorities in school education while taking into account alternative values is very suggestive in today’s social situation, where poverty and inequality are expanding due to the progress of neoliberal policies.

Expanding the Scope of Social Studies Education as Citizenship Education

Inclusion and exclusion of educational studies, written by an educational sociologist, has implications for rethinking research on social studies history in Japan. Additionally, when social studies researchers begin to objectively examine Japanese society, the scope of social studies research will expand further. More specifically, as this book focuses on the political context of educational practice after World War II, the perspective is likely to be closely related to the interests of social studies education researchers. There are three possibilities for accomplishing this expansion.

First, the historical study of social studies could focus on the experience of minorities after World War II. This book considers the educational context of such minorities as *Zainichi* Koreans and Burakumin. As mentioned above, sociology of education researchers came to focus on minorities after 2000. In a similar fashion, historical studies of social studies have the potential for rediscovering minorities through educational practices. For example, historical studies of American social studies have recently begun to focus on minorities and alternative curricula (Woyshner & Bohan, 2012). The focus on minorities in educational practice is a fundamental and crucial perspective for the consideration of social studies as citizenship education. Describing the details of educational practice is one of the strong points of historical research.

Second, this book suggests that there is a double meaning to political neutrality in the historical

perspective. Chapter 5 refers to the case of Iida, a Japanese person who worked to improve education for *Zainichi* Koreans. Though Iida weighed heavily the political neutrality as not emphasizing ethnic separatism, this book regards the attempt by Iida as the wise attempt to create publicness for public education. In other words, not expressing political advocacy is not always apolitical but is at times a wise political strategy for engaging in political education. Iida's attempt occurred when ideological struggles and social movements predominated. In other words, social studies theory, which fought down political opinion during an ideological age, is less apolitical theory and more wise strategy for engaging in political education.

Third, this book considers the identity of teachers and students in educational practice from a historical perspective. For example, Chapter 7 focuses on one high school teacher who made a record of his teaching experiences. This teacher discovered that one of his students was a *Zainichi* Korean. The teacher made various attempts to encourage this student, including creating some lessons about *Zainichi* Koreans for his class on modern society (*gendai syakai*). These descriptions illustrate that the problem of identity is an important aspect of the relationship between teachers and students. Social studies as a form of citizenship education must discuss the sociopolitical positions of social studies educators and their students.

A variety of fields conduct research on citizenship, including political science, sociology, and history. Thus, there will always be a need for social studies research not only to improve educational practices but also to investigate social studies as an object or phenomenon. In diverse research areas, the history of social studies education has the potential to unite research on social studies and the history of citizenship.

References

- Ikeno, N. (2011). Postwar citizenship education policy and its development. In N. Ikeno (Ed.), *Citizenship education in Japan* (pp. 15-28). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Iwata, M. (2008). *Syakaiteki haijyo, sanko no haijyo, hutashika na kizoku (Social exclusion: Lack of participation, uncertain belongingness)*. Tokyo: Yuhikaku.
- Kariya, T. (2009). *Kyoiku to byodo (Education and equity)*. Tokyo: Tyuo koron sya.
- Kimura, H. (2017). Launch of the schooling society: 1930s to 1950s. In M. Tsujimoto and Y. Yamasaki (Eds.), *The History of Education in Japan (1600-2000)* (pp. 86-116). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kuraishi, I. (2009). *Hosetu to haijo no kyoikugau zouho shinban (Inclusion and exclusion of educational studies, 1st ed)*. Tokyo: Seikatu syoin.
- Kuraishi, I. (2018). *Hosetu to haijo no kyoikugau zouho shinban (Inclusion and exclusion of educational studies: From minority studies to social history of educational welfare, 2nd ed)*. Tokyo: Seikatu syoin.
- Miyahara, T. (2008). Rekisi kyoikusha kyogikai 60 nen no ayumi (History of 60 years of historical educators' council). In Rekisi kyoikusya kyogikai (Ed.), *Syakaika kyoiku nenpo 2008 nenban (Annual report of history education, social studies education in 2008)* (pp. 115-126). Tokyo: Sansei do.
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. (1998). *Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools*. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.
- Shimizu, K., Takada, K., Horike, Y., & Yamamoto, K. (2014). Minority and education. *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, 95, 133-170.
- Shimizu, M., & Uchida, R. (2009). Qualitative researches in the last decade: Review of the Journal of

- Educational Sociology. *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, 84, 103-121.
- Weller, S. (2007). *Teenager's citizenship: Experiences and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Woyshner, C. & Bohan, C. (2012). *Histories of social studies and race: 1865-2000*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.