＜論文＞

教員・保育者養成の原理的再検討に向けて
―「信州モデル」の言語論的省察―

高柳充利　　信州大学学術研究院人文社会学域教育学系教育科学グループ
橋本一雄　　中村学園大学短期大学部幼児保育学科
安達佳与子　長野清泉女学院高等・中学校

Re-examining Principles of Teacher/Childcare Provider Education:
Linguistic Reflections on the "*Shinshu* Model"

TAKAYANAGI Mitsutoshi: Group of Educational Science, Institute of Education, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Academic Assembly, Shinshu University

HASHIMOTO Kazuo: Division of Early Childhood Care and Education, Nakamura Gakuen University Junior College

ADACHI Kayoko: Nagano Seisen Jogakuin High School

本稿の目的は以下の3点に要約される．(1)教員・保育者養成への取り組みである，通称「戦略 GP」の趣旨を確認のうえ，(2)その主要な成果のひとつである「子育てシンポジウム」で議論された子どもの言語獲得に関わる問題に焦点をあて，(3)言語哲学の視座から事例への考察を試みることで，発達障害や外国籍児童への対応等の課題を抱える教員・保育者養成について，原理的再検討に向けた示唆を得ようとするものである．

【キーワード】　教員養成　保育者養成　戦略 GP　信州モデル　カベル

1. Introduction

The purposes of this study are: (1) to briefly introduce an ongoing research project about the development of a model of childcare provider and teacher education, which is known as "*Senryaku* GP"; (2) to present its primary achievements by giving a clinical example concerning language acquisition of children; and (3) to raise several questions that reflect the research's progress from the level of theoretical principle, in hopes that these questions will bring a philosophical viewpoint to bear on the duration of the project.

2. Overview of Our Research Project

The project has been proposed and implemented by a joint team of faculty members from Ueda Women's Junior College (Ueda, Japan) and the Faculty of Education,

Shinshu University (Nagano, Japan) and was subsidized by the Ministry of Education.[1] Although the duration of MEXT's subsidy is three years, namely, from academic year 2009 to 2011, the treaty for cooperation between Ueda Women's Junior College and Shinshu University assures a ten-year effort to realize the ideals of our research project. The team's ultimate mission is to realize an educational system in which students become childcare providers and teachers in the community, with a vision of a children's upbringing from infancy to primary education.

This concern originated from a shared sense of urgency: Problems of child rearing and primary education are becoming increasingly complex and severer in a divergent and globalized society, even in traditional rural communities such as Ueda and Nagano. For example, the number of children who are diagnosed with neurobehavioral developmental disorder is increasing (Hosokawa, 2014, p.20) and support for minority students is becoming more evident than it used to be (Ueda-shi Gaikokuseki-shimin Shien-kaigi, 2007, p.6).

In fact, the Central Council for Education, in its report submitted in 2008, mentions the necessity for promoting education for children with special needs (Central Council for Education, 2008, p.27). In response to this concern, the council calls for two measures: the promotion of education for students with disabilities and the promotion of education for minority students (pp.27-28). Following this report, the Japanese government published its "Basic Plan for the Promotion of Education," and the council's proposal for the promotion of education for students with special needs is incorporated almost exactly as it was presented in the report (2008, pp.28-29).

Such governmental efforts are not necessarily helpful in terms of drawing public attention to the issue and may, in fact, be problematic. However, there are some aspects that need to be reconsidered as plausible side effects of the discourse. One of these is the influence on the public conception of the teaching/childcare profession. Manabu Sato points out that as a result of the series of educational reforms introduced in the 1980s, the tendency has been for people to view teachers more as public servants and technicians than as autonomous professionals (Sato, 1992, p.166). Such devaluation of the teaching profession is, Sato criticizes, caused by a centralized and efficiency-oriented educational system (ibid). Hidenori Fujita echoes Sato's criticism. Fujita suggests that "the current reform trends," driven by "growing pressures from backers of the principle of market efficiency and quasi-public accountability," infringe upon "the autonomy of teachers," thereby "lessening the attractiveness of the teaching profession and adversely affecting the quality of teaching in Japan" (Fujita, 2007, p.53).

The point Sato and Fujita are trying to make is not that the government should keep its hands off efforts to improve education for students with special needs. Rather, their point is that reforms should be focused on enhancing teachers' autonomous, individual learning and their mutual collaboration instead of weakening them. Centralized, bureaucratized, top-down reforms, the two argue, are apt to fall short of encouraging teachers' and schools' efforts to approach students with various needs and may even end up discouraging those efforts.

Ryohei Matsushita describes the social background that leads to such an ironical result. He states that the dominant discourse of educational reform often treats teachers as docile spokespeople for the government and service providers to stakeholders (Matsushita, 2012, pp.62-63). Why does such a view of the teaching profession—a view in which teachers are seen as the means for implementing governmental policies adopted to satisfy taxpayers' and their children's demands—discourage teachers' efforts? Matsushita points out the danger of turning teachers into manual laborers who are responsible to management for producing specific numerical results (p.63).

Is there any way to respond to the keen requests of children and their parents without forcing teachers to undergo mechanical training or follow impersonal checklists? Our assumption is that higher educational institutions can contribute to developing an alternative approach by reconsidering the education of childcare providers and teachers. Of course, in the course of our project, we raise practical questions such as, "Is there any way to bridge the boundaries between preschool facilities and primary schools?" and "How might existing facilities in a community organically collaborate to support parents?" Nevertheless, these questions are raised not for the purpose of finding short-term solutions but, rather, in search of a route to re-examine the underlying presumption that the problems are principles-based. In this regard, the project relates to Nel Noddings' opinion on teacher education. She claims:

> They [teachers] should be able to provide an intelligent approach to the legitimate needs and questions of students.
>
> How should teachers be prepared for a program of this sort? Perhaps the most fundamental change required is to empower teachers as we want them to empower students. We do not need to cram their heads with specific information and rules. Instead we should help them learn how to inquire . . . deeply into its [their chosen subject's] place in human life broadly construed (Nodding, 2005, p.178).

Here, Noddings rejects an attempt to coerce teachers to mechanically acquire (allegedly useful) knowledge and skills. Instead, to develop an approach that meets the legitimate needs of students, she emphasizes the importance of securing time and opportunity for teachers to learn and inquire within their specialized fields from the perspective of human life in its broadest sense.

She also states:

> The needs of students must drive our plans for teacher preparation. We have to stop asking: How can we get kids to learn math? . . . How can we prepare teachers for the real world of teaching? . . . Instead we have to change that world. We have to ask: How can my subject serve the needs of each of these students? . . . How can I help them to care for themselves, other humans . . . and the wonderful world of ideas? As we ask these questions, we may find an authentic way to prepare teachers (p.179).

Noddings' view helps to transform the presupposed schema for teacher/childcare provider education. Unlike the widespread discourse, she does not stress equipping teachers with techniques for symptomatic treatment. She even describes such reactions as a "shallow educational response to deep social change" (p.1). In contrast to these piecemeal approaches, Noddings tries to fundamentally reconstruct the argument: that is to say, she recommends reconsidering what a problem really is. In Noddings' view, teachers are better helped by asking themselves, "What can I do to reorganize myself and my worldview in the face of the other?" rather than "How can I get rid of problems to achieve my goal as I planned?"

Based on such interests, we coined the term "*Shinshu* Model" to describe the education project we are devising. *Shinshu* is a traditional name of the region, which has been roughly assimilated into a territory now called Nagano Prefecture,[2] in which the both cities of Ueda and Nagano are located. Thus, the implication of the term is two-fold: On the one hand, the research project tries to excavate and revitalize the potential resources of the province to which it historically relates. On the other, the renewed potential of the community can work as a herald of educational reform for the other parts of the nation, in which communities are facing difficulties related to child rearing in an age of globalization.

One of the major characteristics of the "*Shinshu* Model" is, therefore, its focus on not reacting to so-called problems and instead experimenting with the space for prospective teacher/childcare provider education and re-examining the cultural and

social background that leads people to define certain situations as problems. This model sharply contrasts with the prevalent model of teacher training as embodied by the Renewal System of Teaching License, for example. That system, which has been fully implemented since 2009, aims to ensure that "teachers systematically acquire up-to-date knowledge and skills in order to maintain the professional competencies necessary for today's educators, teach with confidence and pride, and gain pubic respect and trust" (Jimbo et al., 2008, p.23). This description implies that the system views teacher education as the acquisition of information and technique.[3] The "*Shinshu* Model," in contrast, envisions teachers' learning as an open-ended process of rethinking what is currently fashionable in the educational field and recontextualizing what they themselves need as teaching professionals within their communities. To examine the validity of the "*Shinshu* Model", a panel of experts explored the topic during a project-related symposium, as discussed in the next section.

3. Achievements of a Symposium

To address the achievements of the project, let us focus on one of the major accomplishments: a symposium held on December 11, 2010 in the city of Nagano.

The basic concept of the symposium, we called "Symposium for the Support of Child Rearing" (*kosodate-shien shinpojiumu*), was to host a panel discussion with four individuals: a pediatrician, to represent an opinion on child rearing from the medical side; a director of a public childcare facility, who could speak about the frontline of a public support for child rearing; a primary school teacher who was in charge of a special language class for minority students; and a commissioned welfare volunteer, who could provide a non-profit, non-governmental viewpoint about the community's child rearing.

The discussion, chaired by a psychology professor from our team, went quite successfully. It was rich with resources for further elaboration, but, here, two points will be highlighted. Both points were hinted at by the pediatrician's—Dr Kesashi Aonuma's—comments during the symposium.[4] First, he mentioned that many parents are confused by the varied diagnoses by different experts. For example, in the case a child who seems to have difficulty in learning, a psychologist might say that it is a symptom of a learning disorder. The same child might be diagnosed by a pediatrician as having hyperactivity disorder and a psychologist may see her as having Asperger's syndrome. Thus, the parents are forced to choose the opinion that seems to be the most reliable.

Second, Aonuma mentioned that children with autism spectrum disorder have

difficulty in learning language, even though they can communicate with others through their native language. For example, such a child can understand what stomachache is and say "I have a stomach ache" ("*onaka ga itai*," in Japanese). Nevertheless, when his parent replies "Oh, you broke your stomach" ("*Ah, onaka wo kowashita no ne*"—this is a common expression in Japanese for having a stomach ache), the child cannot understand what his parent is saying. To him, breaking one's stomach is interpreted literally, like breaking a machine or a toy house. He does not understand this because his stomach is not working as it supposed to at the moment, but it is not destroyed like a broken toy house. According to Aonuma, this kind of difficulty in language learning seems to have something in common with the cultural barriers that minority students face when they learn Japanese as a second language.

4. Linguistic Issues the Project Raises

How might teacher/childcare provider education respond to the kinds of issues discussed in the symposium? A common approach in traditional teacher/childcare provider education is to find ways to "cram their heads with specific information and rules" (Noddings, 2005, p.178) for handling the students with various diagnoses and students who need to learn Japanese as a second language. This study has no intention of underestimating such efforts, but there are some aspects of this approach that should be considered with caution, as is discussed in the previous section. Viktor Johansson questions the common presumption that teachers are "communicators and transmitters of the values, skills, and knowledge of a certain community" and that children are "recipients in a practice of being initiated into an acceptance of the givenness of that knowledge and those values and skills" (Johansson, 2010, p.469). The problematic part of this picture is that teaching is oversimplified and reduced to a mere "process where the child comes to conform to the rules, norms, or whatever else teachers and adults believe determines their practice as that practice" (ibid). In this sense, teacher education is seen as no more than equipping teachers with tools to carry out their superiors' plan without consideration for who they and their students are. This is a state that Noddings criticizes, and she calls for a transformation of this worldview (Noddings, 2005, p.179).

With regard to language learning, Amanda Fulford has found that rigid forms of teaching do not sufficiently encouraging learners' mastery of their language and instead limit students' creativity and ability to explore possibilities (Fulford, 2009). Her study focused on the influence of "writing frames" designed to transmit writing skills in the United Kingdom (p.223). What is most problematic about students using a

writing frames, she claims, is "not so much that it establishes *structure*, but that it channels *content* in particular ways that limit the possibilities of thought" (p.226). Along with Johansson, Fulford also connects the issue of mechanical transmission to the notion of conformity. She argues that an "unthinking conformity" is "an inherent risk of the writing frame" and its use leads to, ironically, a form of "voicelessness," even though frames were invented and adopted to enhance students' better and freer use of language.

How might this double-layered oversimplification of the concept of education—that teaching is mere transmission and that teacher education is transmission of the technique of transmission—be amended? In response to this question, Johannson and Fulford both pay tribute to Stanley Cavell's ordinary language philosophy. On the one hand, Johannson notes that Cavell's language philosophy elucidates a view on how a child is initiated into a language community (Johannson, 2010, pp.469-470). On the other hand, Fulford refers to Cavell's work in her search for a process of recovery of voice (Fulford, 2009, p.231)—that is a search for a new way of speaking instead of conforming to others' teaching. It is fair to say, at this point, that the ordinary language philosophy can be linked to a way of rethinking teaching that avoids the pitfall of portraying teaching as mere transmission. Drawing upon this understanding, this study examines the validity of the "*Shinshu* Model" and the possibilities it engenders through the lens of Cavell's ordinary language philosophy.

Returning to the discussion that took place at the symposium, this research raises two questions: (1) How can we make sense of experts' varied diagnoses (or names) for the same child's difficulties? (2) Does Aonuma's association between children with autism and non-native speakers make sense? (And why or why not?)

Let us begin by focusing on the latter question, which relates to the issue of a child's acquisition of language. It is often understood that learning a language expands the amount of one's vocabulary and grammatical knowledge. In this sense, however, neither child in Aonuma's example has any problem in acquiring Japanese: Both know what the stomach is and what breaking something means. Some might say, of course, that the issue is not about words and grammar, but about (phrasal) idiom. Still, one question remains: why do these children have trouble understanding idiom, despite their semantic and grammatical knowledge? Possible responses are: "because it is, accidentally, a tricky one" or "because it is cultural." Why is it tricky and cultural, then? In other words, what constitutes complexity, either operational or cultural, in language learning?

Cavell, in his essay "Must We Mean What We Say?" examines the plausibility of a

method of ordinary language philosophy and discusses a widespread confusion about knowing what a word means, i.e., about how we learn a language. He says that people tend to forget how elaborate the learning process is, and then continues:

> We tend to take what a native speaker does when he looks up a noun in a dictionary as the characteristic process of learning language . . . But it is merely the end point in the process of learning the word (Cavell, 1969, p.19).

Replacing the word "noun" with "idiom" in the statement above, Cavell's point is relevant to our concern. It seems unproblematic to understand that the children mentioned in the symposium have trouble determining what "*onaka wo kowasu*" (literally means "breaking stomach," technically means "having stomach trouble") means because they just do not have that idiom in their (mental) dictionary. Even so, why do some children have certain idiom in their dictionary while others do not? Of course the total amount of exposure to the language counts. If that is the case, however, Aonuma's point may be reduced to the issue of time. The consequence of such an assumption may result in a simple conclusion: the longer you are exposed to the language, the more competent you become as a speaker of that language. This sharply opposes the pediatrician's focus on the peculiarity of language acquisition found in children with autism and of non-native Japanese speakers.

In contrast, Cavell's view highlights the complexity of language learning, rather than conceives it to be a matter of expanding knowledge mechanically. Cavell describes a scene in which a person comes across the word "*umiak*" when she is reading in her armchair (ibid). She takes up the dictionary and finds the definition of the word, possibly something as "*noun*. an Eskimo open boat made of wood and skin, traditionally rowed by women. —origin: Inuit *umiaq*." Following the sequence of events in the armchair, Cavell claims that people tend to forget what learning a language is. Although many would think that looking up a word in the dictionary is the pervaded part of one's language learning, it constitutes the end point (ibid). Those who take up a dictionary and hunt for "*umiak*" are those who are prepared to learn what "*umiak*" means. Thus, what is happening here is not merely adding new vocabulary to one's linguistic capacity, but also recollection and reorganization. As Cavell states that when we turned to the dictionary for "*umiak*" we already know everything about the word *except* "its combination" because "we knew what a noun is," "what boats are and what an Eskimo is" (ibid). It is safe to say, at this point, that learning, and even researching, language cannot be narrowed down into accumulating facts and

mastering rules. This kind of oversimplification is the result of forgetfulness, as we have discussed. As Cavell puts it: "We forget that we learn language and learn the world *together*" (ibid). This is why he calls taking up a dictionary as the end point in knowing a word.

Now that the characteristics of the process of language learning have been elucidated, how could we make sense of Aonuma's concern? In order to respond to this question, it is helpful to look at his understanding of the "elaborate" (ibid) quality of the learning process. Cavell finds the tendency of positivistic theorists oppressive with regard to their assimilating the issue of human language into a matter of ostensive knowledge (about words and its use), evidenced by purely objective (hence somehow inhuman) proof (Hammer, 2002, pp.4-5). Such a narrow view of language leads to a narrow view of language learning, and, accordingly, of education.

Against this background, Cavell distinguishes among three types of statements that ordinary language philosophers make: (1) statements that produce *instances* of what is said in a language. For example, "We do say . . . but we don't say . . ."; (2) statements that make explicit what is *implied* when we say what statements of the first type instances; and (3) statements that *generalize* the statements of the first two types (Cavell, 1969, p.3). He explores the conception that the normativity of natural language, contrary to the positivistic view, is not something to be captured or settled by factual evidence, but instead is to be confirmed and to be proven by native speakers'--—ordinary language philosophers included—statements of these three types (p.32). He then writes:

> Since saying something is never *merely* saying something, but is saying something
> with a certain tune and at a proper cue and while executing the appropriate
> business, the sounded utterance is only a salience of what is going on when we talk
> (or the unsounded when we think); so a statement of "what we say" will give us only
> a feature of what we need to remember. But a native speaker will normally know
> the rest; learning it was part of learning the language (pp.32-33).

Cavell reminds us of the fact that acquiring a language is not equated with becoming capable of the first type statements. Of course a learner might, sooner or later, reach the point at which she could say, "we do say '*onaka wo kowasu*' when something is wrong with our stomach" or "we don't say, however, '*me wo kowasu* (to break one's eyes)' when something is wrong with our eyes." Nevertheless, rote memorization of this sort of information does not necessarily lead one to become a competent speaker of the

language. Expressed words and sentences, which manifest themselves as statements of the first type make sense only because they implement "appropriate business" with "a certain tune and at a proper cue" (ibid). To put it differently, being knowledgeable about the first type statements is analogous to being familiar with the domains that the other two types of statements elucidate.

Returning to our initial concern, childcare provider and/or teacher education could find what the discussion above hints at. Facing the difficulties of child-rearing in the community, specifically with regard to linguistic problems, future carers and educators need to pay attention not only to what children say and do not say, but also to what makes their voicing words or sentences possible and plausible. The presence and absence of language does not merely provide something by which to estimate their factual knowledge about words and their usage. Rather, how we appreciate the occurrence of, and confusion towards, speech or silence relates to how we make ourselves understood in the world and in our participation with the language community.[5] Otherwise, the elaborate aspect of acquiring of human language might be overlooked and it shall be reduced to an efficiency-oriented task of collecting of information and skills.

5. The Task of Childcare Providers/Teachers and Their Education in the Community

Finally, what could our project do to explore the betterment of education of childcare providers/teachers, with a focus on elucidating the notion of the "*Shinshu* Model" in the changing community? One answer is to help trainee childcare providers/teachers have a wider view of language so that they can carefully explicate how children, including those who have various needs, "learn language and learn the world *together*" (p.19). To childcare providers/teachers who share this view, language is neither a mere tool of teaching nor a substantiated component of learning objectives. Like the air we breathe, we live and think in it—we merely forget about it while our conversation proceeds smoothly. When we stumble, some take up a dictionary or some try to confirm what we say by exchanging statements of the three types: some coin a term as an effort to elaborate one's (understanding of the) world by adding a piece of language. Terminology such as "a learning disorder," "hyperactivity disorder," "Asperger's syndrome" exhibits how people, experts included, have seriously engaged with children who do not seem to learn in the way adults supposed.[6] To future childcare providers/teachers, the way in which they learn these concepts is critical. Cavell notes that there are two cases in which people align a word and the world:

What seemed like finding the world in a dictionary was really a case of bringing the world to the dictionary. We had the world with us all the time . . . ; but we felt the weight of it only when we felt a lack in it. Sometimes we will need to bring the dictionary to the world (p.20).

The first case is taking up a dictionary when one, while reading, comes across an unknown word. The second is coming across an unknown phenomenon which cannot be explained by the descriptions of the dictionary, and, thus, necessitates re-examining (and possibly revising) the content of it. In either case, Cavell continues:

What you need to learn will depend on what specifically it is you want to know; and how you can find out will depend specifically on what you already command. How we answer the question, "What is X?" will depend, therefore, on the specific case of ignorance and of knowledge (ibid).

Here, one's view of language counts again in the education of childcare providers/teachers. They need to be helped to experience their education not by being provided a set of answers, but rather by knowing what their questions are and examining what ignorance and knowledge comprise these questions. Therefore, a question of "What is X (e.g., autism)" recurs to a learner as long as she is changing (and, thus, going through her education), and accordingly her knowledge and ignorance towards the world and others change. The "*Shinshu* Model", therefore, shall be characterized itself by ongoing practices of bringing the dictionary (of children, of future childcare providers/teachers, and of educators of them) into the community and vice versa. That aims not only raising their vocabulary as educational experts, but also expanding their world and lives as professionals in the community. That would, hopefully, help align the conduct of learning in higher education with the community in which it takes place.

In summary, this study has tried to clarify the validity of the "*Shinshu* Model" from the viewpoint of language philosophy. There are two main points worth emphasizing in concluding this article. First, through the lens of language philosophy, we elucidated the image of helping teachers/childcare providers to demonstrate an "intelligent approach to the legitimate needs and questions of students (Noddings, 2005, p.178). As Noddings suggested (ibid), this approach is not something that can be accomplished by cramming knowledge and skills but must be nurtured and cultivated through the careful process of creative conversation with children, including those who do not respond as teachers/childcare providers might expect. In this regard, the "*Shinshu*

Model" has the advantage of pursuing this image, as opposed to the top-down, prepackaged model of teacher training, because it originated with a concern for re-examining the cultural and social background of the problems that prospective teacher/childcare providers might face. Second, it has become evident that teacher/childcare provider education needs to involve some kinds of linguistic reflections, not in the positivistic sense (i.e., outcome-oriented drilling with devices such as writing frames), but in the sense of the Cavelliean view of language learning—that is, reconsidering oneself on what it means to learn to participate in one's language community. In this regard, the "*Shinshu* Model" also draws on rich soil of hearing one's lost voice within the community. The initiation into the profession of teaching and caring for children necessitates, as discussed above, reflecting and furthering the understanding of the process of initiation into the community. At this stage, elaboration of the sensitivity[7] of (one's and others') language has emerged as a key focus of the project's future.

Note
[1] The official name of the ministry is "Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology in Japan." It is indicated as MEXT hereafter.

[2] A prefecture is an administrative entity of local self-government in Japan. "State" or "province" seem to be counterpart terms in Euro-American countries. Japan consists of 47 prefectural subdivisions.

[3] Takahiro Miura clarifies the fact, through his survey of attendees of the Teachers Certificate Renewal System training in 2009, that many teachers felt that their pride was infringed upon instead of reinforced. This kind of perception, according Miura, resulted from the situation into which the system pushed teachers. In order to maintain their teaching positions, they had no choice but to take courses, no matter how eagerly and earnestly they had been engaged with their work and training (Miura, 2010, pp.35–36).

[4] Dr Aonuma's comments are quoted from the recorded video data of the symposium, with his permission. The original comments are made in Japanese, and the authors of this paper translated them into English.

[5] Yasuhiko Murakami attempts to elucidate the uniqueness and characteristics of the

world that children with autism live in, with his refined way of phenomenology (Murakami, pp. i-ii).

6 In Wittgenstein's scenes of instruction, what is primarily described is a (continuity and resignation of) conversation between an adult and a child, who does not respond in the way that the former expects, e.g.,§ 185 in *Philosophical Investigations* (Wittgenstein, pp.63e-64e). This theme is often discussed in Cavell's subsequent works, most notably in a section titled "Normal and Natural" in *The Claim of Reason* (Cavell, 1979, pp.111-125).

7 This term is associated with Paul Standish's notion of receptivity (Standish, 1992, p.3).

8 平成 21 年度文部科学省大学教育充実のための戦略的大学連携支援プログラム「乳幼児期から小学校までの育ちを見通す地域人材の育成システム『信州モデル』の実現」．

References

Cavell, S., 1969, *Must We Mean What We Say? : A Book of Essays (Updated Edition)*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Cavell, S., 1979, *The Claim of Reason: Wittgenstein, Skepticism, Morality, and Tragedy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

Central Council for Education, 2008, Kyouiku shinkou kihon keikaku ni tsuite: "Kyouiku-rikkoku no jitsugen ni mukete" [Regarding the Basic Plan for the Promotion of Education: For Realizing "An Education-based Nation"] <http://www.mext.go.jp /b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo0/toushin/08042205/001.pdf >.

Fujita, H., 2007, The Qualifications of the Teaching Force in Japan, in: R. M. Ingersoll (ed) *A Comparative Study of Teacher Preparation and Qualifications in Six Nations* < http://www.cpre.org/images/stories/cpre_pdfs/sixnations_final.pdf >.

Fulford, A., 2009, Ventriloquising the Voice: Writing in the University, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 43.2, pp. 223–237.

Government of Japan, 2008, Kyouiku Shinkou Kihon Keikaku [Basic Plan for the Promotion of Education] < http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/keikaku/detail/ _icsFiles/afieldfile/2013/05/16/1335023_002.pdf>.

Hammer, E., 2002, *Stanley Cavell: Skepticism, Subjectivity, and the Ordinary*, Polity Press, Cambridge

Hosokawa, M., 2014, Hattatsu shougaiji no genjou to mirai [The Present Condition and the Future of Support for Children with Developmental Disabilities], in: C. Yamamoto, A. Maeda, and K. Furuya (eds), *Kyoushi wo sasaeru kenshuu dokuhon:*

Shuugaku-mae kara kyouin-yousei made [Handbook for Supporting Teachers: From Preschool Education to Teacher Preparation], Nakanishiya Shuppan, Kyoto

Jimbo, H., Hisamura, K. and Yoffe, L. (ed), 2008, *Developing English Teacher Competencies: An Integrated Study of Pre-service Training, Professional Development, Teacher Evaluation, and Certification Systems,* Tobunsha, Tokyo

Johansson, V., 2012, The Philosophy of Dissonant Children: Stanley Cavell's Wittgensteinian Philosophical Therapies as an Educational Conversation, *Educational Theory,* 60.4, pp.469-486.

Matsushita, R., 2012, Majime-na kyoushi no tsumi to batsu: Kyoushi ga kyoushi de aru tame ni hitsuyou na koto [Crime and Punishment of a Serious Teacher: Necessities for a Teacher to be a Teacher], in Group *Didactica, Kyoushi ni naru-koto, kyoushi de ari-tsuzukeru-koto* [Becoming a Teacher, Being a Teacher: Hope in Difficulties], Keisoshobo, Tokyo

Miura, T., 2010, Kyoushi to shite no jishin to hokori wo ubau koushin-sei: Foramu chousa kekka kara [Renwal System that Deprives Confidence and Pride as a Teacher: from the Results of a Research by the Forum], in: K. Akihito and T. Miura (eds), *Menkyo koushin-sei dewa kyoushi wa sodata-nai: Kyouiku-kaikaku eno teigen* [Teachers Do Not Grow in 'Certificate Renewal System': A proposal for Teacher Education Reform], Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo

Murakami, Y., 2008, *Jiheishou no Genshougaku* [Phenomenology of Autism], Keisoshobo, Tokyo

Noddings, N., 2005, *The Challenge to Care in Schools: An Alternative Approach to Education Second Edition,* Teachers College Press, New York

Standish, P., 1992, *Beyond the Self: Wittgenstein, Heidegger and the Limits of Language,* Ashgate, Aldershot

Sato, M., 1992, Japan, in: H. B. Leavitt (ed) *Issues and Problems in Teacher Education* CT, Greenwood Press, Westport

Ueda-shi Gaikokuseki-shimin Shien-kaigi., 2007, Uedashi tabunka-kyousei no machi-dukuri suishin-keikaku [A Plan for the Promotion of Multicultural Coexistence in the City of Ueda] <http://www.city.ueda.nagano.jp/files/library/ht/ simin/lib/2008040 7150848321.pdf>.

Wittgenstein, L., 2001, *Philosophical Investigations (The German Text, with a Revised English Translation Third Edition),* G. E. M. Anscombe (trans.), Blackwell Publishing, Oxford