No. 189

The Localization of Multicultural Education in Osaka, Japan: With a Focus on the Concept of "Native Speaker"

Yuko Okubo

Department of Sociology
National University of Singapore
11 Arts Link
Singapore 117570

E-mail: socoy@nus.edu.sg

ISSN 0129-8186
ISBN 978-981-3033-83-2
All rights reserved 2008

The Localization of Multicultural Education in Osaka, Japan: With a Focus on the Concept of "Native Speaker"

Yuko Okubo

1. Introduction

The concept of "native speaker," which is conventionally associated with homogeneous national and ethnic subjects, is often used as a model or norm for teaching language. Previous studies such as Sakai (1997) critiqued the homogeneity of "native" and "non-native" speakers as well as a conceptual distinction between the two, but few ethnographic studies examine this issue beyond that. This paper attempts to deconstruct the notion of homogeneous "native speakers," by documenting the ways in which the notion of "native speaker" is being reproduced and by demonstrating the effects and dilemmas involved in this process in ethnographic detail.

In particular, this paper examines the dilemmas involved in the reproduction of the "native speaker" concept in a Japanese political and cultural landscape, the status of which is typically linked to individuals on the basis of ethnicity. This reproduction can be achieved in the following two domains: 1) teaching the Japanese language to immigrant children as their second language, based on the fact that their parents are not Japanese despite the children's fluency in the Japanese language. 2) Teaching "mother tongue" (*bogo*) to students who are considered "native speakers" of the language. In both domains, the association of "native speaker" status with one's ethnic background is reinforced. In Osaka, this process can be considered in the context of both the national government's de-facto negligence of ethnic minority children in Japanese schooling as well as the localization of a popularized version of U.S.-style multicultural education[1] based on the tradition of minority education. This prefecture, located in the western part of Japan, has the second largest population in Japan. The case study I present here is therefore localized on two levels, not only because it refers to the practice in Japan rather than in other countries, but also because it is localized within Japan for being embedded in the reality of the tradition of minority education in Osaka.

In the field of second language teaching, there is a mismatch between the urban multilingualism and the educational classifications of students' language identities and backgrounds. In response to this, Leung *et al.* (1997) propose the concepts of "language expertise," "language inheritance," and "language

affiliation" to replace the homogeneous and idealized notion of "native speaker." The authors contend that these perspectives will allow teachers of English as a second language to understand the needs of non-English-speaking students from the more flexible concepts of ethnicity and language, reflecting the changing relationship among ethnicity, social identity, and language use in the era of postcolonial diaspora. Their argument correlates with the recent research into the relationship between language and speakers of the language, and identity in language education (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002; McKinney and Norton 2008). Garrett and Baquedano-López (2002) argue that the emerging scholarship on language socialization illustrates the shifting notion of "community" as well as the transformative relationship between language and culture. Greater attention has been paid to dialectical tensions between agency and structure, and to the situated and dynamic nature of the relationship between the individual and the group. This recent work does recognize, however, that language still contributes to the constitution of social categories and to the delineation and reinforcement of the boundaries among these categories (Garrett and Barquedano-López 2002). Similarly, under the influence of post-structuralism and critical pedagogy, McKinney and Norton (2008) recognize the connection between the perception of language as a social practice and the theoretical developments in the studies of identity and pedagogy. The authors argue that language, identity, and pedagogy can be theorized so as not to essentialize language and its speakers, rather than associating the language with a fixed group in a structuralist fashion. These studies demonstrate that the deconstruction of the notion of "native speaker" not only pertains to the field of language education but also mirrors the theoretical developments in critical pedagogy, linguistic anthropology, and cultural anthropology. These areas of research now argue for more flexible conceptualizations of language, identity, and ideology within specific contexts, so as to reflect post-structural and post-colonial theories that capture power relations in a larger society.

First, I will explain what is meant by the localization of multicultural education and how a popularized version of U.S.-style multicultural education was introduced to educational practitioners (not researchers) in Osaka. I will also describe the environment of its acceptance (i.e., the tradition of the local minority education) with a focus on the concepts of "ethnic identity" and "symbiosis." Second, I will use my ethnographic research (1998-2000) to examine how the localized version of U.S.-style multicultural education in Osaka was practiced. Third, I will present the ethnographic cases of "newcomer" children who attend Japanese schools in order to problematize this process. These "newcomer" children grow up imagining themselves living in Japan and being Japanese, rather than a citizen of their parents' countries. Educational practices generated from multiculturalism place them as cultural "others." This may produce further marginalized ethnic "others" and reproduce the concept of "native speaker" by associating "native

speaker" with both citizenship (being Japanese nationals) and ethnicity (having Japanese parents). Okano (2006) examined how the central government's educational policies toward recent immigrants developed in response to changes in local educational policies. These changes were implemented to address the ethnic and cultural diversity in schools and were developed in cooperation with grassroots professional groups, activists, and schools. This paper examines the "global-local" interface in a similar manner, but it will instead emphasize the problematizing of this process by examining the outcomes and effects of a popularized version of U.S.-style multiculturalism's localization process within a specific site.

From one perspective, this version of U.S.-style multiculturalism should be considered "critical" or "transformative," as it challenges the dominant norms and values to create a more democratic society. However, the multiculturalism discussed in this paper, which was the foundation for the localized multicultural education at my field site, manifests itself as "difference" multiculturalism, conceptualizing culture as homogeneous and reducing it to a means to an end and a badge for ethnic and national identity (Turner 1993; Goldberg 1994; Eller 1997; Kincheloe 2002).[2] In a sense, Japan's "difference" multiculturalism is similar to what Povinelli (2002) defines as "liberal multiculturalism" in Australia, but with a different sense of moral obligations. According to Povinelli (2002), Australia's "liberal multiculturalism" functions as an ideology and governing practice as well as a form of domination, which is based on the dominant's moral obligations toward minority subaltern subjects. This happens in spite of the fact that the local minority education, which I argue is a forerunner of the localized multicultural education, shares a "transformative" goal of encouraging student empowerment and social action (Banks 1995; Korn 2002).[3] The discrepancy occurs, because approaches and modalities of multicultural education are numerous and may be inconsistently practiced, as Eldering (1996) argues about multiculturalism in North America, Europe, and Australia. Despite its goal to involve everyone, in reality, not all pupils are incorporated into multicultural education. Multicultural education that enables the participation of all is limited to an ideological discourse, for it exists merely as an addition to or a minor adaptation of the regular curriculum and tends to lean toward assimilation rather than cultural pluralism (Eldering 1996: 322). The Japanese case I present below shares these characteristics.

2. Impact of U.S. Multicultural Education on the Japanese Educational Practitioners and a Local Tradition of Minority Education

The term "multicultural education" was first introduced to Japanese academia by educational researchers in the 1980s. In the edited volume, *A Comparative Study of Multicultural Education* published in 1985, education for ethnic minorities in the U.S., Canada, Australia, and European countries was covered under the term multicultural education. In this text, multicultural education was understood as education that

deals with cultural assimilation and cultural diversity (Kobayashi and Ebuchi 1985). In the 1990s, with the publication of books about multicultural education in the U.S., the idea spread to Japanese educational practitioners (Hirasawa 1990, 1993, 1994). With the publication of the Japanese translation of James Banks' *An Introduction to Multicultural Education* in 1999, educational practitioners in Japan came to associate the term "multicultural education" with the U.S. and with James Banks, the leading theorist in this field. Although multicultural education was the dominant model in the U.K., Canada, and Australia, Japanese educational researchers instead studied and reported on the U.S. education. This is partially induced by a strong influence of the U.S. on the post-war Japan, exemplified by the post-war educational reforms for a more "democratic" education led by the Allied Occupation (Okano and Tsuchiya 1999). During my fieldwork in 1998-2000, practitioners of multicultural education in Osaka based their ideas on James Banks' work, a particular version of the U.S.-style multicultural education. According to Haruo Ota, a prominent scholar of the education of "newcomer" immigrant children in Japan, there are still no published articles that discuss the model of multicultural education practiced in Japanese schools (personal communication with Haruo Ota, 2008). However, I argue that the Japanese teachers covered in this study absorb and practice the concepts and theory of "American multicultural education" in a specific way reflecting the educational tradition in Osaka, filtered through frameworks constructed by and embedded in their reality – the local tradition of minority education. I call this process the "localization of U.S. multicultural education."

In the early 1990s, there was a growing familiarity among Japanese educators with the term "multicultural education." Japan had experienced a significant demographic transition in the 1980s, resulting from an influx of foreigners with various cultural backgrounds who came to Japan mainly as laborers. After normalizing diplomatic relations with China in 1972, war-displaced Japanese women and orphans started returning to Japan from China with their children and grandchildren. In addition, refugees from Indochina started arriving in the 1980s, followed by a sudden increase in the Japanese-descended (*Nikkei*) migrant workers from South America in the 1990s. In 1998, the ratio of foreigners to the whole population was 1.2%, exceeding 1% for the first time and having almost doubled in 25 years.[4] Although this ratio is much higher in other countries, the demographic transition had quite a dramatic impact on Japan, which had often been described as a "homogeneous" nation, although this portrayal was, in turn, described as a "myth of homogeneity." The myth ignored the presence of long-standing ethnic/cultural minority groups such as Burakumin (former outcasts), resident Koreans, Ainu (northern indigenous population), Chinese, Okinawans (those living in the southern islands of Okinawa) and so on (Weiner 1997; Lie 2001). The Burakumin are the descendants of the outcasts of the Tokugawa period (1603-

1867), and resident Koreans are the descendants of forced migrant workers and immigrants from Korea during Japan's colonial period (1910-1945). They are regarded as minorities, being subject to relative economic, political and social disadvantages in contemporary Japan (Neary 1997; Weiner 1997). The arrival of these new groups had an especially strong impact on teachers who did not have experience in catering to linguistically and culturally diverse children.

However, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (hereafter, Ministry of Education) simply defines the children of foreigners as "those who require Japanese language instruction" (*nihongo kyōiku ga hitsuyō na gaikokujin jidō, seito*),[5] and it sets a national guideline for these children. They are only given assistance in the acquisition of Japanese language ability and little nurturing of their ethnic and cultural backgrounds (Ota 2000: 26-28). Ota (2000) points out seven aspects of the national policy toward "foreign pupils and students who require Japanese education/teaching." These are:

1) allocating teachers to be in charge of Japanese teaching and the budget to hire them (since 1992).
2) creating and distributing materials for Japanese teaching (since 1992).
3) creating and distributing materials that discuss how foreign children can adjust themselves to Japanese schools (since 1995).
4) assigning 6-8 elementary and junior high schools per year as "schools for cooperating with research on education" (*kyōiku kenkyū kyōryokukō*) and asking these schools to conduct research on educational plans and guidance for these students.
5) offering workshops during the summer for teachers in charge of these children (since 1993).
6) sending "people who can cooperate with teaching foreign children" (*gaikokujin shijo tō shidō kyōryokusha*), that is, people who can understand their mother tongues, to the schools via local boards of education (since 1993).
7) assigning school districts to promote the education of foreign children (*gaikokujin shijo kyōiku ukeire suishin chiiki*) and to conduct research on guidance and teaching materials/curriculum development (since 1998).

In addition, the Ministry of Education's policies for the education for foreign students in 2008 include developing an extensive JSL [Japanese as a Second Language] curriculum (since 2001), conducting research on foreign students who are not going to school in designated districts (2005-2006), and conducting research to find a model for a comprehensive incorporation of foreign students into a local community and to promote attendance of foreign students who are not going to school in designated districts (since 2007).[6]

Since the late 1960s, and especially since Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone launched the National Council on Education Reform (*rinji kyōiku shingikai*) to cope with the internationalization of education in 1984, the central issue related to children with different cultural and language backgrounds has been educational assistance, by which "returnees" may readjust themselves to Japanese society. These

"returnees" have lived abroad for a certain number of years (three to five years), due to their parents' work, mainly for large Japanese corporations (Nukaga 2003; Goodman 1990).[7] Contrary to the abundant educational assistance to "returnees," the Ministry of Education does not recognize a necessity for special assistance to long-residing ethnic minorities such as Koreans and Chinese (represented by the term "internal internationalization" (*uchinaru kokusaika*) of Hatsuse (1985/87)) within regular school curricula.[8] Thus, the arrival of these new immigrants had an especially strong impact on teachers who had limited previous experience with linguistically and culturally diverse children.

When the books on multicultural education in the U.S. were published in the early 1990s, teachers and educational practitioners were eager to learn the methods in order to deal with the increasing number of foreign nationals in their classrooms. Since the mid-1990s, other researchers, who were studying education for ethnic minorities in Japan (Osaka) and who were regarded as supportive of teachers and school issues, began referring to U.S. multicultural education in order to explore the similarities and differences in the education between the two countries (Nakajima 1997; Yokota 2001).

Although the agenda regarding language instruction for foreign children cited by Ota (2000) was a set of recommendations for educational policies at the national level, the degree of implementation differed from one local government to another, leaving much liberty to prefectural and municipal boards of education. In fact, the lack of a national educational policy for foreign children resulted in a de facto policy of neglect, or of cultural assimilation unaccompanied by support for the cultural backgrounds of "newcomer" children. Moreover, since the Ministry of Education only explicitly recommended language instruction for children of foreign nationals, "newcomer" children who were legally naturalized in Japan were technically excluded. However, at the local level, the children of foreign nationals who required language instruction included "newcomer" children who were born in Japan or who were Japanese nationals via having one Japanese parent or having gone through the naturalization process.

Understanding the way in which a concept of U.S. multicultural education was originally introduced to Japanese educational practitioners is important for comprehending the twist that resulted from a culturally specific and localized way of interpreting the term. Multicultural education is defined comprehensively as an educational process or strategy that is supposed to create awareness, tolerance, understanding, and knowledge regarding different cultures, to promote academic and social achievement in intercultural settings, and to accomplish increased communication and understanding between cultures, nations, groups, and individuals (Ekstrand 1994: 3963). However, when Banks' 1994 book, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*, was translated and published in Japan in 1999, the subtitle, "Restructuring Schools in the New Era," was added by the translator. As educational reform has become

an important agenda for the national government since the mid-1990s, an emphasis has been put on multicultural education as a means of school reform. Thus, multicultural education was initially introduced to Japanese educators as an ideal for school reform. The term “restructuring schools,” which refers to educational reform with a focus on school organization and curriculum, was often used together with the term multicultural education among Japanese educational practitioners as in “restructuring multicultural schools (*tabunka kyōsei no gakkōzukuri*)”[9] or “restructuring schools for multicultural education (and education for human rights) (*tabunka jinken kyōiku gakkō o tsukuru*).”[10]

Secondly, the inauguration of the United Nation’s Decade for Human Rights Education in 1995 influenced Japanese educational practitioners as well.[11] “Human rights education” became another way to say education for Burakumin, whose advocates since the mid-1990s had been trying to extend its scope to education for all minorities in Japan, including ethnic minorities, women, the disabled, and the elderly. Whereas the post-World War II discourse among liberals regarding rights of minority groups shifted from a focus on the protection of basic civil and political rights of individuals, i.e. human rights, to the protection of the collective rights of minority groups (Kymlicka 1995), the discourse of minority politics in Japan shifted in the opposite direction: from minority rights to human rights. Thus, multicultural education came to be associated with human rights education. Accordingly, multicultural education in Osaka adopted an approach for “education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist,” which aims to create equitable social structures and cultural pluralism (Sleeter and Grant 1987). It also shares principles with anti-racist education, which intends to eradicate discrimination through human rights education.

Third, there was also a direct influence on Japanese educators at the local level, i.e., the tradition of local minority education in Osaka, which specifically meant education for Burakumin (or expanding to human rights education) and ethnic Koreans. The two educational programs originated in *Kaihō Undō* (liberation movement), which is the civil rights movement of former outcasts, Burakumin, that dates back to the mid-1960s. This movement provided a strong basis for the development of educational initiatives for two minorities (Burakumin, resident Koreans) in the 1970s and 1980s. The goal set for both educational programs was to raise the consciousness of the members of each group in order to fight and overcome prejudice and discrimination. The main philosophy employed was “group process,” centered on improving the situation of “children at the bottom” (*teihen no ko*). These children either belonged to a discriminated group or had serious problems in their personal lives (family and friends), academic performance, and the like. Educators espoused the importance of “awareness of one’s social location”

(*tachiba no jikaku*), "awareness of one's ethnic background and social location" (*minzokuteki tachiba no jikaku*), and "ethnic identity" (*minzokuteki aidentiti*).

Fixing on E. Erikson's "identity" as a popular concept, which implied something similar to the "awareness of one's social location" (*tachiba no jikaku*) in global academia, Mori (1990) argued the importance of the two concepts in developing educational programs for minorities. The phrase "awareness of social location" (*shakaiteki tachiba no jikaku*) was used from the start in Burakumin educational programs, but the term "identity" came to be used interchangeably with this phrase. Therefore, for the Japanese educators, "awareness of one's ethnic background and social location" (*minzokuteki tachiba no jikaku*) and "ethnic identity" (*minzokuteki aidentiti*) were identical in meaning.

This "awareness" was discussed in a handbook on Korean ethnic education that was promoted by a council to fight discrimination against resident Koreans (*Minzoku sabetsu to tatakau Ōsaka renraku kyōgikai* [*Mintōren Ōsaka*])[12] in Osaka. With respect to the issue of identity in third and fourth-generation resident Koreans, who are linguistically and culturally assimilated into the mainstream Japanese society, the handbook stressed the importance of being "aware" of their status as culturally assimilated but marginalized subjects while continuing to live as ethnic Koreans in Japan (Mintōren Ōsaka 1992: 39). In reality, as a group, resident Koreans are diverse, and not every individual refers to him/herself as a marginal subject in society.[13] However, in the handbook, the identity of resident Koreans is regarded as fixed, which does not coexist with being Japanese. In addition to the concept of "group" as a preferred unit in education for Burakumin, education for resident Koreans introduced the notion of fixed identity, neglecting the hybrid nature of their subjects.

"Symbiosis/Coexistence" (*kyōsei*) is another term worthy of notice in this handbook. Realizing a "society of symbiosis" (*kyōsei shakai*) through "ethnic education for symbiosis" (*minzoku kyōsei kyōiku*) is the educational goal of the resident Korean organization. According to Enoi (1997), "symbiosis" or "coexistence" is the philosophy that encourages individuals to act against one's interests for the common wealth of society (Enoi 1997: 15).[14] In order to address issues related to recent immigrants from China, Vietnam, Brazil and the Philippines as well as the increasing diversity of resident Koreans,[15] teachers in Osaka envisioned an education called Multicultural Education and Education for Symbiosis (*tabunka kyōsei kyōiku*) as an educational ideal for foreign residents in Japan. I argue that this represents a localized version of Banks' model of multicultural education based on the tradition of minority education in Osaka. The theme of "cherishing minority children's identity as members of minorities" runs through this Korean ethnic education in a manner similar to human rights education (formerly known as education for the Burakumin). Although the program was called "multicultural," it did not incorporate Japanese nationals

and it focused on those children with foreign backgrounds. Since Japan has relatively strong organizations for teachers such as teachers' union and associations for the education of foreign residents and the education for human rights, teachers are more easily disposed to commonly shared assumptions regarding identity and ethnicity in the classroom.

The local minorities' tradition of multicultural education, which emphasizes their collective identities as minorities, has been discussed with a focus on the terms "identity" and "symbiosis." In the next section, I will first describe the practices of this education in a multiethnic school community. I will then discuss how the "native speaker" concept was re-associated with ethnicity (having Japanese parents), which resulted in the exclusion of Japanese-speaking "newcomers" from being considered part of the "native speaker" community and thus reproduced the ethnicized "native speaker" concept in Japan.

3. Practicing "Multicultural Education and Education for Symbiosis/Coexistence" (*tabunka kyōsei kyōiku*)[16]

In this section, I discuss the reproduction of the "native speaker" concept by which the language is associated with one's ethnic background, as it has been observed in two domains: 1) teaching the Japanese language in the Japanese language classes to Chinese and Vietnamese children, and 2) teaching the Vietnamese language ("mother tongue") to Japan-born Vietnamese, who are considered "native speakers" of the Vietnamese language by Japanese teachers. Most Vietnamese children, who were born and raised in Japan, felt more comfortable communicating in Japanese than in Vietnamese. However, since their parents were from Vietnam, Japanese teachers presumed that their native language was Vietnamese. The teachers thus required the children to enroll in the Japanese language class based on the assumption that they were in need of language assistance, and encouraged them to maintain Vietnamese, their presumed native language, in order to nurture their ethnic identity.

Aoyama City (pseudonym), the city where I did my research from September 1998 to March 2000, is located in the southeastern part of Osaka. The city has many small- to middle-sized companies and factories that provide employment opportunities for foreign workers. In 1998, the 7,900 registered foreigners in Aoyama constituted 2.8% of the entire population of the city. This was more than double the contemporaneous national ratio of 1.2%. Korean nationals, the largest group, totaled 6,000 residents, and accounted for 76.5% of the entire population of registered foreign nationals. The second and third largest communities were the Chinese and Vietnamese at about 900 and 400 residents, respectively.

This paper is based on ethnographic fieldwork in one multiethnic neighborhood in Aoyama between September 1998 and March 2000, August 2001 and September 2001, and May 2004 and June

2004. During my intensive fieldwork between 1998 and 2000, I lived in the neighborhood and conducted participant observations of everyday practices at "diversity points" or encountering places for people with different backgrounds in Japan (Tsuneyoshi 2004). Miyako Elementary School (pseudonym), a public elementary school within the neighborhood, was one of the "diversity points," my entry to the neighborhood, and my main field site throughout 1998-2000 period. I conducted participant observations of class activities, and formal and informal interviews with teachers, children, parents, and other residents in and out of the school. I gave special attention to Chinese and Vietnamese children enrolled in the Japanese language classes at Miyako. Following these children, I also spent one semester respectively on observing a second grade homeroom class and a fifth grade homeroom class with Chinese and Vietnamese children.

In Miyako, I was referred to a "teacher" (*sensei*) by other teachers, children, and parents, although I only helped students as a teachers' aid upon their request. I was given a desk in a teacher's office next to the teachers who were not in charge of homeroom classes. I also participated in the school events as a "teacher," had school lunch in the teachers' office with other non-homeroom teachers who did not have to supervise homeroom classes, and attended teacher's meetings. In the beginning, I was at Miyako throughout the school day: from Monday to Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., and from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. on Saturday. As the scope of my research became broader upon my recognition of the importance of outside factors such as local politics and communities, I spent less time in school; however, my attendance at the Japanese language classes from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. on two afternoons per week observing their regular activities continued until March 2000.

In 1998, Miyako Elementary School had an enrollment of 418 children from the first to the sixth grades, which reflected the demographics of Aoyama City's foreign nationals. Among these, 203 (48.6%) were Buraku children. However, this number included many families that were not originally Burakumin, as many non-Buraku families moved into the neighborhood after being attracted to the lower rent of the area. According to one community official, the actual number of Buraku children should have been 46. Among the student body, the school reports that there were 19 Vietnamese (one Japanese national), 12 Chinese (one Japanese national), 59 ethnic Koreans (33 Japanese nationals), and two doubles (half-Japanese), totaling 92 children with a cultural background other than Japanese.[17] This categorization does not match the legal categories based on nationality, for each group includes Japanese nationals who were confirmed as such by descent or through the naturalization process.[18] The school prides itself on its commitment since the mid-1990s to Multicultural Education and Education for Symbiosis/Coexistence (*tabunka kyōsei kyōiku*), based on Human Rights Education (*jinken kyōiku*). However, while Banks'

model of a "transformative approach" to multicultural education theoretically applies to all students, I found only 12 (15 in 1999) Chinese and 19 (23 in 1999) Vietnamese children whose "needs" were being served out of approximately 400 children enrolled in the curriculum. By only serving the needs of foreign children under their multicultural education program due to the absence of the multicultural activities for all, this program inadvertently called attention to the non-Japanese background of new immigrants. Moreover, as will be explained in the following section, the national educational policy, which provides Japanese language instructional assistance, ascribes yet another marking to foreign children.

3.1. The Reproduction of the "Native Speaker" Concept through Teaching the Japanese Language

The first "newcomer" child (a fourth grade Vietnamese boy) entered Miyako Elementary School in 1984. Since 1988, the school has provided after-school Japanese language instruction for 11 Vietnamese children, beginning before the national government made recommendations for language instruction in 1992. In the academic year of 1987, Japanese language instruction for Vietnamese and Chinese students was situated within the school's Dowa education (education for the Buraku) plan, and since then, Japanese language instruction for the "newcomers" began in Miyako.

In 1998, the school in my field site had two Japanese language classes (*nihongo kyōshitsu*), one for Vietnamese children and one for Chinese children. Prior to 1998, the school only had one Japanese language class, but due to the sudden increase in Chinese children returning from China, the school opened a second class especially for Chinese children and arranged for the transfer of a teacher who was fluent in the Chinese language. This split of the Japanese language class along ethnic lines made it difficult for children who did not fit into either category to participate in a Japanese language class or ethnic club activities. For example, a fifth grade girl, whose mother is Filipina and whose father is Japanese, was originally a member of the Japanese language class. After the split, she was "enrolled" in the class for Vietnamese students, but I did not see her in the classroom during my fieldwork. Her name was removed from the class roster the following year.

Chinese and Vietnamese children were automatically enrolled in these classrooms upon entering school, regardless of the children or parents' wishes or their backgrounds. This reflects the perspective that associates the native speaker status with the ethnic backgrounds of individuals, and assumes that non-Japanese immigrants cannot become the native speakers of the Japanese language and that they need to be taught the Japanese language as their second language.

In 1998, all 12 Chinese children enrolled in the Japanese language class had been born in China and most of them had lived in Japan for two to three years. A few children had just returned from China

and they had started learning Japanese after entering school in Japan. Two children were naturalized and had Japanese citizenship, and most were using Japanese names. As for the 19 Vietnamese children, most were born in Japan and were technically second-generation Vietnamese. Because most of those who were born outside Japan came to Japan as infants, all had a functional command of conversational Japanese. Only one child, who came to Japan in March 1998, was struggling to learn the language for the first time. One child was naturalized, and five were using Japanese names.[19] Although these children were referred to as "Chinese" and "Vietnamese" at school, nationalities, birth places, "native languages," and usage of their names were more diverse than merely Chinese or Vietnamese. "Japanese language class" included both Japanese language instruction and ethnic club activities,[20] which were offered once a week each after school. The following ethnic club activities present the reproduction of the "native speaker" concept in the second domain.

3.2. The Reproduction of the "Native Speaker" Concept through Teaching the Students' "Mother Tongues"

The ethnic clubs for Chinese and Vietnamese children at Miyako Elementary School participated in two ethnic cultural festivals sponsored by Aoyama City Teachers' Association for the Education of Foreign Residents and the teachers' union. Korean ethnic clubs at Miyako Elementary School and in the community and ethnic clubs at other schools in the same city performed in the festivals as well. Vietnamese children from Miyako sang a Vietnamese song about the moon festival and performed a play with two other ethnic clubs from two other schools, which was based on a Vietnamese fable, but was performed in Japanese.[21] Chinese children greeted audience members, saying "*Ni men hao*" (how are you?) in Chinese, introduced themselves in Japanese, and recited the Chinese poetry.[22] Both groups of children wore ethnic dresses, Vietnamese *aodai* and Chinese China dresses and *chipao*. They practiced for these festivals for two months.

In the ethnic clubs offered as part of the "Japanese language class" after school on every Thursday, activities were offered that intended to teach Chinese and Vietnamese children cultural issues and history (only for Vietnamese fifth- and sixth-graders) by playing games, cooking ethnic foods, and singing songs in their "mother tongue." In addition to teaching cultural issues, the Vietnamese teacher was enthusiastic about introducing Vietnamese language instruction for the Vietnamese children so that they could maintain their "mother tongue." A Vietnamese college student was asked to read stories in Vietnamese, pronounce Vietnamese words, and speak to them in Vietnamese. She was asked to share her experience at school with the children because the teacher thought it would be encouraging to learn how someone older than themselves was doing "as a Vietnamese living in Japan." Vietnamese language

instruction was regarded as important for three reasons, according to the teacher in charge of the Japanese language class for Vietnamese children: 1) so that children could maintain their Vietnamese language ability in order to communicate with parents who did not speak much Japanese; 2) to improve their Japanese fluency, based on the teachers' belief that their second-language ability would be strengthened by increasing the input in their native language; and 3) to nurture the children's identity as Vietnamese. In the Japanese language class for the Vietnamese students, children were told, "You should not speak only Japanese. You should speak both Japanese and Vietnamese." "Be proud of yourself as Vietnamese in Japan." A child who was using a Japanese name was told, "You should use your real ethnically distinctive name." It was reported that one Vietnamese child decided to use her Vietnamese name at graduation after realizing the importance of her real name during her conversation with the Vietnamese college student (*Aoyama-shi, Miyako Chūgakkō Miyako Shōgakkō* 1999: 9-10). These messages are common at schools in Aoyama where foreign children are enrolled, and the more these messages are heard, the more the school is regarded as devoted to the children, and as having a good educational program.

The purpose of ethnic clubs for "newcomers" was to learn about their cultures and languages, and the goal of the club activities was to "retain and nurture the ethnic identity" (*minzokuteki aidentiti no hoji shinchō*) of Vietnamese and Chinese children. On the website of the Refugee Assistance Headquarters, it was reported that a Vietnamese parents' meeting regarding language instruction was held by a teacher of the Japanese language class at my field site. The website addressed five major questions as follows: 1) Does a child's being able to speak Japanese mean that s/he has no difficulties in learning?; 2) Don't parents have to teach Vietnamese even if a child is able to speak Japanese?; 3) Does a child understand much of the Vietnamese that his/her parents are speaking?; 4) Do parents take a look at the child's textbooks together with him/her?; 5) Don't parents entrust everything regarding the child's learning to the school? In a one-paragraph explanation of the third topic, the final sentence reads, "Parents should pass down their language, construct the foundation of the child's language, and lay the firm base of their ethnic identity."[23] From this, we can see that language is intertwined together with issues of ethnic identity, even though most of the children in the Japanese language class were born in Japan.

The phrase, to "retain and nurture the ethnic identity," was often heard while I was in the field from 1998 to 2000, but the origin of the phrase remained a mystery to me for some time. Teachers reported that, "the phrase was from the Ministry of Education" and "it was all over their materials." In spite of the popularity of the phrase, not many construed its true origin. Actually, the Ministry of Education has not shown interest in foreign children other than those who need Japanese language instruction. Moreover, they have not acknowledged the educational and training needs of foreign children

beyond language instruction (Ota 2000; Enoi 1997; Aoyama City 1999). As Enoi (1997) argues, the Ministry of Education has not approved ethnic education for resident Koreans at Japanese schools since the war, and they do not know how to define education for foreign children. Given the history of neglecting ethnic education for ethnic Koreans in public and private schools, as well as the fact that the Ministry's only concern regarding foreign children is their ability to understand Japanese, the teachers' assumption that the Ministry of Education had taken the initiative in establishing this phrase as its goal and in showing consideration for ethnic minority education at Japanese schools is doubtful (Aoki 2000; Hester 2000; Motani 2002).

In the case of my field site, the teachers' interpretation of these messages has local implications that raise and nurture self-awareness of "newcomer" members as members of minority groups within Japanese society. This phenomenon arises from the traditions of Dowa education (education for the Buraku) and education for ethnic Koreans in the city, as discussed earlier. Based on the belief that the Ministry of Education requires the teachers to "retain and nurture the ethnic identity" of "newcomer" children in Miyako, Vietnamese children were considered "native speakers" of the Vietnamese language and encouraged to study it at school. Here, the "native speaker" concept that associates a language with an individual's ethnic background is again reinforced.

While Dowa education no longer exists due to its transformation into Human Rights Education as I explained in the first section, extra-curricular Korean ethnic club activities continued to be made available for children with Korean backgrounds and for Japanese children interested in learning about Korean culture at school, even though the number of participants was small. The club, which was separate from the community ethnic club as I will explain later, met once a week after school with the assistance of the Korean community in the neighborhood. The Korean ethnic club at school was intended to foster an appreciation of Korean heritage for all students with such an interest, regardless of their ethnic backgrounds. When I had the chance to discuss club activities for Chinese and Vietnamese children with the teacher who was in charge of school-wide activities, however, he said, "It is still too early to open up their club activities to Japanese children." Teachers seemed to believe that the Chinese and Vietnamese students should have their own club activities without any Japanese participants, contrary to the situation of the Korean children.

Three fourth grade teachers in the year 1999-2000 were against the school's excessive focus on ethnic minorities. One commented, "Look at these Vietnamese kids. They are no different from Japanese kids." A special demonstration lesson open to observation and critique by other teachers did not include any issues on ethnic minorities. Some teachers complained about this radical attempt to not mention

Koreans, Chinese, and Vietnamese in their lesson plans at all. This episode captures the dilemma of emphasizing ethnic identity of minority children at school, and demonstrates the presence of critical views against the practice of marking ethnicity. A community language instructor, who shared with me her experiences dealing with Chinese children and teachers, said vehemently, "I do not want the school to force them to learn the Chinese language." (September 2001, a community language instructor) This resonates with the opinion of an advisor from the Refugees Assistance Headquarters, an organization that provides assistance for Vietnamese refugees and their families residing in Aoyama, who did not want teachers to encourage Vietnamese children to become interpreters without considering the skills necessary to become one. Linking ethnic minorities with their ethnic backgrounds or even marking their ethnicities was uniquely associated with the tradition of minority education. In other areas where there was no tradition of minority education, "newcomer" children were either "invisible" due to a lack of special assistance for cherishing their heritage or were treated as icons for the national cultures of their home countries under the scheme of internationalization.

In the local community, Buraku issues were no longer brought up at the community Youth Center. The Youth Center made its services available to all children in the city in 1995 and offered classes to children and their parents such as peace education (*heiwa gakushū*), development education (*kaihatsu kyōiku*), and education for international understanding (*kokusai rikai kyōiku*), thereby situating Burakumin among other oppressed groups in Japan and in the world. They also offered classes such as English, cooking, sign languages, and sports activities for elementary through junior high school children at rates that were much less expensive than other institutions.[24] One Chinese girl was learning English at the Youth Center, taking advantage of inexpensive class fees and good instruction. The Youth Center was open to first through third-graders who did not have guardians at home after school. It was school policy for first to third-graders to stay either at the Youth Center in the community or at a daycare center inside the school, until 5:00 p.m.[25]

Chinese and Vietnamese children who went to the Youth Center after school also attended a Korean ethnic club organized by a former Korean ethnic club, which is now known as the Center for International Exchange for Koreans, Chinese and Vietnamese. Under the framework of international understanding, the center offered activities mainly for Koreans, Chinese, and Vietnamese, i.e., ethnic minority children, at the time of my research. However, they also assisted schools with ethnic minority children in Aoyama by guiding teachers and sharing information regarding ethnic education. Although the center worked with Japanese teachers, by providing activities catered to ethnic minority children, they were endorsing the separatist version of multicultural education in order to empower ethnic minority

children. In the year 1999-2000, Korean and Chinese children went to the club every Tuesday after school. No Vietnamese children participated in this activity at that time. When I asked the Chinese children what they did at the club, they said, "We eat snacks and play games." Ms. Yamamoto, who was in charge of the Japanese language class for the Chinese children, complained that they could not ask the children to come to the Japanese language class and do assignments on Tuesdays, because the children would reply that they did not want to be late for the club. Ms. Nishi, who was in charge of the Japanese language class for the Vietnamese children, echoed Ms. Yamamoto's complaint when some Vietnamese children started attending the club the following year. The Korean ethnic club in the community aspired to empower ethnic minority youths (those with Korean, Chinese, or Vietnamese backgrounds) by appreciating their ethnic backgrounds and heritage, while the Korean ethnic club in school was for anyone interested in Korean culture to learn about Korean cultural traditions and practices. Therefore, the activities for the "old" minority groups have been replaced by the "new" groups at the same time that these "old" communities experienced major transitions. Accordingly, in the educational arena in Miyako, the issue of identity among old minority groups (Burakumin and resident Koreans) has become a personal choice for each family and individual.

The inactive Dowa education and ethnic education for resident Koreans in Miyako affected the way that teachers dealt with "newcomer" children. Because of their long-held belief that ethnic minority children should be told to be proud of their cultural backgrounds, the teachers applied this idea when dealing with Chinese and Vietnamese children. They perceived "newcomer" children as occupying unprivileged positions in society, similar to other minority groups with which they were familiar, and were thus sympathetic to these students. The teachers' understanding of national guidelines plays out on the local level by raising and nurturing the children's awareness of themselves as members of minority groups in society. Raising ethnic consciousness was the teachers' way of encouraging the children to live vibrantly in Japanese society in spite of their minority status. At the same time, the teachers' reliance on this method reveals the difficulty of being part of an ethnic minority in Japan.

Here, the localization of multicultural education blended the educational tenets of minority education and transformed "newcomers" into members of ethnic minorities in Japan in addition to being foreigners. The association of "newcomers" as ethnic minorities who need to learn the Japanese language further reproduced the notion that the "native speakers" of the Japanese language have to be both Japanese nationals and Japanese ethnic subjects whose parents were Japanese. Although some of these Chinese and Vietnamese "newcomer" children had become Japanese nationals through the naturalization process and spoke the Japanese language with an Osaka dialect as fluently as other children, these

associations created a barrier for the Japanese-speaking non-ethnic-Japanese "newcomer" children that denied them status as "native speakers" of the Japanese language. Furthermore, through teaching non-Japanese "newcomer" children their "mother tongues," the "native speaker" concept was reproduced in the other domain by attaching the "native speaker" status of their assumed "mother tongue" to these children.

4. Responses of the "Newcomer" Children and Parents

What are the responses of the children, of those who took part in ethnic club activities and whose identity was fixed to larger collective ethnic identities? How are they affected by the association of the Japanese language with Japanese nationals and Japanese ethnic subjects, and the reproduction of the "native speaker" concept? Here, their responses are examined in two domains: 1) the responses of the "newcomer" children to the reproduction of the "native speaker" concept for the Japanese language - how they experienced the attachment of the "native speaker" status of the Japanese language to the Japanese ethnic background (despite their fluency in the Japanese language); and 2) the responses of the "newcomer" children to the reproduction of the "native speaker" concept for their assumed "mother tongue" – how they reacted to the attachment of the "native speaker" status of their "mother tongues" to their ethnic backgrounds in order to nurture their ethnic identities.

4.1. "Newcomer" Children in the Reproduction of the "Native Speaker" Concept of the Japanese Language

As previously discussed, at Miyako Elementary School, Chinese and Vietnamese "newcomer" children whose parents were non-Japanese immigrants were automatically enrolled in the Japanese language classes on entering school. Since many of the Vietnamese children who were born and raised in Japan were fluent in the spoken Japanese language, the purpose of the Japanese language class for the Vietnamese children was adjusted to their needs in order to assist them with their homeroom lessons rather than to teach the language as their second language.

The following conversation took place in the Japanese language class for the Vietnamese in June 1999. After practicing a Vietnamese song, *"Con chó" (Dog)*, using a handout that came with a Japanese reading (*furigana*) of the Vietnamese verse, the Japanese language instructor asked the children, "Why do you come to Japanese language class?" [26]

Second grade boy: "To study. I only understand a little."

Second grade boy: "Because we have to study hard."

Second grade girl: "To learn things that I do not understand, and to learn *kanji* (Chinese characters) and to take tests."

Second grade girl: "To learn the Japanese language and *kanji*, and about Japanese people."

Second grade boy: "To enjoy studying."

Instructor: "Are you enjoying it?"

The same second grade boy: "Sometimes. . . . "

Fourth grade boy: "Because I don't understand Japanese enough."

Third grade girl: "To learn Japanese words."

Third grade girl: "To learn the materials not covered in homeroom"

Third grade boy: "To learn about Vietnam and Vietnamese play."

Third grade girl: "To be smart."

Fourth grade boy: "Because I cannot understand [the homeroom lessons]. That's why I use a dictionary."

Instructor: "All of you speak and understand Japanese really well, right?" (*minna nihongo umaiyone*.)

Sixth grade girl: "[It is because] I was born in Japan. Japanese language class is not fun, but I can understand [the lessons] better."

Instructor: "It is not always fun, right? You must want to go out and play [with your friends], too."

Sixth grade boy: "When I was a first or second-grader, it was fun. I cannot

understand some Japanese. Especially difficult words [and phrases]."

Fifth grade boy: "I understand every Japanese word and Japanese things."

Fourth grade boy: "The teacher when I was a first or second-grader made us write compositions (*sakubun*) on Mondays and [let us] play (*asobi*) on Thursdays. She repeated the same activities again and again. But now, Ms. Nishi [teacher in charge of the Japanese language class for the Vietnamese children] makes us study all the time."

Sixth grade girl: "I do not like worksheets."

Instructor: "How about compositions? You are good at it."

Sixth grade girl: "Compositions are OK."

As seen from the Vietnamese children's responses, they were attending the Japanese language class to learn and review the homeroom lessons rather than to learn the Japanese language per se. All the responses were in fluent Japanese. Because the teacher in charge of this class was enthusiastic about assisting them with their schoolwork, except for a few students who needed to learn the Japanese language (one in 1998-1999, two in 1999-2000), this class was used as a setting for supplementary lessons.

Although the Vietnamese children were fluent in the spoken Japanese, the children were referred to as "semi-linguals," those who are fluent in more than one spoken language but have not acquired sufficient writing skills in any language. Compared with other places with foreign children, teachers in my field site had a critical awareness that competency in speech does not equate academic literacy, due to their attendance of teachers' workshops and associations for the education of foreign children. For example, when a sixth grade teacher showed me compositions written by Vietnamese children and a Japanese child for comparison, she described the writings of the former as "just reporting what had happened, without any reflection" and the latter as displaying an adequate level of reflection for a sixth-grader. From this statement, I take the classification of "semi-lingual" as indicating empirical and concrete, but not reflective, thought. Bernstein's (1977) conceptualization of the "elaborate code" of middle-class children that orients them toward universalistic meanings, and the "restricted code" of

working-class children that orients and sensitizes them to particularistic meanings, can be applied to these children. That is, differences between the children's mode of articulation could be attributed to their family class backgrounds (Bernstein 1977: 477). Yet Bernstein's approach has been critiqued as a cultural deficit explanation for arguing that aspects of the culture and environment experienced by the poor lead to deficiencies, including the limitation with their speech (Jacob and Jordan 1996: 5). However, the Japanese teachers reduced these differences to the "newcomer" children's having two languages, and to their being in a "semi-lingual" state, without considering other factors such as their interaction with their parents at home or class backgrounds. "Newcomer" children, including some who were labeled as "semi-linguals," are told to maintain their ethnic identities and their assumed "mother tongues" in my field site. The perception to link "native speaker" status with an individual's ethnic background is therefore at work in this domain.

4.2. "Newcomer" Children in the Reproduction of the "Native Speaker" Concept of the Presumed "Mother Tongues"

As for the second domain, the story of a first grade girl, who was the grandchild of a war-displaced Japanese orphan in China, illustrates a paradox in the educational goal of maintaining one's native language.

> "Miyo, you have to learn Chinese because you are Chinese," said a teacher. The first grade girl answered, "I was born in Japan and I am Japanese." "Isn't your father Chinese?" asked the teacher. "No. He is also Japanese." The teacher asked her again, "Then, how about your grandmother?" The girl said, "She is Japanese. That is why all of my family were able to come to Japan."[27]

This dialogue shows the difference between the teacher's and Miyo's interpretations of being Japanese or Chinese, as well as the teacher's assumption about the girl and her family. Miyo, a first grade girl, considered herself Japanese because she was born in Japan, the only country she had ever known. Moreover, her parents were naturalized as Japanese citizens after migrating to Japan, which makes them Japanese as well. Her grandmother had gone to China from Japan during the war, and because of her status as a war-displaced Japanese orphan, she had been able to return to Japan with her family. Miyo understood her family history in this way. However, the Japanese teacher assumed that they must be Chinese nationals and speak Chinese at home, since they were from China. The teacher encouraged Miyo not to forget the Chinese language in order to maintain her "Chinese" identity.

I visited several elementary schools in the city that offered after-school Japanese classes for foreign children. In addition to regular Japanese language instruction, schools usually allotted an hour

each week to foreign language instruction, so that "newcomer" children could maintain their "native language" abilities. In these classrooms, simple Chinese/Vietnamese words (such as the names of things and numbers) were taught to the children with the assistance of a native speaker. For teachers, children who were related to Chinese people were considered Chinese, even though some had become Japanese through naturalization. From Miyo's story, we can assume that she was told by her family that she is Japanese.

On another occasion, when I was talking with Kim, a second grade Vietnamese girl, in her homeroom during a lunch break, Ms. Fukui came up to us and asked the girl how she was doing. Kim replied, "Yes, I am doing well." The teacher then said with a smile, "What is 'hello' in Vietnamese?" The teacher was being friendly and wanted to chat. The girl, however, looked outside the window and said, "I do not know." Since her classroom said "good morning" and "good-bye" everyday in Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese, and since "good morning" and "hello" are the same in Vietnamese, everyone in her classroom knew the answer. Any child in Kim's homeroom could have answered that question. Moreover Kim was familiar with Vietnamese words and phrases from her Vietnamese ethnic club activities. It is not possible that her silence arose out of ignorance. She simply did not want to be singled out because of her different ethnic background. Ms. Fukui wanted to show her appreciation of Kim's culture, assuming that Kim communicated with her siblings and parents in Vietnamese. But like most of the Vietnamese children at Miyako, she understood her parents' Vietnamese, but she did not speak Vietnamese at home.

Even within the classroom of the Japanese language class, Chinese children hesitated to introduce themselves in Chinese. Ms. Yamamoto, their Japanese language teacher, suddenly asked them one day to introduce themselves in Chinese to a sixth grade Chinese girl, Fei, who had just transferred from another school. Ms. Yamamoto usually placed greater emphasis on improving the students' Japanese than on maintaining their "mother tongue," and the children were surprised by her request. Before introducing herself in Chinese, Fei confirmed Ms. Yamamoto's request. "In Chinese?" she asked in fluent Japanese, as if she was not expecting to speak the language at school. She introduced herself in Chinese, saying, "My name is Fei. I came from Seta Elementary School. I am from Heilongjiang." It was then the other children's turn to introduce themselves in Chinese, and they proceeded in order from first to sixth-graders. Keiko, a first grade girl sitting in the front row on the left end of the classroom, was called on. She stood up but kept silent. Then, Wei, a second grade girl sitting next to Keiko, was asked to introduce herself in Chinese, but she, too, just stood up without saying anything. Ms. Yamamoto called each child's name one by one. After Wan, Kei stood up, and then Tomoko, Naoko, and so on. Within a minute, seven children in the first and second rows were standing. "Don't you speak Chinese?" said Ms. Yamamoto.

Tomoko replied, "It's because I do not want to [speak Chinese] at school." "What don't you want to do at school?" asked Ms. Yamamoto. After a few seconds of silence, Toshi, a third grade boy, who was the next in line to introduce himself, stood up and said, "I am I-Chung Wang," in Chinese. After Toshi, other children introduced themselves in Chinese, including those who had earlier stood up before and remained silent.[28] This shows the contextual nature of ethnicity, despite Japanese teachers' attempts to draw awareness to the children's ethnicity at all times. Although the children had initially been reluctant to express their Chinese-ness, Toshi's introduction in Chinese opened a space for other children to associate themselves with their ethnic background in their Japanese school.

In both cases, teachers associated these episodes with children's shyness, without considering other possibilities. When a Vietnamese boy, who can speak both Vietnamese and Japanese, was asked to translate for a new Vietnamese boy who did not speak Japanese, the two boys whispered in each other's ears as if they were sharing secrets. Vietnamese and Chinese children joined in unison with their Japanese classmates to say "good morning" in their "mother tongue," but with a Japanese accent (*shin-cha-o* and *ni-ha-o*). Speaking their "mother tongue" at school, the way that some of them did at home, was unnatural for them and something they preferred not to do. For immigrant children, the greetings in Chinese and Vietnamese in their homeroom class were simply a part of the everyday routine at Japanese school, and were understood as Japanese cultural practices.

Despite the educational practices of telling these children to cherish their ethnically-distinctive names and be proud of themselves as Chinese or Vietnamese, their reactions to these dogmatic messages are far more complex than educators expect. The situation is made even more complicated by their home and community environments, as well as the way their parents and other adults are perceived in the community and by Japanese in general.

Talking with the Chinese and Vietnamese adults, youths, and children, I sensed that they were caught in a dilemma between their eagerness to become like Japanese and the resentment of being excluded from society. As a result, some say they want their children to become Japanese. Others have come to strongly identify themselves as foreign residents, like Bao Lai, a Vietnamese male in his twenties at the time of the interview who came to Japan as a child, was naturalized, but rediscovered himself as Vietnamese after a stay in southern California.

As for the issues of name and nationality, several Chinese and Vietnamese, who were naturalized or who were considering obtaining Japanese citizenship, were using Japanese names for convenience. Raised by these adults, the issues of their native languages and ethnically-distinctive names for Chinese and Vietnamese children are more complex than what teachers believe. Children come to prefer Japanese

names when they want to assimilate into Japanese society and avoid any ethnic markers. They also grow up imagining themselves living in Japan, not (back) in China or Vietnam. Most of the Vietnamese children in my field site regarded Vietnam as their parents' country, and not necessarily theirs. Using Japanese names is discouraged by the local ideology of minority education (i.e., by Korean ethnic education), and even Vietnamese who were born in Japan are encouraged to live as Vietnamese. This is because teachers are aware of the manner in which Japanese society excludes foreigners and want these children to be strong enough to overcome discrimination in society. Everything is done out of good will. However, in reality, only a few individuals are able to gain strength by identifying themselves as an ethnic minority, the way teachers expect, and this process is challenging, as shown by the cases of resident Koreans and Burakumin. Their realities are more diverse than teachers can imagine.

The categorization of foreigners and ethnic minorities as such vis-à-vis the Japanese based on their ethnic backgrounds is still powerful enough in Japan that it is difficult for many Japanese to even question this categorization and to accept a fluid concept of ethnic identity. Thus, although the student body is complex, teachers at Miyako refer to the children of Chinese and Vietnamese immigrants as "Chinese" and "Vietnamese," disregarding whether they were born in Japan or naturalized to become legally Japanese.

As demonstrated by the cases of "newcomer" children, such as the second grade girl who was reluctant to be singled out as a Vietnamese and the Chinese children who hesitated to introduce themselves in Chinese during the Japanese language class, ethnic identities do not necessarily match with ethnic backgrounds. The episode of the Chinese children, who had initially been unwilling to express their Chinese-ness but who began introducing themselves in the Chinese language after one student's bravery, illustrates the contextual nature of ethnic identity. Identities are formed by introducing an individual's cultural capital, not one's ethnic or cultural background, into a local space that is socially, historically, and culturally created by macro-structural forces. Thus, those living in multiple cultures eventually experience in-betweenness, similar to the process of globalization. Those who form an identity that crosses boundaries of ethnicity challenge the division between Japanese and ethnic minorities, which is still maintained rigidly in Japanese society. One device of this mechanism for maintaining ethnic boundaries is minority education, supported by Japanese teachers who encourage ethnic minority children to retain their ethnic identities. This expectation results paradoxically in an ethnic minority's assimilation into Japanese culture by not providing support for them to express their backgrounds in a safe environment, or in marginalization for those who want to assimilate, including those who choose to

remain as in-between subjects. This maintains Japanese society as monocultural, for ethnic minorities are not considered to have hybrid or in-between identities.

The process of reaching the in-between state also varies. Nhu and Diep, two sisters in their teens and early twenties who I interviewed, regard themselves as "Vietnamese residents in Japan." They are praised by Japanese educators as models for "newcomer" children, for they have retained their ethnic identity without assimilating to Japanese culture. Despite this identification, they may share a sentiment with Kim-Ly, another Vietnamese woman in her early twenties, who described herself as "a strange Japanese." The experiences of 1.5-generation Vietnamese youths in their teens and twenties, who were born in Vietnam and moved to Japan in their elementary school days, demonstrate that their perceptions of Japanese society and their conceptions of themselves change through their experiences. The manner in which they survived critical moments in their lives and whether or not they felt they were being supported by others affected their views in either a negative or positive way (see Okubo 2005 for details). These 1.5-generation Vietnamese may create an alternative way of relating to Vietnam and Japan, which will ultimately influence their ethnic identity in the future. For instance, Kim-Ly, the 1.5-generation Vietnamese woman described above, began showing more interest in Vietnamese culture after reconciling with her family. Later, I learned from the Japanese teacher who had introduced her to me that she had started learning the Vietnamese language. She may have discovered a tie with her Vietnamese heritage and now describe herself as "a strange Vietnamese." These young adults are in the process of weaving their identities (Morris-Suzuki 1996; Holland and Lave 2001).

In addition to the diversity and in-betweenness of the Chinese and Vietnamese communities, we should not forget that the issue of identity among old minority groups (Buraku and resident Koreans) has become a personal choice for each family and individual, although with structural constraints, independent of school and community encouragement. As a result, not many are coming out. The manner in which one regards oneself transforms according to one's life's trajectory and relationship with the social world, which is also shaped by changing life circumstances. Considering this elusive nature of identity, it becomes important to secure a space for each individual to decide how s/he wants to be regarded. However, as seen in the previous section, Japanese schools and society have yet to provide this space for "newcomers." Appreciating individual backgrounds leads to the creation of a multicultural society; however, as ethnic categories are situated within an ethnic hierarchy and as the boundary between the Japanese and ethnic minorities is rigid, multiplicity of ethnic backgrounds cannot constitute "multiculturalism" in Japan. The issues of diversity and social inequality need to be examined together.

As discussed in this paper, language is used as a way to articulate how each individual identifies him/herself or how s/he is expected to identity him/herself.

5. Conclusion

I have discussed the localization process of U.S.-style multicultural education in Osaka under the influence of the localized discourse and practice of minority education that construct minorities vis-à-vis the dominant, educational practices at school and in the community for Chinese and Vietnamese children, and their responses to the educational programs for "newcomer" children. Many of these children are fluent in the Japanese language yet registered in the Japanese language classes. This results in the reproduction of the "native speaker" concept that associates the native language with immigrant children's ethnic backgrounds. As discussed earlier, the association of ethnicity and native speaker-ness occurred at my field site as a result of the local interpretation of the national policy of teaching the Japanese language to foreign students who are in need of language instruction. Furthermore, the reinforcement of "native speaker" status with an individual's ethnic background is achieved by teaching the Vietnamese language to Vietnamese children with the goal of nurturing their Vietnamese ethnic identity. Although there are differences between how the Japanese language classes and ethnic club activities were organized, the teachers and instructors in my field site believe in the educational discourse that "newcomer" children need to be dealt with and taught as "ethnic minorities." This stood in sharp contrast to the more established minority groups whose educational practices were disappearing in the school community.

More than respecting children's cultural backgrounds, we can here observe the power of the institutions to impose ethnic categories even on those born in Japan and to tell them to live as Vietnamese and Chinese in Japan. Raising the "ethnic identity" of "newcomer" children plays an important role at the school in my field site; however, despite the arguments of three teachers, who were against focusing on the ethnic identities of children discussed in this paper, most teachers do not question its importance, nor do they have any interest in exploring the meaning of the concept. It is disconcerting that many of them, both in the community and at school, believe the voice of authority without any critical consideration of the context of official discourse. Therefore, I argue that ethnic education in Osaka has a certain ideological power at school, and that ideology is put forward when dealing with children rather than the importance, meaning, or context of official discourse that goes undiscussed by many teachers. There, the

localized ideology of ethnic education predominated to the detriment of a deeper understanding of the individual child's condition. Even though the three phrases mentioned previously (not to speak only Japanese but speak both Japanese and Vietnamese, to be proud of yourself as Vietnamese in Japan, to use your real ethnically distinctive name) were generated as a form of encouragement, we need to examine individual and long-term effects of this treatment on children.

The localization of a popularized version of a U.S.-style multicultural education has given these children their ethnic identity and native language to a certain extent, but they have been deprived of the option to live like other Japanese do, or to carve out an identity that allows them to live somewhere between the Japanese and Vietnamese or Chinese cultures. They are treated and marked as foreigners, who are perceived negatively in Japan - especially when they are from less economically developed countries. As Morris-Suzuki argues, these new categories of ethnic minorities are placed alongside "mainstream Japanese" culture without recognizing the differences which exist within the category of "Japanese," and thus produce "minorities" in relation to a "majority" (Morris-Suzuki 1998: 208-209). Moreover, the ideal way of life for "newcomers" created by school and educators does not necessarily reflect students' perception of themselves and their lives, but instead the Japanese representation of them and their lives. Despite the national policy recommending language instruction for foreign nationals (based on legal citizenship) who are in need of language assistance, the tendency to distinguish non-Japanese ethnic subjects persists in local school communities, reflecting the Japanese tendency to exclude non-Japanese ethnic subjects from the Japanese. Due to the influence of minority education in Miyako, teachers want "newcomer" children to keep their native languages in order to maintain and cherish their ethnic backgrounds; however, this perception results in reproducing the concept of "native speakers" of the Japanese language as those who are Japanese ethnic subjects, and the concept of "native speakers" of non-Japanese languages as those who are not Japanese ethnic subjects. Where do an increasing number of Japan-born "newcomer" children fit in this scheme? The localization of U.S. multicultural education based on the tradition of minority education in Miyako, Osaka, further strengthens the tie between the "native speaker" status and the language that is regarded to be one's "mother tongue." As the number of the in-between subjects increases due to the recent increase in globalization, this association needs to be re-examined in order to de-stabilize the dichotomy that exists between "native" and "non-native," "majority" and "minority," and "national" and "ethnic." Language as discussed in this paper is used as a way to articulate the tensions and conflicts involved in these identification processes, and thus the transformation and reproduction of the "native speaker" concept in Japan.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful for the participants in my study who shared their experiences with me during my fieldwork. I would also like to thank Neriko Doerr, Michiyo Takato, Anne Whiteside for commenting on earlier versions of this paper.

Notes

1. Since I am aware that multicultural education in the U.S. is diverse, a U.S.-style multicultural education throughout this paper means "a popularized version of U.S.-style multicultural education."

2. The concepts of "critical multiculturalism" and "difference multiculturalism" are discussed in Turner (1993). He also adds another dimension, "a license for political and intellectual separatism" as a characteristic of the latter (Turner 1993: 414). For more discussion on the conceptual differences of the notion of "culture" by multiculturalists and anthropologists, see Turner (1993) and Eller (1997). For the genealogies and different kinds of multiculturalism, see Goldberg (1994). According to Kincheloe (2002), a scholar in critical pedagogy, the notion of "transformative" multiculturalism examines the construction of consciousness, oppositional identities of the marginalized, whiteness or the majoritiness, and the power of difference. Thus, "transformative" multiculturalism in critical pedagogy is multi-dimensional and links epistemology with power dynamics. From this perspective, the local traditional minority education discussed in this paper does not have a "transformative" edge in empowering minority students.

3. According to Banks (1995), the "transformative approach" to multicultural curriculum reform demands a fundamental change that enables students to view society from the perspectives of diverse ethnic and cultural groups. This is the third level of curriculum reform, following the "contribution approach" or a "heroes and holidays approach to multiculturalism" (Korn 2002) and the "additive" approach to the curriculum that merely adds new materials to the existing curriculum without changing its structure. The last level, the "action approach" to multicultural curriculum reform, encourages student empowerment and social action (Banks 1995: 13). In my field site, the approaches to multicultural education and to the local minority education take an "additive" approach to the curriculum, although their stated goal of taking social action to empower minority students resonates with Banks' "action approach" to multicultural curriculum reform and other examples of "transformative" multiculturalism. However, the approach to and the effects of the localized multicultural education and the local traditional minority education are more limited than Kincheloe's (2002) "transformative" multiculturalism. The education programs do not change the structure of the curriculum and school, do not involve all students, and do not exemplify an understanding of the "power of difference" and "difference that nurtures a sense of empathy" (Kincheloe 2002: xxii-xxiii).

4. Some areas had a higher percentage of foreign residents (Osaka 2.36%; Kyoto 2.09%; Tokyo 2.22%).

5. According to the author's web search in 2008, the Ministry of Education further defines these children as "those who are not able to speak conversational Japanese adequately, and those who are in need of Japanese language instruction for lacking a language for learning (*gakushū gengo*) at their grade levels and for having difficulty in participating in learning (*gakushū katsudō*) despite their fluency in conversational Japanese" (Ministry of Education 2008). Even with these clarifications, the

Ministry's focus, as reflected in their policies, is still on language, as Ota (2000) rightly argued. The total number of these foreign children and students in public schools in 2006, from primary to senior high schools and schools for the physically and mentally challenged, was 22,413. Approximately 70% of these children were in primary schools. The speakers of Portuguese, Chinese and Spanish totaled more than 70%. http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/19/08/07062955.htm [accessed on 6/3/2008]

6. *Kikoku·gaikokujin jidō seito kyōiku tō ni kanshite Monbukagakushō ga okonatteiru shisaku ni kansuru jōhō* [Information regarding Ministry of Education's policies for the education and others for returnee and foreign students]. http:// www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/clarinet/003/001.htm [accesed on 6/3/2008]

7. The government's policy was to have full-time or supplementary Japanese schools abroad where children living overseas could study Japanese and attend courses based on Japanese curricula, to finance returnee schools (*ukeirekō*), and to create the special university entrance network (*tokubetsu waku*). The Ministry of Education gave five hundred million yen to each ICU, Gyosei, and Doshisha, three *ukeirekō*, in 1978, 1979, and 1980, respectively (Goodman 1990: 157). The number of Japanese children overseas was reported to be 251,000 in 1988 (Goodman 1990: 25, 10-50).

8. Following the agreement between Japan and Korea regarding the third-generation Korean residents (*Nikkan Sansei Kyōgi*), signed by foreign ministers in each country in January 1991, Japan's Ministry of Education issued the following "notice" (*tsūchi*): 1) do not restrict the opportunity to learn the Korean language and culture that is provided after school, 2) issue guidance about entering Japanese schools to Korean resident parents, and 3) follow the treatment for Korean residents for other foreigners. Ota (2000) says this notice confirmed the notice issued in 1965 that there should be no special treatment for foreigners within regular educational curricula (Ota 2000: 145-146).

9. From Osaka Prefecture Resource Council for Education of Foreign Children in Japan (1996).

10. From the Japanese translation of Cordeiro, Martinez, and Reagan's *Multiculturalism and TQE: Addressing Cultural Diversity in Schools* (1994) published in 2003.

11. The national plan of action for the UN decade for human rights education was announced in December 1996 (midterm) and July 1997. There was also an impact on the policy change from the liberation movement (the civil rights movement for Burakumin), behind the scenes of the transition from education for Burakumin to human rights education.

12. The council is organized by Korean activists and teachers concerned with education for ethnic Koreans in public schools.

13. Some have married Japanese nationals or been naturalized as Japanese nationals using Japanese names.

14. Enoi (1997) further explains that "symbiosis" "constitutes society with a more positive engagement."

15. They encourage resident Korean children who are struggling with/hiding their identities as Koreans to come out, rather than accepting them as Japanese, an alternative which may be more comfortable for some.

16. Some of the ideas in this section also appear in my chapter ["Newcomers" in Public Education: Chinese and Vietnamese Children in a Buraku Community] in *Multiculturalism in the New Japan*, N. Graburn, J. Ertl and R. K. Tierney (eds.) Berghahn, 2008.

17. Because of this demography, the school is assigned by the city as a school for promoting Dowa Education, "education for solving problems caused by Buraku discrimination," and given additional teachers and special financial aid (Hirasawa, Nabeshima, and Mori 1995: 2). The school also receives additional teachers and financial aid for enrolling foreign children and children with disabilities. Moreover, in the academic years of 1998 to 2000, the school was designated as the Center School (*senntaakō*) of the Area for the Promotion of Educating and Receiving the Foreign Children (*Gaikokujin Shijo Kyōiku Ukeire Suishin Chiiki*) by the Ministry of Education, owing to the increase of the number of Vietnamese children in the area. This area consisted of two junior high schools districts, in which were three elementary schools and two junior high schools.

18. Following the school's categorization schemes, in this paper, I will refer to the children whose parents are from China and Vietnam, as Chinese and Vietnamese children respectively, including those who were naturalized and those who were born in Japan.

19. As explained earlier, Japanese citizenship is based on descent. A father who immigrated from China and was naturalized in Japan told me that all his family members became Japanese through naturalization, but he seemed to be accepting of the fact that his daughter was referred to as Chinese at school. At the time of my research, only one Vietnamese first grade boy, a Vietnamese national born in Japan, said that his father told him that he was Japanese because he had been born in Japan.

20. The tradition of ethnic clubs goes back to Korean ethnic clubs in the community and school, which started in 1974 and in the early 1980s, respectively. The ethnic clubs for Vietnamese and Chinese children were overseen by Japanese teachers, with the assistance of Vietnamese and Chinese instructors hired by the city education board. As for the Vietnamese ethnic club, a resident Korean instructor came from the Korean ethnic club in the community, as they had experience in ethnic education. On the ethnic club activity day, another resident Korean instructor also came from the community to lead the ethnic club for Koreans at school.

21. Other than a few phrases like "*xin chào*" (hello) and "*cám ơn*" (thank you), all the lines were in Japanese. The play was based on the Vietnamese fable, "Luck Loan Quan and Au Ko," (two heros for nation-building in Vietnam) and it explained how the country was founded.

22. The fifth- and sixth-graders recited the Chinese poetry, while the first- and second-graders showed the written script to the audience.

23. http://www.rhq.gr.jp/nanmin/05/03_12.html (accessed on 4/22/2002)

24. For example, the class fees were 100 to 2000 yen (about 94 cents to US$18.00) per class per month, depending on the activity. According to the author's web search in 2008, a private English school in Japan which offers an English class once or twice a week (100 minutes a week in total) charges 9450 yen (about US$90.00), excluding the annual material fee of 28800 yen (about US$270.00) and admission fee of 5250 yen (about US$50.00).
http://www.eccjr.co.jp/course/eikaiwa/slp/slp_eigo_elem.html (accessed on 7/12/2008)

25. The daycare room at school charged a monthly fee of 300 yen (about US$2.80) for snacks. Children would go there after class, do homework first, and play until 5:00 p.m. On the other hand, the Youth Center was free and had another set of activities, in addition to serving as a place to study. Cultural and sports activities were available for children from first to third grades. Most of the cultural classes offered on weekdays were for students above the fourth grade. As for Chinese and Vietnamese children, one Chinese boy, one Chinese girl and two Vietnamese girls were enrolled in the daycare room at school, while the other children went to the Youth Center. Children in this area were fully engaged with activities from morning until evening.

26. Since the teacher in charge of the Japanese language class was absent, the Japanese language instructor led the class that day.

27. This story was shared by a community language instructor and was not based on my observations during my fieldwork. The instructor was critical of Japanese teachers who encouraged Chinese children to learn the Chinese language despite the fact that some of them did not speak the language or even identify themselves as Chinese.

28. Most of the Chinese children used their Japanese names at school, even during ethnic club activities. Ms. Yamamoto did not ask them to use their Chinese names as the Japanese language teacher in charge of Vietnamese children did when she organized ethnic club activities. As seen from Toshi's introduction, when he introduced himself in Chinese, he gave his Chinese name. Other children followed his example and gave their Chinese names when they introduced themselves in Chinese.

References

Aoki, Eriko

2000 Korean Children, Textbooks, and Educational Practices in Japanese Primary Schools. In *Koreans in Japan: Critical Voices from the Margin*. Sonia Ryang (ed.), 157-174. London/New York: Routledge.

Aoyama-shi Miyako Chūgakkō Miyako Shōgakkō

1999 *Heisei 10-11-nendo Gaikokujin Shijo Ukeire-suishin Chiiki Shitei Jigyō Monbushō Shisatsu Shiryō* (Materials prepared for the visit of the Ministry of Education to the Area for the Promotion of Educating and Receiving the Foreign Children in 1998-1999).

Banks, James

1995 Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice. In *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*. James Banks and Cherry A. McGee Banks (eds.), 3-24. New York: Macmillan. Originally published in 1993 in *Review of Research in Education* 19, Linda Darling-Hammond (ed.), 3-49. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

1999 *Nyūmon Tabunka Kyōiku: Atarashii Jidai no Gakkōzukuri* [An Introduction to Multicultural Education: Restructuring Schools in the New Era].Tokyo: Akashi Shoten.

Bernstein, Basil
1977 Social Class, Language and Socialisation. In *Power and Ideology in Education*. Jerome Karabel and A. H. Halsey (eds.), 473-486. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ekstand, Lars Henric
1994 Multicultural Education. In *International Encyclopedia of Education*. Torsten Husen and T. Neville Postlethwaite (eds.), 3960-3970. Oxford/New York: Pergamon Press.

Eldering, Lotty
1996 Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education in an International Perspective. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 27(3): 315-330.

Eller, Jack David
1997 Anti-Anti-Multiculturalism. *American Anthropologist* 99 (2): 249-260.

Enoi, Yukari
1997 Gakkō deno Tabunka Kyōsei Kyōiku no Kanōsei ni tsuite [On the Possibility of Multicultural Education at School]. In Aoyama-shi Zainichi Gaikokujin Kyōiku Kenkyūkai Jigyō Hōkoku 1997-nendo, vol.6.

Garrett, Paul B. and Patricia Baquedano-López
2002 Language Socialization: Reproduction and Continuity, Transformation and Change. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 339-361.

Goldberg, David Theo
1994 Introduction: Multicultural Conditions. In *Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader*. David Theo Goldberg (ed.), 1-41. Oxford, U.K. and Cambridge, U.S.A.: Blackwell.

Goodman, Roger
1990 *Japan's 'International Youth': The Emergence of a New Class of Schoolchildren*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hatsuse, Ryuhei (ed.)
1985/87 *Uchi naru Kokusaika: Zōho Kaiteiban* [The Internationalization Within: A Revised and Enlarged Edition]. Tokyo: Sanryo Shobo.

Hester, Jeffry
2000 Kids between Nations: Ethnic Classes in the Construction of Korean Identities in Japanese Public Schools. In *Koreans in Japan: Critical Voices from the Margin*. Sonia Ryang (ed.), 175-196. London/New York: Routledge.

Hirasawa, Yasumasa
1990 Tabunka Kyōiku to Gakkō Bunka [Multicultural Education and School Culture]. In *Gakkō Bunka: Shinsō e no Paasupekutibu* [School Culture: Perspectives to its Underlying Stratum]. Akio Nagao and Hiroshi Ikeda (eds.), 171-192. Tokyo: Toshindo.

1993 Tabunka Kyōiku no Rinen to Jirenma [Ideal and Dilemma of Multicultural Education]. In *Korekara no Kaihō Kyōiku: Gakuryoku Hoshō to Karikyuramu Sōzō* [Education for Liberation From Now On: Guaranteeing Academic Ability and Creating Curriculum]. Buraku Kaiho Kenkyusho (ed.), 229-254. Osaka: Kaiho Shuppansha.

1994 *Amerika no Tabunka Kyōiku ni Manabu* [Learning from U.S. Multicultural Education]. Tokyo: Meiji Tosho.

Hirasawa, Yasumasa, Yoshiro Nabeshima, and Minoru Mori
1995 *Dowa Education: Educational Challenge Toward a Discrimination-Free Japan.* Osaka: Buraku Kaiho Kenkyusho (Buraku Liberation Research Institute).

Holland, Dorothy and Jean Lave
2000 History in Person: An Introduction. In *History in Person: Enduring Struggles, Contentious Practice, Intimate Identities.* Dorothy Holland and Jean Lave (eds.), 3-33. Santa Fe, New Mexico: School of American Research Press.

Jacob, Evelyn, and Cathie Jordan
1996 Understanding Minority Education: Framing the Issues. In *Minority Education: Anthropological Perspectives.* Evelyn Jacob and Cathie Jordan (eds.), 3-24. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Kincheloe, Joe
2002 Forward: Exploring a Transformative Multiculturalism – Justice in a Zeitgeist of Despair. In *Rethinking Multicultural Education: Case Studies in Cultural Transition.* Carol Korn and Alberto Bursztyn (eds.), ix-xxv. Westport, Connecticut and London: Bergin & Garvin.

Kobayashi, Tetsuya, and Kazukimi Ebuchi (eds.)
1985 *Tabunka Kyōiku no Hikaku Kenkyū* [A Comparative Study of Multi-cultural Education] Fukuoka: Kyushu Daigaku Shuppankai.

Korn, Carol
2000 Introduction: Cultural Transisions and Curricular Transformations. In *Rethinking Multicultural Education: Case Studies in Cultural Transition.* Carol Korn and Alberto Bursztyn (eds.), 1-11. Westport, Connecticut and London: Bergin & Garvin.

Kymlicka, Will
1995 *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Leung, Constant, Roxy Harris and Ben Rampton
1997 Idealized Native Speaker, Reified Ethnicities, and Classroom Realities. *TESOL Quarterly* 31(3): 543-560.

Lie, John
2001 *Multiethnic Japan*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

McKinney, Carolyn and Bonny Norton

2008 Identity in Language and Literacy Education. In *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics.* Bernard Spolsky and Francis M. Hult (eds.), 192-205. Oxford and Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.

Mori, Minoru

1990 Shakaiteki Tachiba no Jikaku to Gakkō: Burakumondai kara no shiten [Awareness of Social Location and Schools: From a Perspective of Buraku Issues]. In *Gakkō Bunka: Shinsō e no Paasupekutibu* [School Culture: A Perspective to its Underlying Stratum]. Akio Nagao and Hiroshi Ikeda (eds.), 193-217. Tokyo: Toshindo.

Morris-Suzuki, Tessa

1996 Bunka, Tayōsei, Demokurashii: Tabunkashugi to Bunkashihon no Gainen ni kakawaru Shōkōsatsu [Culture, Multiplicity, Democracy: A Consideration on the Concepts of Multiculturalism and Cultural Capital]. *Shisō* [Thought] 867: 38-58.

1998 *Re-Inventing Japan: Time, Space, Nation.* New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Motani, Yoko

2002 Towards a More Just Educational Policy for Minorities in Japan: The Case of Korean Ethnic Schools. *Comparative Education* 38(2): 225-237.

Neary, Ian

1997 Burakumin in Contemporary Japan. In *Japan's Minorities: The Illusion of Homogeneity*. Michael Weiner (ed.). 50-78. London and New York: Routledge.

Nukaga, Misako

2003 Japanese Education in an Era of Internationalization: A Case Study of an Emerging Multicultural Coexistence Model. *International Journal of Japanese Sociology* 12(1): 79-94.

Okano, Kaori

2006 The Global-Local Interface in Multicultural Education Policies in Japan. *Comparative Education* 42(4): 473-491.

Okano, Kaori and Motonori Tsuchiya

1999 Education in Contemporary Japan: Inequality and Diversity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Okubo, Yuko

2005 "Visible" Minorities and "Invisible" Minorities: An Ethnographic Study of Multicultural Education and the Production of Ethnic "Others" in Japan. Ph.D. diss., Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley.

2008 "Newcomers" in Public Education: Chinese and Vietnamese Children in a Buraku Community. In *Multiculturalism in the New Japan: Crossing the Boundaries Within.* Nelson Graburn, John Ertl, and R. Kenji Tierney (eds.). 171-187. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Ota, Haruo
2000 *Nyuukamaa no Kodomo to Nihon no Gakkō* [Newcomer Children in Japanese Public Schools]. Tokyo: Kokusaishoin.

Povinelli, Elizabeth
1998 *The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australian Multiculturalism.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Sakai, Naoki
1997 Translation and Subjectivity: On "Japan" and Cultural Nationalism. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sleeter, Catherine E. and Carl A. Grant
1987 Analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review* 57(4): 421-444.

Tsuneyoshi, Ryoko
2004 The 'new' foreigners and the social reconstruction of difference: the cultural diversification of Japanese education. *Comparative Education* 40(1): 55-81.

Turner, Terence
1993 Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What Is Anthropology That Multiculturalists Should Be Mindful of It? *Cultural Anthropology* 8(4): 411-429.

Weiner, Michael (ed.)
1997 Japan's Minorities: Illusion of Homogeneity. London and New York: Routledge.