

## Citizenship Education in an Age of Measurement (1):

How Did the Japanese Educational Researchers Discuss about Educational End(s),  
Evaluation, and Ability?

Shinpei Kuwajima, Akira Yanagibashi, Kotaro Abe

Ryoji Nagai, and Kengo Nishimoto

The University of Tokyo

### Abstract

In order to clarify the Japanese context of evaluation in citizenship education, we will focus on the thoughts of four educational researchers at the post WW2 Japan: Shuichi Katsuta, Toshio Nakauchi, Kaoru Ueda, and Minoru Murai.

Section 1 will argue the potentiality and limitation of educational theory of ability, achievement, and assessment in Katsuta's and Nakauchi's thought. Their arguments aimed at a criticism against meritocracy, and at this point their argument would be a meaningful suggestion even for our age. There is, however, the limitation of their theory and we will refer to a criticism against their argument after 1980s.

Section 2 will refer to Kaoru Ueda's thought on evaluation. For Ueda, evaluation in education is a start point of teaching. He puts importance on the individual. Ueda says that if you cannot conceive the differences [*Zure*], students' changes appeared after teaching, you are not apt at teaching students any more. However, it needs very high-quality teachers, and it would be a weak point of his thought.

Section 3 will introduce Minoru Murai's theory on evaluation in education. What is an educational problem for Murai? It is goodness. For Murai education is making individuals

better. Therefore we should or need to ask what education is for. By this approach, educational bad condition would be reconstructed and get better. At this point, Murai's thought resembles Biesta's arguments.

*Keywords:* The pedagogy at the post WW2 Japan, Reflecting process of teaching, the differences [Zure], Goodness

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this paper is to clarify the Japanese context of citizenship education. For this purpose we will focus on the thoughts of four major educational researchers at the post WW2 Japan: Katsuta Shuich, Nakauchi Toshio, Ueda Kaoru, and Murai Minoru. They were the central figures in the educational research at the post WW2 Japan and they faced the situation of reconstructing education. That situation seems to similar to the recent circumstances on citizenship education: globalization and its influences on changing citizenship.

At the post WW2 Japan, a new curriculum "Social Study" (*Shakaiika*) appeared in order to reconstruct education. For example, Ueda Kaoru who is one of the core members of constructing this new curriculum says "Education is for making children happy. [...] Protecting these things [children's will and character] is the ideal of the Constitution of Japan, the point of democratic education, and the starting point of the Social Study (Ueda, vol. 10, p. 17)." For Ueda the Social Study aimed at "the restoration of humans [*Ningen no kaifuku*] (Ueda, vol. 10, p. 17)." It seems that the restoration of humans had to do with the educational end as the model of humans.

This condition at the post WW2 Japan seems to be similar to the recent conditions of citizenship education. For example, Gert J. J. Biesta argues that we should engage with

the question: “what is education for (Biesta, 2010, p. 26)?” His book indicated that we should inquire the educational values even if we faced to an age of measurement. This would have to do with the model of humans (or citizens) as an educational end.

In this way, we will focus on the four educational researchers at the post WW2 Japan. Katsuta and Ueda engaged in organizing new curriculum (*Shakaika*). Nakauchi is one of the followers of Katsuta and he constructed a new theory of evaluation in education. Murai is one of the contemporaries of Ueda. He wrote a theory on the evaluation of education. We could regard these thoughts as the undeveloped-chances to reorganize the paradigm of evaluation in citizenship education.

## **1. Educational Theories of Ability, Achievement, and Evaluation in “Post-war Pedagogy”**

### **1. 1. Educational Theories of Ability, Achievement, and Evaluation in Katsuta’s and Nakauchi's Thought.**

In his famous article “What is a concept of achievement? (1)” (1962), Shuichi Katsuta provided a concept of “achievement” [*gakuryoku*] in school education. He regarded “achievement” as a measurable thing (Katsuta, 1972, p. 370). However, it does not mean that he intended to exclude un-measurable abilities from the concept of achievement. He aimed at defining achievement as “provisional” one in order to redefine a concept of achievement in practice.

In his main work, *Ability, Development and Learning* (1964), Katsuta categorized human abilities: recognition, response & expression, labor, and mediation capability. For Katsuta, achievement is what children get at schools. Therefore “it is a mistake that school education can develop all human abilities (Katsuta, 1973).”

Toshio Nakauchi is one of the academic followers of Katsuta. In his work, *A theory of achievement and evaluation* (1971), Nakauchi tried to construct the achievement

model as continuously re-creating its standard (Nakauchi, 1971, p. 56). According to Katsuta, he also defined achievement as something “provisional.” For Nakauchi, achievement is the “sharing and conveying something with/ to someone.” At this point we can make educational evaluation possible to improve education (Nakauchi, 1971, p. 56). Nakauchi tried to relate achievement with its evaluation. Achievement is the educational objectives and evaluation is two sides of the same coin (Nakauchi, 1971, p. 135). For Nakauchi, the reflective process of examining on teaching or choosing educational materials guides evaluation of educational achievement. In this way, both of Katsuta and Nakauchi constructed their theory on achievement and its evaluation without sacrificing individuals (pupils, students).

Akirou Takeuchi argued that Katsuta’s educational theory of ability and achievement had the viewpoint of cooperative ability (Takeuchi, 1993). In fact Katsuta said that: “It is true that the individuals get the human ability but its values [are never determined individually, rather its values] lies in making people’s life fruitful and doing something for someone or engaging in social service (Katsuta, 1973, p. 235).”

In this way Katsuta expanded the range of human ability from individuals to social relationship. It shows that he had the sight of cooperative ability. Nakauchi seemed to have the same sight because his theory of evaluation aimed at the reflection of teaching (Nakauchi, 1991, p. 21). Both of Katsuta and Nakauchi tried to construct their theories against meritocracy. However unfortunately it seems that they were misunderstood and their theories were not enough to avoid meritocracy. Their theories have been criticized after 1980s.

## **1. 2. Limitation of Katsuta’s and Nakauchi’s Thought**

*To cooperative education from competitive education* (Takeuchi, 1988) was a typical criticism. This collected papers said that the “people’s rights of education [=

*Kokumin no kyouiku-ken*]” played an important role to prevent the intervention by the government in education. Unfortunately, however, it did not work well after all because people did not admit its meaning (Ikeya *et al.*, 1988, p. 7).

In this point, Akirou Takeuchi’s “cooperation” theory is very important because it argued that “ability” should not be regarded as something attributed to the individual but it is constructed by the social demands and the culture. This theory also aimed at the overcoming of oppressing the individuals (Takeuchi, 1993).

Therefore the argument, which criticized the meritocracy, seemed to criticize the meritocracy without noticing the possibility that, as its nature, the idea of human development could function meritocratically. In other words, they were unaware of the danger that the argument itself could lead to the discrimination or oppression of people (Takeuchi, 2005, p. 125).

Takeuchi’s criticism of the post-war pedagogy pointed out that they had criticized the meritocracy but they had not examined whether their own theory was meritocratic or not. It means that, paradoxically, critical theory for meritocracy actually performed meritocratically. If it did not have the reflective viewpoint, the provisional achievement would invert actually an immobile thing. And the theory of evaluation would become to lay the onus on the individuals.

## **2. The Individual and the Individuals: Kaoru Ueda’s Thought on Evaluation**

### **2. 1. The Individual and the Individuals (The Relation between a Student and the Classroom)**

Kaoru Ueda’s thought on the evaluation in education is premised on the relation between the individual and the individuals: the relation between a student and the

classroom. First, we will look at this relation.

Ueda said that “if the teachers would like to make the students to study willingly, there are the problem with the group [= classroom, in this case] (Ueda, vol. 3, p. 170).” However, it is more important for Ueda “to conceive deliberately the results or outcomes of each children [= students, in this case]’s studying or learning (Ueda, vol. 3, p. 170).”

In this way, it is important for Ueda to make the group or classroom preparing for each child. His theory on evaluation not only focused on each child’s outcomes or results of studying or learning, but also focused on the group (the relation of the individuals).

## **2. 2. Ueda Kaoru’s Theory on Evaluation**

Ueda referred to the evaluation in education, in his book *Unkown Education* [*Shirarezaru kyouiku*] (Ueda, vol. 1, pp. 87-95). He defined the “evaluation is not the ends of learning and teaching, but the starting point of that (Ueda, vol.1, p. 87).” Ueda said that “the evaluation must have an aim, and it is the evaluation that refers to relation between this aim and what students actually learned (Ueda, vol.1, p. 87).”

He emphasized that the evaluation in education should be done continuously and that evaluation should be implemented by teachers (Ueda, vol. 1, pp. 94-95).

## **2. 3. Teachers as High-Professionals: Is it a Weak Point of Ueda’s Theory?**

In that case, how do teachers evaluate each student? -- this question would be a meaningful question. However, Ueda did not refer to how can a teacher evaluate his/ her students, rather he said “teacher must be able to realize naturally the differences between his/ her expectations and what the students actually learned (Ueda, vol. 3, pp. 304-305).”

Ueda emphasized teachers’ talents in such a way. His point is that as a teacher it is natural to know what students actually learned. However, would it need a high-talent to know or to realize such a differences? High-talented teachers, high-professionals may be a weak point of Ueda’s theory on evaluation.

### **3. “Goodness” in Education: Minoru Murai’s Educational Value Theory and Theory of Educational Ends**

Minoru Murai placed the “goodness” at the center of his own philosophy of education. For Murai, human beings are “midway (μεταξύ)”<sup>(1)</sup>, because they have efficient cause to long perpetually for “goodness.”

#### **3. 1. Minoru Murai’s Educational Value Theory: Judgment-based Value Theory**

Murai described the judgment of “goodness” as follows: “Our judgment of ‘goodness’ does not depend on the nature of objects nor on our perceptions and sensations (Murai, 1978, p. 110).” However, “at the same time, our judgment [of ‘goodness’] is related to the operation of intellect or reason that tries to be objective (Murai, 1978, p. 111).”

The fact that our judgment of “goodness” requires objectivity is important. At this point, the judgment of “goodness” differs from the judgment of “pleasure.” For Murai “pleasure” is related to our inner demands and its judgment is always subjective. He insisted that the judgment of “goodness” requires satisfying the demand for “mutuality,” and that “mutuality” is based on the fact that “human beings exist among people (Murai, 1978, p. 116).” Furthermore, in his recent book, *Prepare for and Begin the Study of Education Anew* (2008), Murai also emphasized the demand for “mutuality” in the judgment of “goodness” on communication grounded on intellect and reason.

“In this way, finally, our judgment of ‘goodness’ consists of satisfying these demands for ‘mutuality’, ‘consistency’, ‘utility’ and ‘beauty’ simultaneously (Murai, 1978, p. 136).” Murai pointed out that “human beings have an inner mechanism in which these demands operate structurally (Murai, 1978, p. 130).”

However, the judgment of “goodness” is similar to the judgment of “pleasure” in terms of satisfying demands. The objectivity of the judgment of “goodness” that Murai

explained was not strict; he merely explained that human beings long for objectivity by intellect and reason. However, this has the reason. Murai rejected the strict objectivity of value in order to prevent a person in power (*e.g.* the ruler) from monopolizing values and politics.

### **3. 2. Murai's Theory of Educational Ends**

As mentioned above, Murai's value theory attempted to overcome the monopolization on values and politics. For Murai, all people including children would judge "goodness." Murai mentioned, "if adults who are compelled to be concerned with children are naturally erotic [= philosophical, in this case; long for something good] as human beings who long for 'goodness,' in the same sense, children are also naturally erotic (Murai, 1976, pp. 145-6)."<sup>(2)</sup> Therefore, we must acknowledge that both children and adults have the same nature. Both are so erotic (= philosophical; long for something good) that they are compelled to long for "goodness" and judge "goodness" constantly throughout their lives. These are the preconditions of Murai's theory of educational ends.

According to Murai, educational thoughts leading to educational ends are divided into two types, namely, "result-based" and "process-based (Murai, 1976, p. 173)." He argued that result-based educational thought has so strong affinities with political and religious thought, as to result in the confusion of educational thought with political and religious thought. Therefore "now, we must think of process-based educational thought as intrinsically pure educational thought (Murai, 1976, p. 174)." For Murai, "the basis of educational thought (which can hence be radically distinguished from political and religious thought) is to aspire to children's voluntary learning activities and the vigorous development of children's reason as an endless growth process, and to avoid expecting educational results as to what children should become as much as possible (Murai, 1976, p. 174)."

Murai defined “process-based” educational thought as follows: “through their own spontaneity and the external effects of images of E [= ends] (process-based) as clues that are brought by educators, children come to realize images of a ‘good person’ as their own E (result-based) (Murai, 1976, p. 192).” The educator provides images of a “good person” as clues, by which children create their own images of a “good person.” The images of a “good person” that adults have are images of the process of growth for children. In this way, Children learn images of a “good person” from adults and create their own images of a “good person.” Murai acknowledged that children are constantly judging “goodness” and respected that children create their own images of a “good person,” that is, their own educational results.

### **Conclusions**

Finally, we will try to connect our argument about the four researchers with the Japanese context of citizenship education today.

Shigeo Kodama recently argued that it would be possible to think that the educational results were not attributed to the individuals. For example, citizenship and political culture are almost impossible to be measured in the meritocratic way (Kodama, 2013, p. 131). Therefore, if we described the ability or achievement fostered in citizenship education today, it would be based on the “ignorant citizen” (Kodama, 2013; Biesta, 2011). The ignorant citizen is a key concept of citizenship education today. “The ignorant citizen is the one who, in a sense, refuses this knowledge [required as a “good” citizen] and, through this, refuses to be domesticated, refuses to be pinned down in a pre-determined civic identity (Biesta, 2011, p. 152).”

In this way, the ignorant citizen is a keyword in this field and it suggests a sort of ends of education, which are never predetermined. In this respect, the provisional achievement (Katsuta), evaluation as the reflective process of teaching (Nakauchi), the

difference (Ueda), and the process-based end of education (Murai) would be a hint to consider the new type of citizenship education. We can conclude that their theories have some weak points but they are meaningful to us in an age of globalization. If we learned from their arguments, we would construct a new paradigm of evaluation in the post-Biesta's citizenship education.

#### Notes

This working paper is reproduced from [<http://www.schoolexcellence.p.u-tokyo.ac.jp/cms/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Y-wp06.pdf>].

This research was supported in part by a grant, Youth Scholar Training Program from Center for Excellence in School Education, Graduate School of Education, The University of Tokyo.

- (1) Diotima says “So may we not say that a correct opinion comes midway between knowledge and ignorance (diotima, 1964, p. 35)?” in Plato's Symposium. In the previous quotation, “a correct opinion” means an ancient Greek word, “δόξα.”
- (2) Murai means this word “erotic” as an ancient Greek word, “ἔρως.” Murai associates this word “erotic” with Socrates in Plato's Symposium.

## References

- Biesta, Gert J. J. (2010). *Good Education in an Age of Measurement: Ethics, Politics, Democracy*. Boulder/ London: Paradigm Publisher.
- Biesta, Gert J. J. (2011). The Ignorant Citizens: Mouffe, Rancière, and the Subject of Democratic Education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 30(2), 141-153.
- Ikeya, Yoshio., Goto, Michio., Takeuchi, Akirou., Yoshizaki, Shouji., Nakanishi, Shintaro. (1988). *Kyousou no kyouiku kara kyoudou no kyouiku he.* (To cooperative education from competitive education), Tokyo: Aoki Shoten.
- Katsuta, Shuichi. (1972). *Katsuta Shuichi chosakushuu 6. (Katsuta Shuichi collection 6)*, Tokyo: Kokudoshsha.
- Katsuta, Shuichi. (1973) *Katsuta Shuichi chosakushuu 4. (Katsuta Shuichi collection 4)*, Tokyo: Kokudoshsha.
- Kodama, Shigeo. (2013) *Gakuryoku gensou. (An illusion of competence)*, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Murai, Minoru. (1976). *Kyouikugaku nyuumon. (An introduction to pedagogy)*, (Vol. 1), Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Murai, Minoru. (1978). *“Yosa” no kouzou. (The structure of “goodness”)*, Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Murai, Minoru. (2008). *Shin kyouikugaku koto hajime. (Prepare for and begin the study of education anew)*, Tokyo: Touyoukansyuttupansha.
- Nakauchi, Toshio. (1971). *Gakuryoku to hyouka no riron. (The theory of achievement and evaluation)*, Tokyo: Kokudoshsha.
- Plato (1964). *Symposium and other Dialogues*, London: Dent.
- Takeuchi, Akirou. (1988). The capability of “cooperation” and “utility”. In *Kyousou no kyouiku kara kyoudou no kyouiku he. (To cooperative education from competitive*

*education*), edited by Ikeya Yoshio, Goto Michio, Takeuchi Akirou, Yoshizaki Shouji, Nakanishi Shintaro, Tokyo: Aoki Shoten.

Takeuchi, Akirou. (1993). *Jakusha no tetsugaku. (The Disadvantaged Person's Philosophy)*, Tokyo: Ootsuki Shoten.

Takeuchi, Akirou. (2005). *Inochi no byoudou ron. (The Egalitarianism of Life)*, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Ueda, Kaoru. (1992-1994). *Ueda Kaoru chosaku-shu. (The Collected Works of Ueda Kaoru)*, 15vols, Nagoya: Reimei-shobou. [the original in the Japanese].

- vol. 1: *Shirarezasu kyoudoku: chushou heno teikou. (Unknown Education: Resisting the Abstract)*.
- vol. 3: *Zure niyoru souzou. (Creation Made by the Deference)*.
- vol. 10: *Shakaika to ningen kaifuku. (Social Studies and the Restoration of Humans)*.