

平成27年3月31日

兵庫教育大学長 殿

受入研究者

所属・職 教育実践高度化専攻・准教授

氏名 安藤 福光



外国人研究者短期招へいプログラム研究成果報告書

外国人招へい研究者の研究経過について、下記のとおり報告します。

1. 外国人招へい研究者 氏名 (所属・職・国籍) Markku Antinluoma (ヘルシンキ大学パルメニア研修養成開発センター・プロジェクトマネージャー・フィンランド)
2. 研究課題名 教育長の資質能力開発カリキュラムに関する日本・フィンランドの比較研究 (英訳名) Curriculum Development for Superintendent of the Board of Education “Comparison with Japan and Finland”
3. 期間 平成26年10月11日 ～ 平成26年10月18日 (8日間)
4. 主な研究協力者 氏名 (所属・職・氏名) 日渡円 (教育実践高度化専攻・教授) / 藤本孝治 (教育行政能力育成カリキュラム開発室・教授)

(注) 必ず招へい研究者の作成した Research Report と併せて、招へい期間終了後1か月以内に、提出してください。 (裏面につづく)

5. 滞在中の日程

年月日	訪問先名称・訪問内容（研究討議・講演・視察等）
平成26年	
10月11日	入国、東京へ移動
10月12日	日本教育行政学会（於：東京学芸大学）見学
10月13日	兵庫教育大学教育行政能力育成カリキュラム開発主催シンポジウム （於：東京大学）参加（講師登壇）
10月14日	神戸市教頭2年目研修（於：神戸市総合教育センター）見学
10月15日	学校経営コース院生（P1）、その他院生・学生との懇談（於：本学加東 キャンパス）
10月16日	京都府立堀川高等学校調査
10月17日	京都市立御所南小学校調査
10月18日	帰国

（注）来日日及び離日日を含めて記入してください。

6. 研究討議・研究協力等実施の状況とその成果

来日期間中、マルック氏との間で、日本とフィンランドの教育長養成カリキュラムに限らず、初等中等学校におけるカリキュラム、授業方法、さらには教員養成および採用形態の差異について広く討議を重ねた。本事業の成果の一端はマルック氏のレポートに記されている通りである。同氏との研究協力について、今回の調査訪問を機に、相互交流を重ね、論文投稿につなげていくことで一致した。

7. 外国人招へい研究者事業に対する意見・要望等

今回、本事業を採択してもらい、外国人研究者との調査協力を行えたことは大変良い経験となった。今後も本事業を活用し、諸外国の研究者との共同研究を実施したい。

* Please submit your research report to HUTE through your host researcher within one month after the end of your Fellowship Period in Japan.

To President, HUTE

HUTE SHORT-TERM FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM
FOR RESEARCH IN JAPAN
RESEARCH REPORT
(Cover Page)

Affiliation: University of Helsinki, Finland

Name of the Host Researcher: Yoshimitsu Ando

Fellowship Period: From 11.10.2014 To 18.10.2014

Title of the Research:

Curriculum Development for Superintendent of the Board of Education
"Comparison with Japan and Finland"

Date: 31.3.2015

Your Signature: Markku Antinluoma

* Future Contact Information

(If you wish HUTE to maintain contact with you after the completion of your fellowship)

(Office/Home)

Fax No.: _____

E-mail Address: _____

Address: _____

(It continues on the reverse.)

Fellowship visit to the Hyogo University of Teacher Education
Japan 10.-18.10.2014
Report

Markku Antinluoma
University of Helsinki
City of Porvoo

Content

1. Education systems	3
1.1. Curriculum and special needs education	4
1.2. Books as curriculum.....	5
1.3. Religion	5
1.4. Multiculturalism	6
2. Diverse comparisons.....	6
2.1. Teacher's hours at school.....	6
2.2. Class size	6
2.3. The Finnish assessment system.....	7
2.4. The proportion of female teachers	7
2.5. School Leadership structures	7
2.6. Efficiency rating of teachers	8
3. Reflections about visits	8
3.1. Horikawa Senior High School, Kyoto	8
3.2. Goshominami elementary school, Kyoto	9
3.3. Hyogo University of Teacher Education, Library	9

On 10 March 2014 Hyogo University of Teacher Education, The Department of Teacher Education at the Helsinki University and Palmenia Centre for Continuing Education at the University of Helsinki signed a cooperation agreement. In consequence of this HUTE invited the writer of this report to a fellowship visit to Japan 10.-18.10.2014. The writer had the opportunity to visit educational institutions and present the Finnish education system, educational leadership and in-service training of superintendents and principals. This report explores the Japanese education system and is concerned with certain aspects of the educational system. This study focuses on comparison between the Japanese and the Finnish education systems and practice. The approaches used are international, integrated and descriptive. Some perceptions are based on writer's observations under the short visits to Goshominami elementary school and Horikawa Senior High School. Both schools represent high-quality education in Kyoto. The writer would like to extend his sincere gratitude to president Kajisa, professor Madoka Hiwatashi and his excellent team for making this unforgettable visit possible.

1. Education systems

The Japanese and the Finnish constitutions set forth the basic national educational policy: all people shall have the right to receive an equal education corresponding to their ability and compulsory education should be free (Japan constitution, article 26; Finnish constitution, section 16). In Finland everyone has the right to free basic education, including necessary equipment and text books, school transportation and meals. Post-compulsory education is also free: there are no tuition fees in general and vocational upper secondary education, in polytechnics or in universities. Education is primarily co-financed by the Government and local authorities. In both countries Education is seen as a key factor for the competitiveness and wellbeing of the society.

The education administration system in Finland and Japan embodies of the parliament (in Japan: cabinet), the ministry of education and culture (in Japan: the ministry of education, culture, sports, science and technology, latter MEXT) and ministers. In Japan, there are 7 vice or deputy ministers. In Finland, there are minister for education and communications and minister of culture and housing. On the next level in organization chart in Japan stand several bureaus and in Finland several departments and units. In both countries, the Ministry of Education publishes ministerial ordinances and notices concerning standards for establishing schools and curriculum standards.

In consequence of differences between Japan's and Finland's demographics the Japanese administration is more extensive and complex. Main difference between Japan and Finland might be according to the discussions that in Japan the change of the minister can cause extensive changes in the direction of education policy whereas in Finland the changes are minor. The key words in Finnish education policy are quality, efficiency, equity and internationalization.

Both countries have 6-3-3-4 year system of education. This system was established in Japan (single-track school system) 1947 and in Finland late 1970's. Japanese kindergartens cater for children aged 3-5 and Finnish childhood and care cater for children aged 0-5. In Japan children

who have attained the age of 6 begin at primary school. In Finland children begin at primary school that year they attain 7 years.

In Finland Pre-primary education and instruction is provided in the year preceding the start of compulsory education. Providing a place in preprimary education free of charge for all children is a statutory duty for municipalities. Participation is voluntary for children, but nearly all 6-year-olds are enrolled in pre-primary education. Pre-primary education is organized in day care centers and schools.

In Finland about 50 % of the lower secondary school-leavers continue on to general upper secondary education and 39 % to the initial vocational education. Share of applicants to vocational education has been increasing under last years. In Japan the percentage of enrollment of upper secondary schools and technical colleges is currently more than 95% (Murata & Yamaguchi, 2011). Upper secondary school education has become universal topic like semicompulsory education (Murata et al, 2011).

In Japan master's degree can be completed in 2 years and the doctoral degree in 5 years. Finnish master degree can be normally completed in 4 years and doctoral degree in 4-6 years.

In Finland primary education can be provided in separate primary schools or in comprehensive schools, where primary school and lower secondary school are combined to one unit. The number of comprehensive schools is increasing.

The Finnish education system differs from the Japanese in student's opportunities to transfer between academic and vocational study paths. Other difference is that In Finland, according to the Finnish Basic Education act, to a student may be provided a voluntary basic education lasting for one year. On 10th grade a student has an opportunity to improve grades on core subjects of the basic education syllabys for applying to upper secondary school or vocational education.

The Japanese and the Finnish education are facing many common challenges: school violence, bullying and truancy. To solve these and other school connected problems and development demands with decreasing resources challenges whole society.

1.1. Curriculum and special needs education

Curriculum in Japan is drawn up and implemented in each school based on the Course of Study which is published by (MEXT). In Finland the National core curriculum and local curriculum are drawn-up in open, interactive and cooperative processes. Cooperation is based on mutual trust and respect. The Finnish core curriculum reform 2016 is outlined by multidisciplinary working groups supported by online consultation groups. Education providers were asked to provide feedback during the reform process. The National Board of Education's website has been open for consultations three times during the process. (Halinen, 2014)

The reform of the National Core Curricula 2016 for pre-primary education and for compulsory basic education was completed in the end of 2014. Currently the local education authorities are working with the local curricula based on the National Core Curricula. Local education

providers can decide if schools draw up their own curriculums. Schools will start working according to the new curricula in autumn 2016. (Halinen, 2015)

According to Halinen (2015) developing schools as learning communities, and emphasizing the joy of learning and a collaborative atmosphere, as well as promoting student autonomy in studying and in school life are some of our key aims in the reform. In order to meet the challenges of the future, there will be much focus on transversal (generic) competences and work across school subjects.

Frameworks of special needs education in Japan and Finland are corresponding. Special education is provided in regular classes, with special education teacher separately, in special classes and in special schools. The Finnish support is divided into three stages: general support by class teacher, intensified support by special education teacher and special support in special education classes and schools.

1.2. Books as curriculum

Japanese teachers are obligated to use textbooks by law as the main materials for subject-instruction in schools and textbooks have been given thoughtful considerations in their examination, selection and usage method in classes and have been revised many times (Murata et al, 2011). Therefore books are usually used as curriculum. In Finland there is no national control of text books or other learning materials. Teaching should follow the curriculum and teachers can choose books and materials they prefer. In practice teachers and principals decide books and materials in collaboration. Final decision is made by principal who is responsible for school's finance.

1.3. Religion

During the occupation (1945-1952) Japan adopted the principle of the separation of state and religion as a means to democratize education system of pre-1945. The principle of the separation of State and religion was considered to be an important means to democratize Japan and to re-educate the people. Constitution article 20 states that 'The State and its organs shall refrain from religious education or any other religious activity.' (Shibata, 2004)

The Finnish constitution states that everyone has the freedom of religion and conscience. Freedom of religion and conscience entails the right to profess and practice a religion, the right to express one's convictions and the right to be a member of or decline to be a member of a religious community. No one is under the obligation, against his or her conscience, to participate in the practice of a religion. The objectives of religion instruction are familiarize student with own religion, with the Finnish spiritual tradition and introduce to other religions etc. Perceptions of religion instruction and religion in core curriculum have been changing because of growing multiculturalism. This means that more students choose to study ethics or other religion than Lutheranism. This development has effected in school's annual celebrations.

1.4. Multiculturalism

Since the Japanese government started to promote “internationalization” in the 1980’s, slogans such as “international exchange,” “cultural exchange,” “understanding of other cultures,” etc., have become the most popular expressions among policy makers and educators (Qi, 2011). Jie Qi (2011) tries to demonstrate that the notion of Japanese multiculturalism is intricately and deeply embedded in the society, culture, and educational system of Japan, and that this type of multiculturalism tends to exclude some immigrants who have lived in Japan for generations.

Qi (2011) challenges the assumption that Japan is a homogeneous nation. He asserts that Japan is not a homogeneous nation, rather a society with diverse cultural groups. He argues that the present notion of multiculturalism in Japan has been limited to such things as “cultural exchange” and “international exchange.” The Japanese notion of “cultural exchange” and “international exchange” tends to be associated with newcomers, foreign people, and foreign cultures. Ethnic groups, e.g., Ainu, Korean, Chinese, and so on that have been living in Japan for generations are not included in this “cultural exchange” and “international exchange.” Therefore he claims that the Japanese version of multiculturalism is anti-multiculturalism. According to Qi this type of multiculturalism is not for the cultural minorities but for the social and cultural majorities. (Qi, 2011)

In Finnish instruction, special national and local attributes, the national languages (Finnish and Swedish), the two national churches, the Sami as indigenous people, and national minorities must be taken into consideration. According to the contemporary Finnish curriculum (2004) the instruction must take into account the diversification of Finnish culture through the arrival of people from other cultures. The instruction helps to support the formation of pupil’s own cultural identity, and pupil’s part in Finnish society and globalizing world. In practice this means that Finnish basic education provides preparatory classes, lessons in different mother languages and religions for children with immigrant background.

2. Diverse comparisons

2.1. Teacher’s hours at school

Total statutory working time for Japan’s school teachers is longer than in OECD average. According to the Labor Standard Law working hours are 8 hours a day and 40 hours a week (Murata et al, 2011). Corresponding hours in Finland for primary school teachers are 4-7 hours a day and 24 hours a week. Finnish teachers are obliged to participate into collaboration (meetings, team work, curriculum design etc.) and family cooperation etc. 3 hours a week.

2.2. Class size

In 2011, the average primary school class in Japan had 27.9 students – down from 29.0 students in 2000. The average lower secondary class had 32.7 students – down from 34.7 students. These figures are still the second largest among OECD. Corresponding average in Finnish primary and lower secondary schools is about 20 students.

2.3. The Finnish assessment system

The Finnish assessment system includes sample-based national achievement tests in two or three subjects of basic education every year. These national results are published as mean values with no possibility for ranking lists of schools. Results are used for development purposes, for improving curriculum, learning materials, teacher education etc. In Finland there are no school inspections or no national achievement tests covering the entire age groups. (Halinen, 2014)

2.4. The proportion of female teachers

Number of female teachers is significantly lower in Japan than in other OECD countries at all levels of education except pre-primary and tertiary-type B education. In 2011, 65% of primary teachers were women (OECD average: 82.1%); 41.7% of lower secondary teachers were women (OECD average: 67.5%); 28.4% of upper secondary teachers were women (OECD average: 56.5%); and 19.1% of tertiary-type A and advanced research instructors were women (OECD average: 38.7%). The number of female teachers decreases as the grades go up from kindergarten, to primary school, to lower and upper secondary schools, and to university (Murata, 2011). In Finland there are less male teachers on primary school level than in Japan and the number of male decreases as in Japan.

2.5. School Leadership structures

According to Basic education act each school providing education shall have a head teacher responsible for operations (chapter 8, section 37). Therefore leadership structures in Finnish schools are quite low: one principal and a vice-principal always, otherwise no legal basis for other solutions. Depending on school size and municipality arrangements, there are usually assistant principals. The largest municipalities have created a system of district principals. Flexible team structures and leadership teams in larger schools are very usual. According to Basic education act principal leads, controls and supervises instruction and education and conduct to him/her determined administration, finance and instruction tasks. More specific rules/norms are given in service regulations (1983). Municipal administration regulation determines more detailed principal's duties.

In Japan the school is established by national government, local government or educational corporation and is managed by the board of education. Like in Finnish, the Japanese schools can set up its own system of school management. Principal is responsible for the general management. A deputy vice principal assists the principal and the head teachers contact and coordinate the staff. Head teachers play a team leaders role. In Finnish practice team leaders correspond with Japanese head teachers. Japanese principals manage a school independently in cooperation with the board of education, teachers and personnel. Teachers meeting have no legal authority like in Finland. Finnish principals manage finance unlike Japanese principal.

2.6. Efficiency rating of teachers

In Japan for personnel management teachers are evaluated. This means evaluating and keeping a record of the teacher's achievements, ability and aptitude as a teacher. At present both public and private educational employees are evaluated. Principals evaluate teachers and superintendent evaluates principals. Teacher job performance evaluation system was launched nationwide: self reporting, performance evaluation (class teaching, life and career consultation, school operation, activities) and interviews between teacher and principal. (Murata et al, 2011)

In Finland self-evaluation of local authorities and schools is based on the Education Act. The main objective is to help local authorities and schools to take responsibility over their own work: to plan, assess and develop systematically (Halinen, 2014). Teacher evaluation is also based on self-evaluation. Teacher and principal discuss 1-2 times a year about personal improvement/learning objectives, participation into the in-service training and achievements.

3. Reflections about visits

3.1. Horikawa Senior High School, Kyoto

Horikawa Senior High School in Kyoto is providing high-quality science education. According to the principal every year 250 students apply to the school and about 50 % are accepted. Most of the students aim to degree studies at the Kyoto University. The special characteristic in Horikawa is their way of organizing studying according to student's research interests. Studying and instruction approach is research based. The students are working in research groups. Students express their research interests in group sessions. Research interests and subjects are discussed and final subjects and objectives are decided with teachers and teacher assistants. Study processes are based on the inquiry model of learning which simulates scientific research process.

Teacher, teacher assistants (TA) and other students support the research and learning processes. Teacher assistants are degree students from the university. Their support is valuable resource for the students and the teacher. They are paid for their services. Current issue in Finland is how to improve high school student's preparedness for university studies. One solution has been offering option to university studies to general upper secondary school students (high school). In writer's opinion Horokawa's approach yields results and prepares students for researcher career.

The Finnish general upper secondary education continues the teaching and educational tasks of basic education. It's role is to provide extensive all-round learning and it must provide sufficient capabilities for further study. Education must provide students with capabilities to meet the challenges presented by society and their environment and the ability to assess matters from different points of view. Students must be guided to act as responsible and dutiful citizens in society and future working life. Upper secondary school instruction must support the development of students' self-knowledge and their positive growth towards adulthood and encourage students towards lifelong learning and continuous self-development. (Syllabys, 2003)

Horokawa's and the Finnish approaches differ totally because Horokawa is specialized in science teaching. Therefore it should be compared with a Finnish science high school. Horokawa's approach should be tested in Finland.

3.2. Goshominami elementary school, Kyoto

20 years old Goshominami elementary school at Kyoto provides instruction to 1-9 grades. 1-5 grades compose the primary school and 6-9 grades the lower secondary school. As Horikawa, the Goshominami elementary school is providing high-quality education. Goshominami is a research school and local curriculum development school. There are 1248 children at the school, each grade having approximately 200 children and 6-7 classes on same grade. From the Finnish perspective the number of students is exceptional. The number of employees is 84. The low number of special teachers and lack of cleaning personnel draws attention. School day starts at 8.30 and finishes at 16.15. Weekly instruction time is higher and breaks fewer than in Finnish schools. Finnish children have 190 school days a year and approximately 3 months holidays whereas Japanese children having about half of this. Goshominami emphasizes student participation and engagement, theme based learning processes and literacy. In lessons students take active roles as chairmen in leading the planning of studies. Theme based learning processes follow the inquiry model of learning. In designing literacy instruction and learning Goshominami has taken model from Finland. In the draft for core curriculum 2016 Finland has launched a multi literacy concept. In this new approach literacy perceives all forms of literacy e.g. digital and media literacy which goes beyond reading and understanding only traditional texts. Literacy lessons are designed in 7 minutes working periods. This model does not take into consideration student difference but represents standardization of learning. Writer might be incorrect in this because of short observation period. Goshominami elementary school emphasizes cooperation with parents, other adults as resource (community) and club activity.

Writer observed following differences between Japanese and Finnish elementary schools: home visits by teachers, children as cleaners, open space as learning environment, systematic inquiry learning, students participation as chairpersons, strength of the community, active clubs integrated into school day, long school days, 6 grade being attached to lower secondary school and communal school.

3.3. Hyogo University of Teacher Education, Library

Hyogo University was established in 1978. The Graduate school of education (master's program) provides in-service teachers with opportunities to carry out research on education. The faculty school of education trains mainly kindergarten and elementary school teachers. The recently established library represents 22th learning environment that combines ideas about peer learning, active learning and open learning. At the University of Helsinki corresponding flexible learning environment (Engaging Learning Environment ELE) is Minerva square which supports active learning and use of different technologies in learning. Library in Hyogo represents well new learning environment which DiPierro describes in following.

According to DiPierro (2013) 22th century learning environment cultivates appropriate supportive relationships by creating the human and technological conditions under which optimum learning for students is maximized.

This approach represents synergistic systems that enhance the learning experience through:

- Quality tools.
- Technology.
- Collaborative interaction.
- Information sharing.
- Interdisciplinary partnerships.
- Critical thinking.
- Real-world, problem-based, and project-based heuristic experiences that account for effective, outcomes-based student learning and progress and that reflect the social and academic integration critical to student success. (DiPierro, 2013)

DiPierro (2013) describes new learning environment as holistic and takes into account the entire student as that student is enmeshed in the learning process education, and technology serve as the critical matrix from which student learning will evolve in this and the coming century. She emphasizes flexibility in teaching and the applications of new pedagogies will be key. Further, the traditional desk and chair or more industrial classroom will be replaced by comfortable settings with zones or modular units, which encourage group participation, collaboration, and interaction.

Such surroundings set the tone for learning by dismantling educational hierarchies and positing the student as both the teacher and the learner within the framework of the knowledge circle. The shift is away from traditional dispensing of information toward joint knowledge cultivation. Students will move from passive information acquisition to the action of being key players—with their faculty and peers—in the cultivation of knowledge. (Di Pierro, 2013)

References

Basic Education Act 628/1998 Amendments up to 1136/2010

Di Pierro, M. (2013) Vision for a 22nd century learning environment. *Journal for Quality & Participation*, 36(1), 24-27.

Finnish National Board of Education (2014), <http://www.oph.fi/english>

Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture (2014), <http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/?lang=en>

Halinen, I. (2015) What is going on in Finland? – Curriculum Reform 2016, Blog text 25.3.2015, The National Board of Education

Halinen, I. (2014) Curriculum reform 2016 Building the Future Together. Enirdelm Conference presentation 19.9.2014

MEXT, The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2014), <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/organization/index.htm>

Murata, Y. & Yamaguchi, M. (2011) Education in Contemporary Japan, System and Content,

Qi, J. (2011). Diversity and multiculturalism in japan: What is called into question? *Educational Research for Policy & Practice*, 10(2), 105-114.

Shibata, M. (2004) Religious education reform under the US military occupation: The interpretation of state Shinto in japan and Nazism in Germany. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education*, 34(4), 425-442.