

DESIGNING JAPANESE “MULTI-CULTURAL SYMBIOSIS”
FROM THE COMPARISON WITH CANADIAN SOCIETY

THE ROLE OF EDUCATION
AND
IMMIGRANTS’ SENSE OF BELONGING

Shiobara Yoshikazu Seminar 5th

#31055764

Reina Sano

INDEX

Introduction

Chapter 1: Japanese “Multi-cultural Symbiosis”

(1) Transition

(2) Facing Troubles

(3) Where It Should Go: *Multi-cultural Question*

(4) To the Next Chapter

Chapter 2: Japanese Educational System, and Its Time for Corrections

(1) Gradual and Systematic Language Teaching

(2) Generosity with Diversity: Multi-cultural Education

(3) Shared Responsibility for the Social Challenges and Cohesion

(4) To the Next Chapter

Chapter 3: Immigrants' Sense of Belonging, and Its Invisible Constrains

- (1) Deprivation of the Fundamental Rights
- (2) A Sense of the "Lack of Fit": Field and Habitus
- (3) Potential Sense of Discrimination/ Prejudice
- (4) To the Next Chapter

Conclusion

Introduction:

In this era of great global mobility, the momentum of humans flux continues to force the host society to change its social mechanisms and the way people adopt accordingly.

In the midst of massive social changes, people have experienced large number of encounters with increased diversity in societies. This necessitates their “openness to other cultures, as well as the recognition of minorities” (Hebert, 2002: 7), and their awareness of the importance of “the transformation of citizenship,” concordant with those social changes (Hebert, 2002: 3). As a result, the world has witnessed a citizenship that moved “from being closed to being open, from exclusion to inclusion” (Hebert, 2002: 3), giving way to “a rethinking of education for citizen” (Hebert, 2002: 24). This leads pluralistic countries worldwide to prepare their citizens for their shared future with those coming from beyond their boundaries and emphasize less their common past.

Promoting “cultural and racial diversity as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian heritage and identity” (Hebert, 2002: 15), Canada emphasizes the importance as citizenship models, of including “Individuals and groups of people across the country in such a way that their diversity contributes to the creation and sustenance” (Herbert,

2002: 4) of the country, and requires that “Any form of citizenship education include and acknowledge the contributions of immigrants” (Hebert, 2002: 17) for the cohesive society. Encountering increasingly diversified populations within Japan since the end of the 1980s (Iwabuchi, 2010: 11), but still refusing to frame Japan as a multi-culturally integrating society on the national level (Iwabuchi, 2010: 12, 19), Japanese educational system still sees its public education oriented only toward its “nation” (Ota, 2005: 65) and does not always apply compulsory education to immigrant children (Ota & Miyajima, 2005: 4). Treating them as “Japanese” students, it still imposes assimilative educations on them (Ota, 2005: 63), and excludes their diversity from the educational arena. Today, it can be said that Japanese educational system should confront its fundamental corrections based on Canadian educational system shaped by numerous trials and errors the country’s diversity has brought so far.

This paper aims to design how to accomplish Japanese “multi-cultural symbiosis” as one of its ultimate goals in the 21st century, with particular inquiry into the role of education and immigrants’ sense of belonging to their host community. Reflecting the

first visit to Vancouver, British Columbia in 2010 summer, people's welcoming attitudes toward a Japanese girl, and its harmonious atmosphere shaped by internal diversity, I decided to come back to this beautiful country for further understanding of Canada's multiculturalism and immigrants policy, and to write this paper for my undergraduate thesis. Therefore, I particularly focus on a comparison between Japan and Canada, and believe that there must be great deal of wisdom Japanese society can learn from Canadian examples.

For the following chapters, the paper is mainly divided into three parts.

In the first chapter, I will trace back the history of immigration to Japan and Japanese "multi-cultural symbiosis" followed by its facing troubles as of today, and discuss ideal way of "symbiosis" by referring to Stuart Hall's "multi-cultural question."

In the second chapter, as a way of struggling with Hall's "multi-cultural question" in Japanese context, the importance of education and its prospective contributions are emphasized. And in doing this, I will compare Japanese citizenship education with Canadian citizenship education, and mention some of the lessons that Japanese

citizenship education could learn from numerous trials and errors Canadian citizenship education has faced so far.

In the third chapter, in order to deal with national policy on accepting immigrants in Japan, I will show the necessity of eliminating discrimination or inequality and assuring fundamental rights to them. Moreover, I will discuss immigrants' sense of belonging to the host society in terms of structural obstacles implied by a blogger, Frank Kimbal Johnson.

To end introduction, I would like to thank my seminar professor, Mr. Yoshikazu Shiobara for having introduced me to this topic in my freshman year, warmly welcomed to his seminar and assisted me to profound the field and to work on the thesis for the last two and a half years. Furthermore, I appreciate the opportunity to go on exchange at Queen's University in Canada during the 2012-2013 academic year. Especially, I would like to express my gratitude to the professors, Mr. Christopher Samuel and Mr. Stephen Sheps for always understanding my situation and supporting me to face educational hardships. Lastly, I feel thankful for Mr. John Glew correcting my English in the thesis.

Chapter 1: Japanese “Multi-cultural Symbiosis”

(1) Transition

As in introduction, a number of people started to immigrate to Japan for jobs and better life at the end of the 1980s (Iwabuchi, 2010: 15). These people were attracted to Japanese economy and strong yen, and the numbers have been increasing since that time (Iwabuchi, 2010: 11, 15). Seeing suddenly increased immigration at the border, Japanese media was prompted to discuss the phenomenon by coining the word, “multi-ethnic symbiosis” to re-describe Japan as ethnically diverse nation (Iwabuchi, 2010: 15). Afterwards, as part of the policies for growing foreign citizens in the country, another term, multi-cultural symbiosis began to be used (Iwabuchi, 2010: 15). This term was first used in areas around Kawasaki City in the beginning of the 1990s (Iwabuchi, 2010: 15). Moreover, after Han-Shin Awaji Earthquake Disaster in 1995, the word was

frequently mentioned when both Japanese and foreign nationals were involved with reconstruction and support services (Iwabuchi, 2010: 15).

As in these two cases, multi-cultural symbiosis was encouraged in the policies and practices on a local basis, but for the first time in 2005, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications introduced it in a policy suggestion on a national level, and established a committee to examine this (Iwabuchi, 2010: 15). This resulted in the Ministry's policy suggestion, "multi-cultural symbiosis promotion program in local communities," in which it defines multi-cultural symbiosis as follows:

People from diverse nationalities and ethnic backgrounds accept their difference one another, and live close together as members of their society while trying to establish equal relationship (Iwabuchi, 2010: 15).

(2) Facing Troubles

Nevertheless, the Ministry's "multi-cultural symbiosis promotion committee" in 2005 was established to provide local autonomous bodies with guidelines enabling assistance

in various services for foreign residents (Iwabuchi, 2010: 19). Basically, multi-cultural symbiosis in Japan is only prompted on a municipal and NGO/ NPO basis to support foreign residents with the lowest conceivable necessities such as language, education, and medical treatment, showing that the nation is not directly involved with “immigrants policy” (Iwabuchi, 2010: 19, 20). Furthermore, Japanese multi-cultural symbiosis solely aims to place foreign residents as members of local society, and presumably those people are not framed as “Japanese” (Iwabuchi, 2010: 21).

Namely, Iwabuchi critically states that multi-cultural symbiosis is merely designed for the nation to promote its integration of foreign citizens in local community (Iwabuchi, 2010: 12). And how to approve cultural differences, to secure equal rights, and to design a future Japan as ethno-culturally diverse society is excluded from political agenda on a national scale (Iwabuchi, 2010: 12).

(3) Where It Should Go: *Multi-cultural Question*

In discussing ideal multi-cultural symbiosis, Iwabuchi refers to “multi-cultural

question” by Stuart Hall. Hall insists on the importance of seriously dealing with this question in multi-cultural society, and defines it as follows:

How groups or communities with diverse cultural differences could possibly live close together and conceive commonly shared social place without abandoning their own identity (Iwabuchi, 2010: 13).

He also claims that multi-cultural question must be implemented according to its social context (Iwabuchi, 2010: 13).

When it comes to Japan, he concludes, the question is fundamental to imagine/ create social relationship to embrace people with diverse cultural differences as Japanese citizens, and to design multi-cultural society (Iwabuchi, 2010: 13). Based on this understanding, it is required to re-construct national identity, and to equally place each and every immigrant not as foreign resident but as a citizen in Japan (Iwabuchi, 2010: 23). In addition to this, social integration policy needs to be proposed and promoted on a national level even if it requires involvement by diverse social subjects such as local autonomous bodies, local communities, and NGOs (Iwabuchi, 2010: 23). So basically, it is mandatory to officially acknowledge that Japan has always been a multi-cultural

society (Iwabuchi, 2010: 23). Moreover, in order to deal with national policy on accepting immigrants, it is necessary not only to integrate and solidify in local community but also to eliminate discrimination or inequality, improve legal status, and efficiently use citizenship education and media for approving cultural differences and designing multi-cultural society (Iwabuchi, 2010: 23).

In re-constructing the way of ethno-culturally diverse society, Iwabuchi refers to Hara and Shiobara, saying that in implementing multi-cultural symbiosis, it is required for each and every subject to change as citizens in the shared community, which leads to the construction of the whole society (Iwabuchi, 2010: 25). Immigrants and minorities should not always be imposed on change and assimilation, and every citizen needs to be involved interactively and transform the whole society into more integrated and equal one (Iwabuchi, 2010: 31).

(4) To the Next Chapter

In order to deal with Hall's "multi-cultural question" in Japanese context, the

importance of education and its prospective contributions should be emphasized. If used efficiently, it could play a significant role in raising mutual respects and recognition for diverse cultural differences in societies, becoming more aware of belonging to the same social place, and treating each and every immigrant as an equal citizen. On this premise, education could also contribute to designing multi-culturally overarching society by the active interaction among people in the shared community.

As in introduction, however, Japanese educational system still refuses to frame Japan as a multi-culturally integrated society on the national level (Iwabuchi, 2012: 12, 19), and sees its public education oriented only toward its “nation.” Treating immigrant children as “Japanese” students, it imposes assimilative educations on them (Ota, 2005: 63), and excludes their diversity from the educational arena.

In this point of view, it can be said that confronting fundamental corrections to Japanese educational system on the national basis, is one of the ways to implement “multi-cultural question” in its context.

Then, where should Japanese educational system go?

In the next chapter, I will discuss how to encourage the whole society to imagine/

create socially equal relationship as Japanese citizens to design ethno-culturally more embracing society. To do this, I will specifically compare aspects of the Japanese educational system to that of Canada, and outline the major differences existing between each system and advantages of the Canadian program.

Chapter 2: Japanese Educational System, and Its Time for Corrections

In this chapter, I will compare Japanese citizenship education with Canadian citizenship education, and argue that Canadian citizenship education is more efficient than Japanese citizenship education in socially integrating people from ethno-culturally diverse backgrounds and establishing the multi-ethnically embracing society. In doing this, I will also refer to some of the lessons that Japanese citizenship education should learn from numerous trials and errors Canadian citizenship education has faced so far.

(1) Gradual and Systematic Language Teaching

First of all, one of the reasons Canadian citizenship education appears to be more effective than Japanese citizenship education is that it provides newcomers with the opportunities to learn English as an official language gradually and systematically, which helps engaged participation in civic activities.

Generally speaking, it is said that in order to understand the contents of classes in schools, students are required to acquire different language ability from everyday conversation, which assists a more abstract way of thinking (Ota, 2005: 61). Acquiring such language ability in Japanese as a second language needs a massive amount of efforts by the students on the one side at the same time as continuous and appropriate assistance of people around them on the other side (Ota, 2005: 61). In spite of this, Japanese education does not recognize these factors and in fact, minority children are encouraged to stop Japanese education as a second language in an early stage (Ota, 2005: 62, 68). These students are treated as those not requiring further language instructions, and result in taking the same classes with their Japanese fellows (Ota, 2005: 68).

However, as Cray and Currie state that “In order to settle and integrate successfully, newcomers need to attain the practices of social literacy that are shared by the majority population of the nation” (Cray & Currie, 2004: 52), Sakuma emphasizes the necessity of adding “Japanese” into the current curriculum and of making it gradual and systematic language teaching from elementary to post secondary stage (Sakuma, 2005: 227). As a reason of the lack of Japanese systematic learning, Sakuma mentions that in Japan, the pedagogy has not been established yet which deepens its learning from, for example, saying names and greeting to subjects learning and major subjects studying, from the world of personal experiences to the phase of linguistic expressions, from the representational world to the world of universal and abstract thinking (Sakuma, 2005: 227). Based on this reflection, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology in Japan has been working on the establishment of JSL, Japanese as a Second Language for a few years, which is not considered a gradual and systematic learning process from elementary to post secondary stage (Sakuma, 2005: 227). Yet, in terms of improving the language from everyday conversation level to the level enabling minority students’ abstract way of thinking, structuring the framework of the pedagogy

of Japanese education not only in middle schools but also in higher education institutions is urgently needed (Sakuma, 2005: 227).

While in Canada, on the assumption that for immigrants, “One important aspect of settlement and integration involves literacy,” the federal government has made numerous efforts for “the linguistic integration of newcomers,” assisting their participations in civic life by providing them with language instructions (Cray & Currie, 2004: 51, 52, 54). For instance, according to Cray and Currie, “In 1992 the Government announced an ILT [Immigrant Language Training] policy, Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC)”, that afforded adult immigrants official language training for “their social, cultural, and economic integration into Canada,” which encourages them to “become participating members of Canadian society” (Cray & Currie, 2004: 52). “The implementation of LINC has been realized through the development of numerous texts,” the primary text of which is *Canadian Language Benchmark 2000 (CLB 2000)* (Cray & Currie, 2004: 54). *CLB 2000* translated “the LINC policy into a set of competencies from basic to advanced levels,” informing and guiding “the teaching of English as an official language to newcomers” (Cray & Currie,

2004: 54). “*CLB 2000* details 12 levels of language proficiency” from basic to “successive levels of achievement on a continuum of ESL performance” (Cray & Currie, 2004: 54, 55). “With each level consisting of descriptors of the four skills” (Cray & Currie, 2004: 55), it allows newcomer immigrants to learn one of their official languages gradually and systematically.

Although the LINC policy is only designed for adult newcomer immigrants, it gives prospective Japanese education for newcomer immigrant children some important implications.

When discussing the importance of “the literacy practices of the new communities” for immigrants and their successful integration, Cray and Currie see “literacy as a set of conventionalized practices appropriate to a particular context,” insisting that “Literacy is not something that exists in isolation from society but rather is constitutive of and shaped by that society” (Cray & Currie, 2004: 55). Based on this recognition about literacy, it can be said that the reason why the pedagogy has not been established yet which gradually and systematically improves minority students’ Japanese from everyday conversation level to the one enabling their abstract way of thinking, is that

Japanese educational system does not regard learning literacy as learning a set of conventionalized practices needed for them to function successfully as citizens in Japanese society. The lack of this appropriate understanding of literacy as a result, brings such a situation as encouraging minority children to stop Japanese education in an early stage to the extent to which they acquire the language skills to some degrees.

Therefore, what Japanese educational system can do for “the linguistic integration” of newcomer students in the future is, as discussed previously, to incorporate the established JSL program into the broader school curriculum based on the recognition about literacy as “a set of social practices,” making Japanese education gradual and systematic language teaching from elementary to post secondary stage (Sakuma, 2005: 225, 227, Cray & Currie: 2004: 52, 55). As Hebert states, “Skills fundamental to citizenship include the acquisition of literacy, which involves the mastery of the cultural codes and symbols of a society so as to foster informed, active, and engaged participation in full-fledged citizenship” (Hebert, 2002: 23), introducing comprehensive Japanese education as part of the entire curriculum expands the possibility of immigrant children’s great commitment to the society by active citizenry in the future.

In this sense, Canadian citizenship education appears to be more effective than Japanese citizenship education, since it provides newcomers with the opportunities to learn one of their official languages gradually and systematically, so that they can acquire a set of conventionalized practices needed for them to function successfully in their multicultural host society, which helps engaged participation in civic activities.

(2) Generosity with Diversity: Multi-cultural Education

Secondly, Canadian citizenship education is more generous with diversity in its curriculum practices, empowering diverse students in classrooms to contribute to their society in their own ways, which can be another reason of Canadian citizenship education's superiority.

On the one hand, Japanese educational system, as discussed previously, is practiced on the notion that public education is only oriented toward its "nation" (Ota, 2005: 65), not paying attention to students' cultural and racial differences, and treats diverse foreign students as "Japanese" (Ota, 2005: 63). Under this school system, minority

students are not given the opportunities to study society, history, and culture of their own countries or communities, and instead, required to participate in learning Japanese society and history only in Japanese, perceived to be the only appropriate language for understanding classes in this monolingual context (Ota, 2005: 62, 66). Consequently, structurally excluded collective experiences of those minority students under this monolingual and mono-cultural circumstance, make them feel their own heritage languages, cultures, and values remain unrecognized or, even worse, disregarded in their host society, resulting in disempowerment of establishing self-identity as a person with a unique background (Ota, 2005: 62, 66). In order to be accepted by and adjusted to Japanese educational arena, children from different backgrounds have no alternative way but to become Japanese (Ota, 2005: 64), leaving no room for their contribution to the future prosperity of the country in their particular way.

On the other hand in Canada, “Awareness about the importance of diversity and non-British perspectives was highlighted, with curricular practices changing to accommodate a wider range of perspectives” (Robson, 2013: 146). Since the 1960s, multicultural education is represented through such techniques as “The introduction of

topics like ethnic studies, heritage language programs, and the inclusion of gender and ethnic representation in curricula” (Robson, 2013: 146, 148). For example, “teaching heritage languages other than French and English” was promoted and “expanded in schools across the country from the 1980s onwards” and based on “the needs of particular areas,” a large number of which “are offered in British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario” (Robson, 2013: 149). Furthermore, in the citizenship textbooks, “Cultivate Your Commitment to Canada” issued by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (Kishida, 2011: 112), instead of marginalizing experiences and cultural heritages of minority children and assimilating them into the monolingual and mono-cultural classrooms similar to Japan, students are made to recognize individuals’ diverse belongings and identities and become aware of their differences from their classmates, and then of being “Canadian” as a common belonging and identity for all (Kishida, 2011: 112). In addition to that, students learn great contributions of diverse immigrants coming from every corner of the world to the development of Canadian society, and conflicts and challenges made by its diversity (Kishida, 2011: 112). In order for different seeds to grow in one field of Canada without being driven out by dominant seeds, students are

asked what they can do as a tiller in the field (Kishida, 2011: 112).

In this sense, Canadian citizenship education empowers newcomer immigrant children with diverse cultural backgrounds in a way that lets them recognize their particularities and the values of being different from others, contrary to Japanese citizenship education, leaving room for their contributions to the future prosperity of the country in their unique way.

Schools should essentially be the place where children can realize their inherent power, resources, and unique way of being and maximize what they have, assisting them to find their own way to provide the society with their value and a commitment to the future. That is what is defined as empowerment in educational settings and the curriculum should also be made and practiced accordingly on the notion of empowerment for those children involved. In order to empower minority children from culturally diverse backgrounds in educational contexts, instead of mono-cultural education based on somewhat the denial of their cultures, Japanese educational system stands at a turning point, and is required to step forward and become progressively more generous with diversity to establish multicultural education (Ota, 2005: 70).

As Hooks sees “Schooling as always a part of our real world experience, and our life” (Hooks, 2003: 41), schools should always progress, in step with social changes outside their boundaries. With an understanding that schools and people’s life outside cannot be separated and are always correlative to and reflective of each other, what children learn and gain at schools should always be open to their future by making most of their knowledge and exercising their experiences beyond the boundaries. In this sense, schools increased their significance as a place where children can be empowered to contribute to their future, especially in multicultural contexts like Japan and Canada.

In this regard, Canadian citizenship education is more efficient than Japanese citizenship education in terms of its generosity with diverse curriculum practices, encouraging students’ subjective actions, decision-makings, and participation in the commitment to the future in their own ways, and empowering them to contribute to their society, establishing the unique multi-cultural embrace of their country.

(3) Shared Responsibility for the Social Challenges and Cohesion

Thirdly, Canadian citizenship education is superior to Japanese citizenship education in that it encourages all people to share the social challenges their diversity brings, and to participate in the process of establishing multi-culturally overarching society all together.

For more than twenty years since the introduction of the term, “multicultural symbiosis,” Japan has not yet accomplished its societal goal in spite of the term’s prevalence (Mabuchi, 2011: i). As of now, Japan has consistently committed itself to “multicultural symbiosis” only through the practice of educationally supporting minority foreign students, particularly those recent newcomer students in local schools (Morishige, 2011: 22). However, it is necessary to redesign the educational approach to multicultural symbiosis as a way of educating all students, the majority of which are Japanese, to collectively become more responsible for sharing the social challenges and to function in the multicultural society accordingly (Morishige, 2011: 22). In this way, the process of solving shared social concerns as combined effort can be realized, instead of leaving them as “their” isolated individual group problems.

Whereas in Canada, the growing number of ethnic minority populations roused

anxiety among the white Canadian about losing social cohesion in the 1990s (Kishida, 2011: 109). The commonality of Canadian society, rather than its division, came to draw more attention and was underlined toward both majority and minority groups (Kishida, 2011: 109). This led to the transformation of its conventionally newcomers-oriented citizenship policy into the one expanding toward all the Canadian, making them aware of their rights and responsibilities as citizens (Kishida, 2011: 109). Moreover, on the assumption that participating in the process of establishing multi-culturally overarching society generates a sense of belonging to it, citizenship education in Canada is required to encourage all people to participate in the commitment to the sustainable future as a path to the cohesion in the multicultural society (Kishida, 2011: 111, 113, 114, 115). This Canadian citizenship education's way of approaching and solving the variety of challenges through involving all people in the continuous process to the future, does not sacrifice its diversity, equality, and societal cohesion (Kishida, 2011: 107).

This provides Japanese citizenship education with some important lessons. Under the present education system in Japan, as discussed previously, both majority Japanese students and minority foreign students receive the same assimilative "Japanese"

education equipped with the supporting teaching to function in culturally dominant classrooms. However, Japanese education system has to make itself more inclusive and to turn its vector toward not only minority foreign students but also majority Japanese students, regardless of their origins. This approach makes them aware of their rights and responsibilities as citizens of multicultural society that promotes their social participation in how they confront and solve their shared social concerns of the future and involving them in a commitment to more socially integrating and embracing circumstances. This sense of involvement creates a sense of acceptance by the host society among diverse minority groups and gets Japan close to the societal cohesion, that is, “multicultural symbiosis” (Mabuchi, 2011: i).

In this sense, Canadian citizenship education is superior to Japanese citizenship education in terms of fostering its peoples’ competences to live close together with others from diverse backgrounds in pluralistic societies and to cooperate to build communities of greater fairness and equality, making them desirable citizens for the 21st century.

(4) To the Next Chapter

Through this chapter, I discussed the importance of education and its prospective contributions in terms of these following factors:

- (i) Raising mutual respects and recognition for diverse cultural differences in societies,
- (ii) Becoming more aware of belonging to the same social place,
- (iii) Treating each and every immigrant as an equal citizen,
- (iv) Designing multi-culturally overarching society by the active interaction among people in the shared community.

And in doing this, I emphasized that confronting fundamental corrections to Japanese educational system on the national basis is one of the ways to implement Hall's "multi-cultural question" in Japanese context.

However, as discussed previously, in order to deal with national policy on accepting immigrants, Iwabuchi states that it is necessary not only to efficiently use citizenship education for approving cultural differences and designing multi-cultural society but

also to eliminate discrimination or inequality and to improve legal status (Iwabuchi, 2010: 23). On this premise, his claim gives us a significant implication. As long as immigrants are not assured any fundamental rights and treated unequally by their host society, no matter how they are encouraged to participate in the commitment to establishing multi-culturally embracing society, it does not generate a sense of acceptance and belonging among them.

In the next chapter, I will discuss immigrants' sense of belonging to the host society in terms of such structural obstacles as legal status and discrimination or inequality.

Chapter 3: Immigrants' Sense of Belonging, and Its Invisible Constrains

In this age of globalization in which the world witnesses a great number of people transferring from one place to another with ease, what people took for granted as common sense yesterday suddenly becomes a meaningless myth the next day. Likewise, people's belief or desire that the country to which they belong accommodates only one

language, tradition, and history, has turned out to be a mere fantasy to see the increasing diversification of populations on a daily basis.

In discussing the continual renegotiation of Canadian identity “in relation to internal sub-group identities,” Will Kymlicka states that, “Learning how to accommodate this internal diversity, while still maintaining a stable political order, has always been one of the main challenges facing Canada, and remains so today” (Kymlicka, 2003: 368). In addition to that, he insists that, “For the country to function, citizens must have a strong sense of identification with Canada as a political community, an identification that stands over and above their more particularistic sub-group identities” (Kymlicka, 2003: 376).

On the contrary, in the blog, “*ELLIOT LAKE News Political INcorrect Constructs Arranged To Awaken Slumbering Minds...*,” Frank Kimbal Johnson radically affirms that in the multiethnic arena of Britain, people whose origins in the country lie in the act of immigration can never be genuine citizens, claiming that, “The reason why ethnic minorities feel no sense of belonging in Britain is (because) they do not belong here” (Johnson, 2010). His claim in the article carries significant implications that there are

structural obstacles to ethnic minorities' feeling a strong sense of identification with the host communities, leaving any collective endeavor at the national level to integrate immigrant groups in vain.

In this chapter, I will argue that a sense of belonging cannot automatically be instilled into ethnic minorities when they physically migrate to the host communities precisely because there are invisible constraints in their everyday experiences that prevent them from feeling that sense of identification.

(1) Deprivation of the Fundamental Rights

First of all, the deprivation of some of the fundamental rights by the larger society is one of the factors for ethnic minorities to feel no sense of belonging.

Out of four types of minority rights, Will Kymlicka maintains that ethnic minorities demand representation rights and accommodation rights as a desire for inclusion in the larger society (Kymlicka, 2012: 186).

According to him, throughout the Western democracies dominated by middle-class,

able-bodied, white-men, the political process fails to reflect the diversity of the population in the sense that members of ethnic and racial minorities are excluded from the representative process (Kymlicka, 2012: 182). In this case, no matter how they hope to contribute to the larger community into which they are incorporated, to make it more accommodating and overarching the internal diversity, ethnic minorities cannot have any influence over the policy making. Most piece of legislations which have direct impacts on their everyday life are approved without meeting their consent in their absence, leaving them to feel that they are merely the attachment to a unit headed by someone else. Therefore, there is no way for ethnic minorities to have a strong feeling of belonging to or identification with the larger society, in more sustainable and accommodating development of which they are not involved through the cooperation with the majority people.

In addition to representation rights, Kymlicka mentions that, “Many immigrant groups and religious minorities have demanded various forms of recognition and accommodation of their cultural practices” (Kymlicka, 2012: 182). The demand for accommodating ethno-cultural differences shows no sign of fading away, which can be

interpreted that majority institutions governed by majority laws are still not enough revised to accommodate ethno-cultural identities, not allowing ethnic minorities to express cultural particularity in the larger society as freely and equally as their major peers (Kymlicka, 2012: 182, 187). This inequality in the way both the majority and minority groups show their cultural identity in symbols and behaviors, leads ethnic minorities to feel that their ethno-cultural identities are not appreciated but scorned and, even worse, excluded by what the larger society thinks is the standard to which other cultures must be subordinate. As a result, those ethno-cultural identities are marginalized, making their possessors feel alienated and unrecognized in the larger society, resulting in their uncertainty about the sense of belonging to it.

As Kymlicka mentions, those rights to representation and accommodation can be regarded as an expansion of the familiar democratic ideas, and can promote both participation of ethnic minorities and fairness in the mainstream society (Kymlicka, 2012: 186). Moreover, the demands for those rights can also be seen as evidence that members of ethnic minorities want to participate in and contribute to the mainstream society (Kymlicka, 2012: 186). In spite of this, the deprivation of some of those

fundamental rights by the larger society prevents them from their participation and contribution, and basically, can be one of the invisible constraints in the everyday experiences that do not let them automatically feel a sense of belonging when they physically migrate to the host communities.

(2) A Sense of the “Lack of Fit”: Field and Habitus

Secondly, the experience of the “lack of fit” between the field and the habitus can contribute to feeling no sense of belonging to the host countries for ethnic minorities.

When discussing the importance of having white and middle-class based activist habitus, which is seemingly a common condition for young activist from any ethno-cultural backgrounds so as to feel at home within the activist field, Jacqueline Kennelly briefly summarizes Pierre Bourdieu’s notion of field and habitus. Bourdieu explains that, “A field can be broadly understood as the specific sociocultural context within which people interact,” and habitus plays a significant role “in structuring people’s process of seeking out a field that matches their own sensibilities and

experiences” (Kennelly, 2011: 75, 79). According to him, when the agent tries to find the most compatible field with his or her habitus, such emotional responses to situations as “sympathies and antipathies” can be an important criterion, that assists an individual in determining whether or not he or she feels “at home”, that is, a sense of belonging to the social space (Kennelly, 2011: 75, 76). Based on the framework within Bourdieu’s perspective, Kennelly affirms that although many visible minority young people manage to obtain activist habitus, necessary to interact in the activist field with ease, “Many of them also experience of ‘not quite fitting,’” caused by the “lack of fit” between the habitus of their own families or wider ethno-cultural communities and the youth activist field marked by white and middle-class (Kennelly, 2011: 82, 83).

This framework of the “lack of fit” can be applied to the case of ethnic minorities. Located within a cultural context dominated by the white and middle-class majority, one’s family background has a great impact on whether one feels a sense of belonging or exclusion in the social space in both ways of class and race. For ethnic minorities who previously have not been exposed to any shared values of common knowledge of dominant class and race in the host countries by growing up in such family and

ethno-cultural contexts, their habitus shaped by those backgrounds is not always compatible with the field to which they belong, causing the “lack of fit,” which provokes no sense of identification with the place they are in.

To sum, this experience of the “lack of fit” between the field and the habitus can be another invisible constraint in the everyday experiences that prevents ethnic minorities from automatically instilling a sense of belonging when they physically migrate to the host communities.

(3) Potential sense of Discrimination/ Prejudice

Thirdly, the potential sense of discrimination or prejudice of the majority groups can generate ethnic minorities’ no sense of belonging to the mainstream society.

In the following part of this section, the three types of discrimination or prejudice potentially shared by the majorities will be discussed.

- (i) Firstly, one of the potential prejudices against ethnic minorities emerges

from the misconception of the term “social exclusion,” making them feel no sense of belonging.

In discussing some of the problems with the term “social exclusion,” Michael Samers claims that the term is quite often referred to as the parallel with the term “underclass,” “Where the explanations for the socially excluded (sometimes) become synonymous with the explanations of/for the underclass” (Samers, 1998: 127). According to him, the term “underclass” has been used as the specific class position to situate immigrants and ethnic minorities within the “receiving societies,” suggesting that it is this deviant association of the underclass with the socially excluded that makes the underclass (ethnic minorities) unlikely to be integrated into “mainstream society” (Samers, 1998: 127). In this case, based on the assumption that those socially excluded ethnic minorities are not worth helping, the “receiving societies” are not interested in no matter how they are treated as resident aliens, subjected to physical segregation and economic discrimination, and denied political rights, implying that “they” are responsible for facing “their” own problems, trying

not to solve those issues cooperatively. This attitude of the majority groups makes ethnic minorities feel abandoned and misrecognized by the rest of the society, provoking the sense of isolation in the marginalized position, and then continually being reminded that they do not belong to the “mainstream society.”

- (ii) Secondly, another potential sense of discrimination against ethnic minorities is caused by the misunderstanding of cultural binary in the “mainstream society.”

Besides the term “social exclusion,” when understanding the term “integration,” Samers points out that people in the “mainstream society” tend to critically assume that their national identities in the past have currently been damaged by globalization, rendering their culturally pre-homogenous societies too heterogenous (Samers, 1998: 129). As a result, they needed to facilitate the integration of ethnic minorities to make a static society “where the ‘them’ confronts the ‘us’” (Samers, 1998: 129). This historical conception of the “mainstream society” as culturally homogenous in the past and the

assumption of cultural binary generate the distinction between “us” and “them” in the majority groups’ minds. Consequently, no matter how much loyalty ethnic minorities feel toward the “mainstream society” into which they become integrated, they continuously keep on being reminded of the invisible barrier of being different, leaving no room for their being incorporated into “us.” These everyday encounters with the difference within the cultural field leave them ambivalent and uncertain, with a sense that they do not quite belong to where they are actually integrated.

- (iii) Thirdly, the other potential sense of discrimination against ethnic minorities can be ascribed to the transformation of employment for ethnic minorities.

According to Samers, the so-called transition to “post-Fordism” fundamentally shaped a shift of employment for them from “the ‘exposed sector’ (international traded goods and services) to the ‘sheltered sector’ (local, urban traded services)” (Samers, 1998: 135). As a result, a number of ethnic minorities started engaging in low-paid and “low-skilled” jobs in the urban areas, resulting in “the suburbanization of (white) nationals out of

metropolitan centers and the consequential replacement in housing and jobs by ethnic minorities” (Samers, 1998: 135). This replacement particularly in jobs by ethnic minorities causes rising unemployment and growing social inequalities among the majorities, provoking their abhorrence of ethnic minorities and making them feel invaded by those uninvited strangers. Those who share the same hatred come to show their unwillingness to make unwanted ethnic minorities feel at home within their host communities. Consequently, in spite of their contribution to the mainstream societies, as if they are never allowed to succeed economically, ethnic minorities are segregated and excluded by the rest of the societies, finding no way to feel sense of identification with those communities.

In sum, this potential sense of discrimination or prejudice of the majority groups can be regarded as another invisible constrain in the everyday experiences so that ethnic minorities cannot automatically instill a sense of belonging when they physically migrate to the host communities.

(4) To the Next Chapter

Referring to Johnson's claim and implication, this chapter explained that there are structural obstacles to ethnic minorities' feeling a strong sense of identification with the host communities, leaving any collective endeavor at the national level to integrate immigrant groups in vain. At the same time, it challenges Kishida's view of Canadian educational approach in encouraging all people to participate in the commitment to the social cohesion. As mentioned in Chapter 2, as long as immigrants are not assured any fundamental rights and treated unequally by their host society, no matter how education tries to prompt them to become involved with establishing multi-culturally embracing society, it does not generate a sense of acceptance and belonging within Japanese society.

As far as Iwabuchi is concerned, in Japan people with different nationalities, ethnicities, and origins are accepted as temporary workers and foreigners on the one hand, but are not guaranteed fundamental rights as citizens on the other hand, which he

calls “differential exclusion” (Iwabuchi, 2010: 21). Therefore, the idea of exceeding exclusive notion of “nation” and assuring rights to all residents as an equal citizen, is still lacking in Japan (Iwabuchi, 2010: 21). Yet, borrowing Charles Taylor’s language, Iwabuchi explains that in multi-cultural society, equality has to be pursued in two ways:

- (i) Guaranteeing dignity as a human being and fundamental rights (Equal dignity),
- (ii) Respecting cultural differences with justice (Equal respect) (Iwabuchi, 2010: 21).

So basically, in order to come to terms with and implement Hall’s “multi-cultural question” in Japanese context, it is critical to efficiently use citizenship education to create equal respect and at the same time to eliminate discrimination and inequality. In this way, we may assure fundamental rights for equal dignity, leading to meeting Taylor’s view of equality in multi-cultural society.

Conclusion:

This paper was designed to show how to accomplish Japanese “multi-cultural symbiosis” as one of its ultimate goals in the 21st century, with particular inquiry into the role of education and immigrants’ sense of belonging to their host community. In writing it, I particularly focused on a comparison between Japan and Canada, believing that there must be great deal of wisdom Japanese society can learn from Canadian examples.

The paper was mainly divided into three parts.

- (i) In the first chapter, I traced back the history of immigration to Japan and Japanese “multi-cultural symbiosis” followed by its facing troubles as of today, and discussed ideal way of “symbiosis” by referring to Stuart Hall’s “multi-cultural question.”

“Multi-cultural symbiosis” in Japan started to be encouraged in the policies and practices on a local basis to deal with increasing immigrants in local communities (Iwabuchi, 2010: 15). However, it is merely designed for the nation to promote its integration of foreign citizens in local community (Iwabuchi,

2010: 12). And how to approve cultural differences, to secure equal rights, and to design a future Japan as ethno-culturally diverse society is excluded from political agenda on a national scale (Iwabuchi, 2010: 12).

In discussing ideal multi-cultural symbiosis in Japan, it is important to examine Stuart Hall's "multi-cultural question," in order to imagine/ create social relationship to embrace people with diverse cultural differences as Japanese citizens, and to design multi-cultural society (Iwabuchi, 2010: 13). Based on this understanding, it is required to re-construct a national identity, and to equally place each and every immigrant not as foreign residents but as a citizen in Japan (Iwabuchi, 2010: 23). In addition to this, social integration policy needs to be proposed and promoted on a national level (Iwabuchi, 2010: 23). And in order to deal with national policy on accepting immigrants, it is necessary not only to efficiently use citizenship education for approving cultural differences and designing multi-cultural society but also to eliminate discrimination and inequality, and to improve legal status (Iwabuchi, 2010: 23).

(ii) In the second chapter, as a way of defining Hall's "multi-cultural question" in

Japanese context, the importance of education and its prospective contributions were emphasized, maintaining that confronting fundamental corrections to Japanese educational system on the national basis, is one of the ways to implement “the question” in its context. It is based on the discussion of how to encourage the whole society to imagine/ create socially equal relationship as Japanese citizens to design ethno-culturally more embracing society by specific inquiry into a comparison of Japanese educational system with that of Canada.

Along with the discussion, I explained the efficiency and superiority of Canadian education system in socially integrating people from ethno-culturally diverse backgrounds and establishing the multi-cultural society, which I supported with the three examples below. Furthermore, I referred to some of the lessons that Japanese citizenship education could learn from numerous trials and errors Canadian citizenship education has faced so far.

The chapter is divided into three parts along with the supporting examples.

Firstly, providing new immigrants with the gradual and systematical learning of their official language, Canadian citizenship education lets them acquire a set of

conventionalized practices needed to function successfully in their multi-cultural host society, and helps their engaged participation in civic activities (Cray & Curie: 2004: 54, Hebert, 2002: 23). Based on the idea of “the linguistic integration” of new students in the future, what Japanese educational system could do is to incorporate the established JSL program into the broader school curriculum with the recognition of literacy as “a set of social practices,” making Japanese education gradual and systematic language teaching from elementary to post secondary stage (Sakuma, 2005: 225, 227, Cray & Curie, 2004: 52, 55). As Hebert states, “Skills fundamental to citizenship include the acquisition of literacy, which involves the mastery of the cultural codes and symbols of a society so as to foster informed, active, and engaged participation in full-fledged citizenship,” (Hebert, 2002: 23) introducing comprehensive Japanese education as part of the entire curriculum expands the possibility of immigrant children’s great commitment to the society by active citizenry in the future.

Secondly, Canadian citizenship education is generous in providing diverse curriculum practices. That helps students to recognize their value of being

different, which empowers them to commit themselves to and contribute to their society with their uniqueness. On the contrary, instead of marginalizing experiences and cultural heritages of minority children and assimilating them into the monolingual and mono-cultural classrooms, Japanese educational system stands at a turning point, and is required to step forward and become progressively more generous with diversity to establish multi-cultural education (Ota, 2005: 70). In educational contexts, that could help empower newcomer immigrant children with diverse cultural backgrounds in a way that lets them recognize their particularities and the values of being different from others, leaving room for their contributions to the future prosperity of the country in their unique way.

Thirdly, Canadian citizenship education encourages all people to share the social challenges their diversity brings and promotes their participation in the process of establishing multi-culturally overarching society all together. Reconsidering the educational approach to multi-cultural symbiosis only through the practice of supporting minority foreign students (Morishige, 2011:

22), Japanese education system has to make itself more inclusive and to turn toward not only minority foreign students but also majority Japanese students, regardless of their origins. This approach makes them aware of their rights and responsibilities as citizens of multi-cultural society that promotes their social participation in how they confront and solve their shared social concerns of the future and involving them in a commitment to more socially integrating and embracing circumstances. On the assumption that participating in the process of establishing multi-culturally overarching society generates a sense of belonging to it (Kishida, 2011: 111), this sense of involvement creates a sense of identification with, and acceptance by, the host society among diverse minority groups and gets Japan close to the societal cohesion, that is, “multi-cultural symbiosis.”

- (iii) The third chapter is discussed in the light of Iwabuchi’s idea that in order to deal with national policy on accepting immigrants in Japan, it is necessary not only to efficiently use citizenship education for approving cultural differences and designing multi-cultural society but also to eliminate discrimination or

inequality and to improve legal status (Iwabuchi, 2010: 23). On this premise, I asserted that as long as immigrants are not assured any fundamental rights and treated unequally by their host society, no matter how education tries to prompt them to become involved with establishing multi-culturally embracing society, it does not generate a sense of acceptance and belonging within Japanese society.

Implied by a blogger, Frank Kimbal Johnson, I discussed immigrants' sense of belonging to the host society, claiming that there are structural obstacles to ethnic minorities' feeling a strong sense of identification with the host communities, leaving any collective endeavor at the national level to integrate immigrant groups in vain. Consequently, followed by the three explanatory examples below, I argued that a sense of belonging cannot automatically be instilled into ethnic minorities when they physically migrate to the host communities precisely because there are invisible constraints in their everyday experiences that prevent them from feeling that sense of identification.

- Firstly, the deprivation of some of the fundamental rights, such as representation rights and accommodation rights, is one of the factors for

ethnic minorities to feel no sense of belonging.

- Secondly, the experience of the “lack of fit” between the field in which ethnic minorities culturally interact with their host countries and their ethno-cultural habitus can contribute to their feeling no sense of belonging to them.
- Thirdly, the potential sense of discrimination or prejudice of the majority groups can generate ethnic minorities’ sense of no belonging to the “mainstream society.”

As Johnson mentions in the blog that, “Simply acquiring a sense of belonging will never be enough to make it so, since that is only within the gift of the host community ... at everyday face-to-face encounter with the community’s members,” whether ethnic minorities feel a sense of belonging or not is permanently dependent on the way their “receiving communities” are (Johnson, 2010). So basically, in order to implement Stuart Hall’s “multi-cultural question” and to deal with national policy on accepting immigrants in Japanese contexts, it is significant to efficiently use citizenship education for equal respect at the

same time as to eliminate discrimination and inequality, and to assure fundamental rights for equal dignity.

As mentioned in the introductory paragraph, today, it can be said that Japanese citizenship education should confront its fundamental corrections based on Canadian citizenship education that has been shaped by numerous trials and errors the country's diversity has brought so far. However, it is not always the case that Canadian citizenship education works in the same way in Japan as efficiently as it has in Canada. Promoting the commitment to the shared future with others rather than the common past can be a different story in Japan, with majority of people having a different mentality toward the same societal goal from Canada. Therefore, Japan should seek for its own way of socially integrating its people of different backgrounds and establishing the unique multi-cultural embrace of the country, only appropriate for its particular context, cultures, history, and of course, its people.

Works Cited

- Cray, Ellen and Pat Currie. "Conceptions of Literacy in Canadian Immigrant Language Training." *Current Issues in Language Planning* 5:1, 2004: 51-63.
- Hebert, Yvonne M. and Lori Wilkinson. "The Citizenship Debates: Conceptual, Policy, Experiential, and Educational Issues." Hebert, Yvonne M., *Citizenship in TRANSFORMATION in Canada*. Toronto Buffalo London: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 2002: 3-36.
- Hooks, Bell. *Teaching Community A Pedagogy of Hope*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Iwabuchi, Koichi. "多文化社会・日本における'文化'の問い." Iwabuchi, Koichi, 多文化社会の<文化>を問う 共生/コミュニティ/メディア. Tokyo: 株式会社 青弓社, 2010: 9-34.
- Johnson, Frank Kimbal. "A Sense of Belonging." *ELLIOT LAKE News Political Incorrect Constructs Arranged To Awaken Slumbering Minds...*
(<http://elliottlakenews.wordpress.com/2010/07/13/a-sense-of-belonging/>).
- Kennelly, Jacqueline. "Citizen Youth: Culture, Activism and Agency in a Neoliberal Era." New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011: 73-110.
- Kishida, Yumi. "多様性と共に生きる社会と人の育成 -カナダの経験から-."
- Mabuchi, Hitoshi, 「多文化共生」は可能か 教育における挑戦. Tokyo: 株式会社 勁草書房, 2011: 106-123.
- Kymlicka, Will. "Being Canadian." *Government and Opposition*, 2003: 357-385.
- Kymlicka, Will. "Ethnocultural Minority Groups, Status and Treatment of." *Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics*, 2012: 178-188.
- Mabuchi, Hitoshi. "はじめに." Mabuchi, Hitoshi, 「多文化共生」は可能か 教育における挑戦. Tokyo: 株式会社 勁草書房, 2011: i-vi.
- Miyajima, Takeshi and Haruo Ota. "外国人の子どもと日本の学校 何が問われているのか." Miyajima, Takeshi and Haruo Ota, 外国人の子どもと日本の教育 不就学問題と多文化共生の課題. Tokyo: 財団法人 東京大学出版会, 2005: 1-36.
- Morishige, Takeo. "多文化共生をめざすカリキュラムの開発と実践." Mabuchi, Hitoshi, 「多文化共生」は可能か 教育における挑戦. Tokyo: 株式会社 勁草書房, 2011: 22-42.
- Ota, Haruo. "日本のモノカルチャリズムと学習困難." Miyajima, Takeshi and

Haruo Ota, 外国人の子どもと日本の教育 不就学問題と多文化共生の課題.
Tokyo: 財団法人 東京大学出版会, 2005: 57-75.

Sakuma, Kosei. “多文化に開かれた教育に向けて.” Miyajima, Takeshi and Haruo Ota, 外国人の子どもと日本の教育 不就学問題と多文化共生の課題. Tokyo: 財団法人 東京大学出版会, 2005: 217-238.

Samers, Michael. “Immigration, ‘Ethnic Minorities’, and ‘Social Exclusion’ in the European Union: a Critical Perspective.” *Geoforum*, 1998: 123-144.

Robson, Karen L. “The Role of Curriculum.” Robson, Karen L., *Sociology of Education in Canada*. Toronto: Pearson Canada Inc., 2013: 122-159.