Legitimate peripheral participation
in international exchange in education in elementary schools

Tetsuro Ejima
Aichi University of Education, Japan
tejima@auecc.aichi-edu.ac.jp

Hitomi Saito
Aichi University of Education, Japan
hsaito@auecc.aichi-edu.ac.jp

Kiyoko Majima
Aichi University of Education, Japan
kmajima@auecc.aichi-edu.ac.jp

Takeshi Tsuchiya
Aichi University of Education, Japan
tktutiya@auecc.aichi-edu.ac.jp

Takahito Ueda
Aichi University of Education, Japan
tueda@auecc.aichi-edu.ac.jp

Mari Yamane
Aichi University of Education, Japan
myamane@auecc.aichi-edu.ac.jp

Kyoko Umeda
Aichi University of Education, Japan
kumeda@auecc.aichi-edu.ac.jp

Hong Jae Kang
Chinju National University of Education, Korea
kanghj@cue.ac.kr

Abstract: In fiscal 2004, we had an international exchange program with Chinju National University of Education in Korea. In the spring, about 12 students of Chinju National University of Education went to Aichi University of Education. In the fall, about 12 students of Aichi went to Chinju for about one week each. The major feature of this training was that the students have practiced doing classes at an elementary school in the partner's country. In addition, using the Internet, this practice was operated by the students' principal.

In this research, we primarily analyzed the text that students wrote. We found that the students' learning can be explained by legitimate peripheral participation theory. Changes to the central role of peripheral legitimate participation were considered more significant than age and grade, and the number of times that they have participated in this training had a large impact. In addition, when a person whose age and grade was not very different to those of the average became a leader, cognitive apprenticeship seemed to function more.

In the future, we will survey graduates and children who take classes. As a result, we will examine the effect of this training.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate in Japan and Korea how teachers and parents can instruct their students in an ever-evolving, ever-changing information network society. This study particularly focuses on teacher trainee university students, who will be future educators and parents.

In Japan, "amidst demand for developing people responsive to globalization, it is necessary for educators themselves as well to also adopt global viewpoints and thinking. Therefore, for example, at universities with teacher training programs, it is necessary to encourage students who wish to become teachers to study abroad by recognizing credits earned while studying abroad (if conditions are met) as applicable to their teacher training program while maintaining and improving the quality of the teacher training courses (Central Education Council 2012).

However, since teacher training is often closely intertwined with its country or region, it is considered an area difficult to internationalize. Is Universal Teacher Training actually possible?

The number of students enrolled in Japanese public schools requiring Japanese-language instruction is 27,013 as of May 2012. Among these, 5,878 are in Aichi Prefecture. This is almost twice as much as Kanagawa Prefecture, which ranked second (2,863 students) (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology 2013).

Incidentally, 82.4% of students who passed the entrance exam for the Aichi University of Education in the spring of 2013 were graduates of high schools in Aichi Prefecture. The total of students from high schools in the prefectures in the Tokai Region (Aichi, Gifu and Mie Prefectures) totaled 90.0%.

Next, 95.1% of the certified teachers who graduated from the teacher training program in the spring of 2013 are in Aichi Prefecture, and a mere 4.9% are outside the prefecture (Aichi University of Education 2013).

Since teachers in Japan are employed as local civil servants at the prefectural or municipal level, transfers to other prefectures are rare.

We believe it is necessary to have these future educators acquire international sensibilities.

OUTLINE

Since concluding an exchange agreement in 1997, the Aichi University of Education (henceforth, "Aichi") and the Chinju National University of Education (henceforth, "Chinju") have conducted various educational and research exchanges. Among these, from autumn 2004, the student training exchange (henceforth, "the training program"), which included actual experience at an elementary school, utilized the characteristics of an educational university (Aichi University of Education and Chinju National University of Education 2006).

In the training program, students from Chinju visit Aichi roughly around every May, and in September, students from Aichi visit Chinju, where approximately one-week long training programs are held. A visitation group consists of around twelve students each. Also, at the respective partner school, the students assemble to form teams to welcome the visiting students. Since these are entirely voluntary, each time a program is held students who are interested gather.

This study focuses on an analysis of the content of the reports the students wrote for the training program, as well as the text posted to SNS (social networking services) and reports on the findings.

The training program has the following two objectives.

> 1. Japanese and Korean students studying at education universities understand each other's societies and cultures while fostering mutual exchange.
> 2. Students at both universities teach at elementary schools alongside students in the respective host country, and through planning and implementing practicums with children, deepen their understanding of children from a different society, and deepen their understanding of education.

In particular, (2) is a major pillar characterizing the training program. This shall be referred to "*classroom practicums*" in this study. Classroom practicums are held in groups of approximately 2-4 sessions.

Also, the training program keeps the following three points in mind (Ejima, Yamane, Ueda & Umeda 2009).

> 1. Encourage the participating students to be basically responsible for making preparations, etc.

> 2. Encourage the students above to ask their fellow foreign students or students with study abroad experience, and students who have participated in previous programs to actively participate.
> 3. Prepare an e-Learning system to facilitate smooth mutual communication.

When visiting a partner university, the training program selects participants through an open recruitment of interested students and an interview by the faculty. However, when accepting visiting students, students who wish to participate may freely do so, as there is no selection process.

At Aichi, students are asked to submit a written application prior to the interview.

Students will commence preparations approximately two months prior to their respective actual visits. Also, in both Aichi and Chinju, in general participants will be recruited from all majors, etc.

Also, from September 2012, Aichi students are required to submit a report after the completion of the training program.

Table 1 is an outline of the itinerary from the September 2012 visit.

Table 1: Itinerary for September 2012

Date	Time	Description
Sept. 19 (Wed)	PM	Opening Ceremony
Sept. 20 (Thurs)		Class preparations
Sept. 21 (Fri)	AM	Classroom Practicum (at the Elementary School Affiliated to The University)
	PM	Teaching Reflection Meeting
Sept. 22 (Sat)	AM	Fieldwork (Jinju)
	PM	Home Stay
Sept. 23 (Sun)	AM	
	PM	Travel (Bus)
Sept. 24 (Mon)		Fieldwork (Busan)
Sept. 25 (Tues)	AM	Closing Ceremony
	PM	Return to Japan

Aside from some minor differences, both Aichi and Chinju generally held the same program. The students prepared for their classroom practicums and fieldwork prior to their visits.

In Aichi, the training program maintained a mailing list for information sharing purposes as late as 2005. In addition to the students, faculty leaders, etc. also joined this list.

In Aichi, a dedicated course has been offered on the e-Learning system from the training program offered in September 2006. Also, in Chinju, information was exchanged via a blog as recently as May 2010.

Aichi decided to utilize a general SNS from the training program offered in September 2011. Naturally, mailing lists are also used.

A private group was created on the SNS for the training program offered in September 2012. The group was created by the students.

Also, in the training program held in May 2012, the students created a similar private group.

By using SNS, so-called overhead communication (OC) was established (Ejima, Majima, Umeda, Ueda, Tsuchiya, Yamane & Kang 2012).

METHODOLOGY

Performed by analyzing the text below.

(a) Aichi University of Education and Chinju National University of Education (2006). "Aichi kyōiku daigaku 2004-5 nendo purojekuto keihi hōkokusho kokusai kōryū kyōteikō to no renkei ni yoru kyōin yōsei daigaku gakusei no heiwa kōryū puroguramu" (Aichi University of Education 2004-5 Project Expenses Report Peace Exchange Program for Teacher Trainee University Students through Partnerships with International Exchange Partner Schools) Nikkan kyōiku bunka tsūshinshi (Japan-Korea Education and Culture Mission), Kariya, Aichi University of Education.

(b) Majima (2011). Gurobaru jidai ni hagukumu kankeisei (Relations developed in an age of globalization). Kariya, Aichi University of Education

(c) Aichi student written application forms
(d) Aichi student reports

EXAMINATION

Below, the participation frequency for the September and May training programs shall be counted as one time respectively, and clearly indicated to the extent known. Also, the academic year at the time the quoted text was written shall be listed.

CONTINUITY

Umeda (2011) makes the following observations.

In both Japan and Korea, there are many students who continuously participated in this student exchange visitor training program. For example, the following pattern could be seen for Aichi University of Education students. As Japan was the exchange site, they participated in the welcome program in May, which was relatively easy. There, they made friends with the Korean students, and participated in the training program in Korea the following September. Conversely, students who participated in the training program in Korea in September were impressed by the way they were treated, so they participated in the May activities. There are various methods and motives for participating in the training, but in any case, there are numerous cases where the students participate more than once.

Narita (junior, third time participating) (Majima 2011), the 2010 training leader, wrote the following.

This project is passed down from year to year. This program is built on the accumulated feelings of those who participated in prior years, such as "I cannot just be on the receiving end with my Korean friends" and "I want to give an even better welcome than last year."

On the other hand, there are few students who serve as leaders twice for the visitation and welcome.

Iwase (sophomore, third time), the leader of the September 2012 training, wrote the following.

[Kimura, the May 2012 leader, explaining the reason for deciding not to participate in the September 2012 training] "Having completed the May training as a leader, I think it would be absolutely difficult for the September leader if I also participated in the September training." I was surprised when I heard this. I don't think that anyone would find it difficult. I blurted out, "You are wrong for thinking this waand smothering her desire to really participate in the Korea training."

However, Iwase wrote the following in the second half of the same report.

My participating two times leads to taking a chance away from someone else. I went t time with the intent of keeping this in mind, but whether I did that person's part as well, and I have been thinking about how I will relay my experience with the Korea training after I return to Japan.

COMMUNICATION

Whether the students have sufficient foreign language proficiency (particularly English) when they participate in an international exchange is an unavoidable issue.

Ueda makes the following observation (Majima 2011)

If you discard the notion that just because it is foreign exchange you must be proficient in English or another foreign language and just increase the opportunities for exchange in Japanese, "international exchange" could be transformed from the extraordinary to the ordinary. . . . If we can know and acknowledge another's culture, values and experience without passing judgment as to its value, this should lead to true understanding.

Miyata (sophomore)(Aichi University of Education and Chinju National University of Education 2006) in an article entitled "*Communication,*" wrote about the use of the Japanese, Korean and English languages during training. Also, she said, "*If only I could speak [Korean] better...*" However, at the same time, she wrote "*I also thought that I want to focus on other things, not just the Korean language.*"

Conversely, Minami (sophomore) (Aichi University of Education and Chinju National University of Education 2006) wrote, "*Even if there was a language barrier, if you try to make yourself understood, your thoughts and feelings will be understood.*"

Differences between the two ways of thinking about language can be seen.

These differences are not just simply individual differences, and changes along with participation in training are suggested by Kamiya's (senior, three times) May 2013 report.

International exchange is not something for learning languages. My English is on the less-than-proficient

side, and it isn't the best. I had no interest in international exchange, and avoided them up to that point. However, what I learned from participating in this training is that language exists as a tool.

Araki was the leader for May 2013. We will compare her May 2013 report to her September 2012 report.

September 2012 (sophomore, second time)

Through by contact with Korean students, I strongly felt that I wanted to be able to speak Korean, to want to learn it. . . . I would like to study Korean and speak to them in Korean next time I see them and express my feelings of gratitude.

May 2013 (junior, third time)

I spoke using English, Korean and Japanese, but I felt that there were definitely moments when my feelings were understood even if I did not use words.

I treasure the person I am dealing with as an individual human being, and the fact that the language is different is irrelevant. Precisely because the language is different, I have to make more of an effort to get my thoughts across.

LEARNER'S AUTONOMY

Ejima et al. (2009) examined the training program in 2008 and stated, "*The authors think that the 'Debate among future teachers' held during the advance preparations were particularly significant. In these debates, the faculty removed themselves from the management portions, and the fact that the students primarily worked on their own initiative, is even more significant.*"

The organization of the Aichi student teams was basically conceived by the students themselves. Selection almost invariably emphasized past experience with the training program, followed by academic year. Also, students with prior experience as leaders tended to decline another leadership position, so many leaders were sophomores and juniors. The reason for this is unclear, but perhaps it is difficult for seniors to assume leadership positions, since Japanese students take the teacher employment examination during their summer vacation.

Here, a cognitive apprenticeship is clearly visible. The team's *master* was not the leader, but a student who served as a leader in the past. Since they know that "this is the last time" for them, they try their best to transfer their knowledge to the next group of students. For example, they try to impart the sense of "this is how a leader should be."

Therefore, when seniors become leaders, they do not appear to function well. In the past, only once did a senior become a leader. To the authors, it appeared that an excessive amount of authority was concentrated in her.

The students conceived, examined, decided and implemented most things themselves. In actuality, very few students in leadership positions (most of them participating for the third time) have significant authority. In particular, students who serve as leaders have a great deal of authority concentrated in them. However, in many cases, they do not attempt to exercise their authority in a monopolistic fashion. As a result of the leaders having a strong sense of continuity, they appear to be aware of a zone of proximal development (ZPD).

Narita (junior, third time), the leader in May 2010, wrote the following (Majima 2011).

I think that while there are leaders who shine and walk ahead of everyone, there are also leaders who walk with everyone. I was of the latter, and while I had some anxieties and uncertainty, I am happy that I was able to give the best possible welcome with the help of all of the project participants.

Kimura (junior, third time), the May 2012 leader, wrote the following.

The four participants with me most of the time talked on numerous occasions, and we prepared for the welcome with a great deal of worry. I consulted with the professors and past participants, and felt the support of many people. I thought that this is something that absolutely cannot be done by one person, and I was able to do it precisely because other people assisted me.

Also, students who participated on numerous occasions changed their stance a little each time, but there too lies a fixed tendency.

First, we will track Iwase's (leader in September 2012) changes.

Written Application in September 2011 (freshman, first time)

I think of myself as person who cannot do anything by himself. I am always swayed by someone's opinion, and I cannot start anything unless I am with someone else. I have the strong desire to change this part of myself at the university. I thought of this training in Korea as an opportunity to change myself.

Written Application in September 2012 (sophomore, second time)

Last year, I did not have such passionate feelings toward this training program. . . . I wish I had tried harder. This year, I want to strike down these feelings of regret.

Report in September 2012 (sophomore, second time)

This is my second time participating in this training program, and I was not just impressed – I was also able to see the training program as a whole, and through this training, I ultimately I understood how I should grow.

Report in May 2013 (junior, third time)

As you (the professors) know, in this year's training there were a lot of changes. . . . Were they good? Were they bad? I have a lot of thoughts on this, but what I can say for sure is that these changes will continue into next year. . . . I was able to participate in training that will lead to the next step! Look, I can say this with pride. (Laughs)

Kamiya, a sub-leader in May 2012, summarizes it more succinctly.

Report in May 2012 (senior, third time)

This time, I had the privilege of participating as a core member, and I was truly able to gain a great deal of experience. When I went to Korea for the first time in September, the Korean students were very kind to us, so in our own way, we thought great deal about how to put all of our efforts into welcoming them, and carried it out.

Report in May 2013 (senior, third time)

It is a fact that the reason I participated in this training program changed from being for myself the first time, for the Koreans the second time, and then to sharing the value of this training to the other Japanese people around me.

FACULTY INSTRUCTION

Faculty dealt with the teams primarily through the student leaders. Here, there were few detailed instructions, and they shared their assessment of the large policies and results.

Narita, May 2010 Leader (junior, third time)

Then, the professors said to look at the students in Japan and Korea. When I looked around me, I saw people having a good time chatting. A leader's ability is not just to get in front of everyone and manage things. While listening to the professor say "Whatever the method may be, the result is that this type of setting is created, and isn't that enough?" I tried my best to fight back tears.

Araki, May 2013 Leader (junior, second time)

At that time, the professor told me, "You must be happy that everyone is enjoying themselves." Then, I felt as though a great burden had been taken away. Everyone was having a good time, and everyone was smiling. I thought that was something to be happy about. It was then that I was able to see myself as a participant and as a leader.

CONCLUSION

The learning process seen in the training program can be explained as legitimate peripheral participation (LPP).

In the training program, the more frequently the students participated, certain changes could be seen in them.

Also, as a result, clearly hierarchical and concentric structures were present, and this assumed to be due to how frequently the students participated in the training program, not due to factors such as academic year, affiliation, or gender.

For example, regarding communication, students participating for a second time or more indicate that language is merely a tool, despite giving it a high priority the first time. Also, the purpose for participating in the training program changed from "for oneself" to "for the students in the partner country" to "for the next generation."

One of the goals was to have the students manage the program, and although there were some differences in minor details each time, from the students reports, it can be seen that virtually the same results were obtained.

Students in the training program for the first time were fully occupied with just participating. The second time, they had clear objectives, and participate as the leader or in a leadership role. At this time, the students embody the goals of this training program. Also, the third time, they support the leaders while developing the next generation of leaders and students in leadership roles. Here, cognitive discipleship can be seen. The team leaders do not correspond to the *masters* in the cognitive discipleship system. Students participating for the third time primarily serve as *masters*.

The community in the training program is not fixed by academic grade or extracurricular activity, and is randomly created by the applicants each time. Regardless, several students repeatedly participated, which maintains

continuity.

In other words, this community is a *"community of practice"* which is reproduced, and has the essence of learning in the process of participation.

Conversely, since it is not fixed, not all of the students can participate each time. There are also a fixed number of students who have participated only once, and not a second time. We have not been able to analyze learning in these students.

IN CLOSING

The training program has been made possible through repeated analysis by the co-investigators. A great deal of resources have been invested, and it cannot be said to be efficient. Six faculty members from Aichi University of Education alone have spent approximately two months to train twelve students.

The training program ultimately cuts into the essence of education (transmission to the next generation). As seen in student observations that language is a tool, in fact international exchange itself is a tool.

That education horizontally links Chinju National University of Education and Aichi University of Education, and perpendicularly a hierarchical or concentric structure for the students.

The largest problem in the training program is that it is created by participants who are motivated from the onset. For this reason, it is accurate to say that educational quality is guaranteed. At least in teacher training, there are differences in opinion among the co-investigators regarding policies to expand learning opportunities via training programs for all students, so a unified policy cannot be presented.

Last, we quote from Kamiya's (sub-leader in May 2012) report.

My dream is to work as an elementary school teacher. When I become a teacher and manage a class, my goal is to create a class where everyone can mutually accept one another. I learned how to do this from this training program. "Accepting one another" means to make an effort to understand the other person, and to compromise. For children, this is not easy. However, as they will grow as people, or when they eventually they are active out in the real world, I strongly hope that they will be people who can have this kind of mindset. Also, for myself as well, I want to be a person who strives to understand any type of child and can always continually grow as a person. Also, I want have a broad perspective and become a teacher who can provide an education useful to the children's future, for the children who will live in the future.

Reference

Aichi University of Education and Chinju National University of Education (2006). "Aichi kyōiku daigaku 2004-5 nendo purojekuto keihi hōkokusho kokusai kōryū kyōteikō to no renkei ni yoru kyōin yōsei daigaku gakusei no heiwa kōryū puroguramu" (Aichi University of Education 2004-5 Project Expenses Report Peace Exchange Program for Teacher Trainee University Students through Partnerships with International Exchange Partner Schools) Nikkan kyōiku bunka tsūshinshi (Japan-Korea Education and Culture Mission), Kariya, Aichi University of Education.

Aichi University of Education (2013). 2013 AICHI UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION. Kariya, Aichi University of Education

Central Education Council (2012). Kyōshoku seikatsu no zentai wo tsūjita kyōin no shishitsu nōryoku no sōgōtekina kōjōhōsaku ni tsuite (tōshin) (Regarding Comprehensive Improvement Policies for the Caliber and Capacity of Teachers throughout their Lives as Teachers) (Report) Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology

Ejima, T., Yamane, M., Ueda, T. and Umeda, K. (2009). Practical use of the information media in the exchange program of the university of education of Japan and Korea, B*ulletin of* Integrated Center for Educational Research and Practice, Aichi University of Education, 12, 99-106

Ejima T.,Majima, K., Umeda, K., Ueda, T., Tsuchiya, T., Yamane, M. and Kang H. (2012). Practical use of the information media in the exchange program of the university of education of Japan and Korea, The Study Meeting Reports of The Japan Association for the Study of Educational Media, 33, 19-26

Majima, K. (2011). Gurōbaru jidai ni hagukumu kankeisei (Relations Developed in an Age of Globalization) Kariya, Aichi University of Education

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2013). School Basic Survey. Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology

Yamane, M., Ejima, T., Umeda, K., Kong, Y. & Kang, H. (2008). A Practical Report on Korea-Japan Student Exchange Program focusing on Teaching Practice in Primary Schools : The Case of 2007's Program between Chinju National University of Education and Aichi University of Educataion, B*ulletin of* Integrated Center for Educational Research and Practice, Aichi University of Education, 11, 47-53