

Title	Conflict and transformation of a teacher through gender sensitive practice : From interviews with a teacher
Author(s)	Teramachi, Shinya
Citation	Osaka Human Sciences. 2017, 3, p. 21-38
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://doi.org/10.18910/60590
rights	
Note	

Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

CONFLICT AND TRANSFORMATION OF A TEACHER THROUGH GENDER SENSITIVE PRACTICE: FROM INTERVIEWS WITH A TEACHER

SHINYA TERAMACHI*

Abstract

This paper diachronically grasps teachers' recognition towards "Gender Pedagogical Practice," and clarifies transformation processes of individual teachers through their execution of "Gender Pedagogical Practices" by discussing the relationship between "Gender Pedagogical Practice" and the individual teacher using the teacher's life history. The relationship between the individual teacher and "Gender Pedagogical Practice" is not simple, and self-transforming process is not flat either. The "substantial self" that the teacher learned individually, and the "self as teacher" and "self as person" that it regulates are constructed through complex relationships with others as well as "Gender Pedagogical Practices" at school.

Key words: gender pedagogical practice; teacher's self; life history; conflict; transformation

1. Introduction

In various social realms of this modern age, the existence of division of labor and gender disparity has become more obviously exposed. Even in school education, which is regarded as a sphere where equality between genders exists, the "coexistence of two contradicting principles of egalitarianism, which blurs the lines in differences between genders or emphasizes homogeneity, and sexism, which emphasizes the dissymmetrical relationship of gender"¹⁾. In such school education, it has been pointed out, deliberately or not, that teachers are key persons as both substantial actors who regenerate gender²⁾ and also, on the contrary, as innovative actors of gender³⁾, and the necessity for critical review perspectives regarding division of labor and

This article is the English translation of the original one "Teramachi, S. (2014). Conflict and Transformation of a Teacher through Gender Sensitive Practice: From Interviews with a Teacher. *Educational Research*, 81 (3), 14–25 (in Japanese)".

* Graduate School of Human Sciences, Osaka University, 1-2, Yamadaoka, Suita, Osaka 565-0871, Japan

gender disparity at the time of teacher education is currently being discussed⁴).

Traditional “gender and education” research has focused on interactive processes between the child and the teacher, and pointed out that teachers situated in important positions within education, whether deliberately or not, become actors who regenerate the division of labor and gender disparity⁵). After this, the difficulty of practice by teachers who strive for positive changes in regeneration, and not as those who are actors of regeneration, has been made more clear⁶). However, in previous research, teachers in general tend to be criticized or the importance of their roles was discussed, which might have excluded the perspectives of those individual teachers’ “individuality” and life histories.

I.F. Goodson brings up the following two items as characteristics of school education research using Interactionism or ethnomethodology: convertibility and consistency.

Convertibility is defined as a situation in which teachers are described as an individual without individuality, where their individual life history and lifestyles are disregarded. Consistency is defined as one facet of convertibility, which disregards historical processes. This predicates a condition that things will always occur in the same way regardless of era or the teachers involved. Goodson decided that understanding teachers as individuals is important to understand individual activities such as lectures in class sessions, and adopts the life history research method to accept the effectiveness of Interactionism or ethnomethodology and object to discussions that ignore a teacher’s individuality⁷).

As Goodson points out, even the teacher figures described in “gender and education” research that focus on teacher interaction seems to have the two characteristics of convertibility and consistency. Who the practicing teacher was has never been an issue (convertibility), and the life of the teacher in question hasn’t been paid much attention to (consistency). However, the great impact that these teachers’ own practices are subject to receive through the formation of their values on gender as they go through various experiences over several decades as an individual by the time they engage in teaching, or through the values on gender or life experiences that the teachers possess, cannot be ignored. That is why if learning “sensitive perspectives on gender issues” is regarded as teachers’ development, the teacher’s voice has to be listened to, and the “self as teacher” needs to be considered⁸).

Research that pays attention to these teacher’s voices and associate them with gender has been accumulated⁹). Research by Junji Yamazaki as well as by Mamoru Tsukada describes teachers’ development and the emotional conflict over compatibility between occupations and lives through interview investigations with female teachers. They are beneficial in that they brought to light the influence of gender on these individuals’ lives as teachers, but the description is limited to the differences between female and male teachers, which means that the relationship between the self as a teacher and the “teacher’s role,” as an actor that innovates or regenerates the division of labor and gender disparity, has not been clarified. Therefore, this research aims to clarify the transformation process of the self as teacher who has experienced “Gender

Pedagogical Practices” after diachronically understanding teacher’s understanding regarding practices that attempt to deliberately solve education issues generated by gender¹⁰⁾ (hereinafter referred to as “Gender Pedagogical Practice”), and considering the relationship between the “Gender Pedagogical Practice” and one’s self as teacher by reviewing life history.

2. The teacher’s self and its transformation process

J. Nias is an example raised for an advocate examining individual teachers’ development while discussing the relationship between teaching and the teacher’s self¹¹⁾. Nias’s theoretical foundation is based on Symbolic Interactionism, especially on G.H. Mead.

Nias pays attention to two aspects of the self that Mead develops, or the “I” and “me,” and states that the “self as me” (hereinafter referred to as “me”) can be divided into the “situational selves” and “substantial self.” The latter is deeply associated with teaching¹²⁾. The “substantial self” consists of the most important aspects of the concept of self which prominently appear in mental/physical attitude and values, and it is influenced by the value system in the cultures to which the individual belongs since childhood, including family. These individual values incorporated in the “substantial self” play an important role when teachers conceptualize their tasks and carry them out. This value establishes “the self as person in teaching,” which includes one’s own roles, interests, and emphasis when teaching (hereinafter referred to as the “self as person”), and the “self as teacher” such as criteria of occupational competence, “role as teacher,” “ideal teacher figure.” This values and standard are sometimes clearly self-defined before teaching begins.

The “substantial self” is not fixed, yet at the same time, not easily influenced and changed by recursive activities. However, it is difficult not to be influenced by the teaching environment due to the nature of the teaching profession, and there might be cases where the core of an individual’s personal values may be deeply impacted¹³⁾. As Mead points out, “people respond to ‘me’ as if it were ‘I’.”¹⁴⁾ When an individual encounters situations or things that would strongly impact the “substantial self,” said individual responds as the “self as I” (hereinafter referred to as “I”). Let’s look at what this response is like.

The first case scenario, when an emerging situation matters very sensitively to the self-core, the individual tries to defend themselves by resisting or refusing it. This is a response that uses the existing “me,” because the “me” is an “expedient and habitual individual”¹⁵⁾, and the traditional “me’s” systemized experiences are what start to address something new initially. This is backed up by the characteristic of “me” that Mead has pointed out, that “it assigns a position that gives individuals dignity as a member of a community”¹⁶⁾. In order to assure the experience of the “me” that is addressing the situation, the individual in question might rely on the reference group that they belong to. For example, when the values of the teacher in question are different from that of his school environment, the school head or his colleagues, Nias describes the

teachers' attitudes that attempt to maintain and approve their own values using their referencing groups in and outside of the school¹⁷).

The second possible case is to repair and reconstruct his or her own self instead of resisting the changes. According to Mamoru Funatsu, who is compiling Mead's theories, human beings are able to objectivize themselves "through self-objectification, the existing sense of self is reviewed, repaired, revised, and reconstructed"¹⁸). The subject that conducts his or her own repair and reconstruction is the "I," and Funatsu recognizes this as "emergent reflexivity"¹⁹). "Emergent reflexivity" refers to "reflecting upon one's inner self via other individuals' attitudes, and creating a new world by making associations between the past and future"²⁰). Through this process, the existing "me" is modified to fit the new.

As discussed so far, under situations where core conventional values are greatly impacted, and where premises that were taken for granted stop functioning, the "emergent reflexivity" that changes the existing "me" causes changes in the "substantial self," occasionally creating new values. This change in the "substantial self" can be understood as a transformation in terms of adult educational theory²¹).

The next discussion concerns moments that cause transformation. The individual used as a reference here is N. K. Denzin, who has paid attention to people's "*Kojinshi* (personal biographies)" from the perspective of interpretive interactionism, and focuses on life experiences where an individual transforms and constructs the meaning of oneself and one's experiences²²). Denzin defines that interactional moments that have an impact on people's lives have potential to create transformation experiences, which he named "epiphany." He further divided this concept into main four structures: (1) "major epiphany," (2) "cumulative epiphany," (3) "illuminative epiphany," and (4) "relived epiphany."²³). People's cores will be influenced when experiencing an epiphany, and they will react in the way described above. When "emergent reflexivity" is generated alongside this epiphany, the "substantial self" will change.

The discussion above can be organized in relation to "Gender Pedagogical Practice" as follows. Firstly, if an individual has engaged in gender relationships and has subjected themselves to its influence, the "substantial self" is not free from this gender relationship either. The judgement criteria in conducting "Gender Pedagogical Practice" and the teacher's values toward gender are controlled by the "substantial self." Even the "substantial self," which is not easily affected, would change through emergent reflexivity due to experiencing epiphanies such as marriage, or first meetings with pupils, guardians and co-workers. Then, the teacher's recognition toward gender images and "Gender Pedagogical Practice" will eventually change. On the contrary, there might be a case where gender images remain unchanged due to the individual defending himself or herself.

Though the conventional "Gender and Education" research has described relationships between teachers' practices and teachers' self (such as the teacher's gender image unconsciously appearing in practice), the teachers' awareness of them has not been paid attention to²⁴). The next

section will analyze interview data to reveal the “substantial self,” as well as the teacher’s recognition toward their “self as person” and their “self as teacher” which are regulated by their “substantial self.”

3. Analyzing interview data

This section uses interview data that was conducted to Teacher A, who practices “Gender Pedagogical Practice” (Interview date: November 21, 2011). This interview was a semi-structured interview where the whole interview was recorded using an IC recorder which was then converted into text. The questions were all regarding recognition of ongoing practices and its results, as well as attitudes towards practices.

Teacher A has reported his practices at a section meeting related to “Gender Pedagogical Practice” in a Kansai area conference held in the 2010s by a teachers’ organization associated with human rights education²⁵). Teacher A, who was reluctant about “Gender Pedagogical Practice,” reported at the report meeting that he was able to change his understanding. He was selected as a sample with consideration that analyzing his understanding would help uncover the transformation processes in relation with “Gender Pedagogical Practice.” In addition to the details explained later, Teacher A has ample experience in human rights education as a teacher and as a student, and he could not recall having experienced gender education until undergoing “Gender Pedagogical Practice.” Because of this, experiencing “Gender Pedagogical Practice” seems to have had a great impact on Teacher A.

3.1. *Encountering human rights education*

A male P.E. teacher, Teacher A (in his 30s), who has more than 10 years of experience which includes 2 years of part-time teaching, is in his 4th year at his alma mater junior high school, Junior High School B, in the Kansai area. He set his future goal to be a teacher when he was only in his grade school years. The tennis club, which he joined in his junior high school years, inspired him to supervise club activities, which made his goals more specific: to be a junior high school teacher. Now he is a tennis club advisor in his junior high school. Originally, he was teaching in a different city from City C, where Junior-High School B is located. He received his first teaching position there, and later petitioned for transfer to another city to be relocated to City C. He wanted to teach at Junior High School B someday since the beginning of his career, but he made it to his alma mater for his first transfer. Teacher A says that Junior High School B has been working on human rights education focusing on “studies on outcasts,”²⁶) and experience as a student of such education influenced his thoughts greatly.

A1: Without the experience of human rights education during junior high school, I wouldn't ...have become someone who thinks about such a variety of things, I guess. [...means an omission]

Teacher A evaluated himself in grade school as an “egotist.” As he proceeded with his education to junior high school, he read an essay on literacy written by his friend’s guardian as a part of a “study on cast out individuals” in his 1st year, which impacted him greatly towards an interest in human rights education centered on “studies on outcasts.” Junior High School B taught human rights education regarding “Koreans living in Japan,” as well as “peace studies” without the limitation of “issues pertaining to outcasts,” but his recognition was:

A2: Honestly, to my great sorrow, my understanding before being a teacher was merely “human rights education is the same as studies on outcasts”

This recognition that “studies on outcasts IS human rights education” that was cultivated during his student years gradually started to change as he was transferred to Junior High School B.

Contrary to his desires to conduct student guidance at a thorough, slow pace, the role Teacher A was responsible for at his first school was “to reprimand” pupils at the frontline of pupil guidance. He “fought with his students during his days and nights” because of his blocky body as a P. E. teacher. Now, at the school he has newly been relocated to, he has been released from the responsibility of being the head of pupil guidance so as to be able to secure more time for facing pupil guidance or human rights education to address various practices. From there, he started to widen his rather restricted vision of human rights education.

A3: (Since relocating to Junior High School B,) I wonder if this might be called a sense of involvement, but when I came to wonder about “what my thoughts are, what attitude I am going to have, or what I will absorb and consider that I must be able to think in a certain way,” I came to notice that human rights education is not only about studies on outcasts, but that “everything is intertwined, or engages one another in a spiral manner.”

Texts within () were added by the author [hereinafter, the same]

His opinions against discrimination had grown even stronger in the course of interaction with people whom he met at Junior High School B.

A4: It was when I came to Junior High B that I came to hold strong thoughts of “nondiscrimination” and “refusing discrimination.”

Furthermore, he describes his ideal figure of a teacher as “those that educate pupils to never give in to discrimination.”

As we can see from his remarks, Teacher A’s experiences at Junior High School B impacted him strongly, and they have been inscribed into his “substantial self.” In particular, the “studies on outcasts” in his 1st year at Junior High School B was the epiphany that greatly changed his

sense of recognition. The stronger he came to recognize that “studies on outcasts IS human rights education,” the greater the experiences of “studies on outcasts” impacted the formation of Teacher A’s “substantial self”. This formed “substantial self” of Teacher A became inseparably related to each other with his “self as person” and “self as teacher.” The former led to emphasis on his human rights education on the axis of “studies on outcasts,” which was applied into various practices related to human rights education at Junior High School B where he became relatively able to secure time to work on this education. The latter led to the teacher’s “no discrimination” ideal, and his pupil guidance and practices were conducted to fit this ideal. On top of this, Teacher A’s teaching experiences at Junior High School B backs up his value on anti-discrimination, and helps him conduct human rights education practice with a wider perspective around “studies on outcasts.” It is fair to say that this experience is a series of events moving from the “substantial self” to its related “self as teacher” and to the “self as person.”

3.2. Unknown experiences and conflict against criticism

Junior High School B, which caused Teacher A to form his foundation, conducts practices that emphasize human rights even now. In particular, the school put a premium on body measurement even before Teacher A’s arrival to the school. They split classes into two mixed groups of male and female, and measure them. The measurements take place for each individual in a privacy-secured space, under the policy of “respecting individuals regardless of their gender.” This policy had been in effect at Teacher A’s first arrival, and his first impression with his puzzlement regarding this effort was:

A5: I was simply surprised. Like, “is this (body measurement of both sexes together) possible?” I would think splitting the class by “because he is a boy, she is a girl” is less risky in terms of risk management.

At his first school, pupil lists by gender were used daily, while Junior High School B has “a totally different atmosphere” which includes the body measurement in addition to using gender-mixed lists. This integrated-gender body measurement effort was received positively as an “innovative effort” from people in the area.

Teacher A felt puzzled regarding this body measurement based on gender-mixed student lists as an “innovative effort”, due to his experiences and its differences from them at first, and considered division by genders to be less “risky.” This effort generated a sense of puzzlement stemming from an “unknown experience” that affected both the interests of the “self as person” regarding body measurement that were cultivated from past experiences, as well as the “self as teacher” who is in the position of “risk management” conductor.

Aside from this, Teacher A underwent a new experience: the “Gender Pedagogical Practice.” As discussed in (1), though Teacher A put a premium on human rights education focused on the axis of “studies on outcasts,” he has stayed a good distance away from “Gender Pedagogical Practices.”

A6: Somehow, I theoretically understand (that “Gender Pedagogical Practice” is necessary as a part of human rights education), but I feel that something is wrong with (practicing) gender equally coexistence²⁷.

This remark was followed by A3, which was concerning human rights education. There are two factors why Teacher A, who has widened a then-restricted vision regarding human rights education, reached the conclusion that “gender-equal coexistence” is wrong. Firstly, it was “puzzlement” over “how to tackle” the “Gender Pedagogical Practice.”

A7: Simply, so far, I think I have kept a distance from gender–equal coexistence. ... I didn’t know what to teach them.

Teacher A was hesitant, believing that he “didn’t know what to teach” because he had never had a chance to engage in practicing, studying, or getting involved in “Gender Pedagogical Practice” before doing so for the first time. Secondly, the “Gender Pedagogical Practice” conducted by others raised a conflict for Teacher A. Previously, he had some of the following experiences: when he dealt with the topic of “marriage discrimination” in “studies on outcasts,” his associates pointed out that “his idea concerning marriage is biased to the side of males,” or “his basic premise is that brides must move into the groom’s house.”

A8: I should be acknowledging (genders) as equal as long as I am conducting classes. But I was told that “you want to reconsider your concept of gender-equal coexistence, and reconsider your understanding about marriage.” I couldn’t find an answer for these points for a while. “Why am I being blamed?” As a person on the side of teaching... I have to face my students as individuals (with unique characteristics, and not biased by a fixed gender image). I thought, “why am I being blamed like this?”

Despite the fact that he was trying not to pay attention to pupils’ genders “as a person on the side of teaching,” the remarks by his associate teachers that pointed out to him that he must make reconsiderations (his ideas of family which were based on fixed gender image) caused a feeling of uneasiness for Teacher A. He has responded as follows to the question of whether or not he has not paid attention to (fixed gender image),

A9: Honestly speaking, because I was working hard not to dare to pay attention (to pupils’ genders), I can’t deny that I might appear to portray (a fixed gender image).

In answers A8 and A9, Teacher A, who worked hard “not to dare to pay attention to” pupils’ genders because of his “self as teacher,” displayed a sense of fixed gender image of the “substantial self” unconsciously during his practices, and his associates criticized it. The comments by his associate teachers can be considered “Gender Pedagogical Practice” to Teacher A. As we can observe from his remarks, such as “Why am I being blamed?” and “I can’t deny that I might appear to portray,” the comments by his associates brought to light Teacher A’s biases of

genders that were internalized within his “substantial self,” and it generated a contradiction with his other value including “never give in to discrimination.” This caused Teacher A’s conflicts.

Due to the puzzlement regarding the contexts and methods handled in the “Gender Pedagogical Practice” in addition to the conflicts generated by his associate teachers’ comments, Teacher A came to stay away from the “Gender Pedagogical Practice.” In particular, his comment in A6, “*I theoretically understand, but I feel that something is wrong*” might have slipped out due to his experience of conflicts. Further, after tackling the “Gender Pedagogical Practice,” Teacher A reflected upon himself at that time and said the follows.

A10: I must admit that there might be another part of me that convinces myself to say “This has to be like this without question” pertaining to gender equal coexistence. ... “You shouldn’t look at them as boys or girls,” but “as an individual child.” “This is so natural to see that way, isn’t it?” How should I explain this? These thoughts might have partially become checkmated me by altering my justification such as “I must look at them like this.” “I have to behave like this” as a teacher.

As the parts “convincing myself” and “*I have to behave like this as a teacher*” tell us, Teacher A has tried to tell himself to let him be his “self as teacher,” to “look at [students] as an individual child and not through a bias of gender,” as if it were an obsession to some extent, and reflected upon himself as these thoughts having “checkmated” him. In other words, to settle Teacher A’s conflicts which have been generated by his two opposing values of anti-discrimination and gender discrimination which exist in his “substantial self,” Teacher A attempted to address his “self as teacher” as something accompanied by a compulsion. Eventually this attempt caused Teacher A to put pressure on himself.

Including all of these things that happened to Teacher A, who experienced puzzlement regarding “Gender Pedagogical Practice” and experienced the conflict that stemmed from it, an effort that just incidentally started relating to “Gender Pedagogical Practice” which is described in the next section brought about unexpected changes for him.

3.3. Awareness of diversity and biases

Mainly, among the 1st year female pupils of which Teacher A was in charge, someone had started “flipping up girls’ skirts,” and “pulling down someone’s P.E. pants.” When considering how to handle the solution to this incident, Teacher A was asked if “there was anything he was putting some effort into regarding gender equal-coexistence” by the teacher’s organization in charge of human rights education affairs. Taking this incident as an opportunity to “broaden the possibilities regarding many things pertaining to (human rights education) using gender equal-coexistence education,” the school started tackling “Gender Pedagogical Practice” that focused on the perspective of “sexual harassment” with the school head and his associates, starting from the grade group centered around Teacher A.

In response to a question about the outcome of these efforts, Teacher A seems to have felt the changes in students' behavior through daily interaction that focused on the practice, rather than a big difference due to "a single effort during this time."

A11: Instead of getting the concrete outcome of having decreased sexual teasing of someone... I think the outcome was more fruitful regarding being able to have the students recognize that "it is ok to have different opinions from others." In that way, I came to be aware of boys' feelings and girls' feelings, such as, "now I see that they feel differently about this matter too."

In addition to changes among pupils, he pointed out that there was an outcome where voices from male pupils, who had been rather disregarded so far, started to be heard.

A12: (For male pupils, there is no locker room to change clothes, and they always have to change where they are exposed to other people's eyes. Under these circumstances, male pupils said that) "Guys don't want someone to see us, either." Not even seen by guys, you know... Guys used to be dismissed, like, "just go to the corner and change!" but now voices like "even guys don't like this." can be heard.

The fact that the pupils' attitudes have changed like this, and touching upon the new aspect of male pupils have made Teacher A become more positive about "Gender Pedagogical Practice." He said that, in addition to the change in pupils, Teacher A himself has changed as well.

A13: What matters are the aspects that related to the changes in myself. I feel me, as someone who is trying to change these kids, is also changing big time. That was an important result.

Teacher A evaluates himself positively, but what change has he exactly undergone?

A14: But, there is no such thing as a special triggering point. Just, right there, I saw the gap between what I wish to be and what I should be. But, during my efforts, I became aware of the fact that "they are all unique kids, after all."

According to A14, one can tell that it was not a special event that changed Teacher A, but that he gradually deepened his recognition of "they are all unique kids, after all" through the "Gender Pedagogical Practice." Until then, he possessed the point of view that students were "unique kids," but this was something similar to a compulsive recognition of the "self as teacher," and this only functioned as self-control for Teacher A. However, as seen comments in A11 and A12, he succeeded in recognizing students' diversity and confirmed that "(every child is) a unique child (with character and unrelated to gender)" through the "Gender Pedagogical Practice." As we can infer from his remarks of "what I wish to be and what I should be," Teacher A came to recognize the contradicting values between anti-discrimination and gender discrimination in his "substantial self" as well as ways to address such contradictions in this "self as teacher." Finally, he relativized these ideas and reflected them upon himself.

A15: Though I have taught various types of human rights education, I wasn't able to accept the difference ...between "how should I accept diversity?" and "how should I accept differences in others." ...I must have insisted upon the thought of "boys should be like this. Girls should be like this." And, when I succeeded in admitting that to myself, a burden on my shoulders disappeared. And then I think I became able to observe things in a level-headed manner.

He might be able to maintain his distance from suppression by his "self as teacher" that was accompanied by a certain compulsive idea of "never give in to discrimination," through relativizing the "substantial self" and admitting to himself that he is a person who has gender biases. This might be why he said "*a burden on my shoulders disappeared.*"

These changes were made not only because of the effort to conduct the "Gender Pedagogical Practice." The accumulated studies of the "Gender Pedagogical Practice," which involved the grade group including the school head who conducted this practice together at Junior High School B, might also have impacted Teacher A. Additionally, the result of the longtime custom of integrated body measurement that puzzled Teacher A upon his first arrival to the school, as well as the school culture that supported this custom should all be elements that spurred changes in Teacher A. It is safe to say that many elements were intertwined for the transformation in Teacher A's "substantial self" that was centered on "Gender Pedagogical Practice."

3.4. Acquiring perspective free from genders and its outcome

Teacher A kept relativizing his "substantial self" even further using the changes he underwent through the "Gender Pedagogical Practice."

A16: After close reflection (about class practices dealing with the aforementioned "marriage discrimination")... there were many cases that I can admit that "I've done then" with the thought of "because [students are] boys, and girls." If you ask me "how about now?" then I would say yes, I think. But I think now I wouldn't separate them by "man/woman" or "boy/girl." I would be able to "address them as a unique child."

Teacher A reflects upon himself on his experience of conflict, and admitted that he had possessed the value of "because [students are] boys, and girls," and expressed his awareness of a "substantial self" that is not perfectly free from such biases against genders. However, he assesses himself differently in that he can now address his students as unique children. This assessment and the fact that Teacher A had shifted his perspective from one that is free of genders, to one that consciously puts a premium on interaction with pupils as "a unique child" through recognition of children's' diversity gained via "Gender Pedagogical Practice" are interrelated to each other.

A17: To tell the truth, I think that I always put “what do manliness and womanliness really mean” in my mind when talking to someone. If you were able to talk without thinking about it, “I wonder how easy it would be” to interact with them, I imagined.

A perspective that is free of genders is a newly added trait, and a conscious attitude to ask what “(wo)manliness” is can be observed. Furthermore, he aimed to make a perspective free of genders that could be integrated into his “substantial self,” in order to eventually be able to talk without thinking about it. However, Teacher A recognizes that contradicting values of anti-discrimination and gender discrimination coexist inside of him. Because of that, as we can be sure from his remarks of “put in my mind,” he positions the gender-free perspective to his “self as person” so that he can consciously emphasize it within himself.

The “substantial self” cannot easily be transformed, nor are newly obtained perspectives spontaneously integrated with it. Teacher A also knew that his values themselves wouldn’t instantly change.

A18: I think a pendulum hardly swings like this, from 0 to 100. Regarding a frail kid, I think “hey, you are wimpy,” or such things. like that And I would say it in words, if I were me in the past. like, “you’ve got to fight back stronger. be strong for your future, man!” But now I can hold back the temptation and keep it at the tip of my tongue without saying it.

Teacher A’s former self might have naturally interacted with pupils with the fixed gender image of “man is powerful,” which he possessed. However, becoming self-conscious about gender discriminatory aspects of his “substantial self” allowed him to consciously incorporate the gender-free perspective with his “self as person” to recognize diversity of male pupils. And even though he may not be able to change his gender image all at once, he is considering practices so as not to expose such values, and to hold back the temptation to say so.

Furthermore, Teacher A explains the outcomes from the “Gender Pedagogical Practice” efforts. This outcome is perspectives toward sexual minorities. When he saw, in the past, a male pupil take another male pupil’s hands to wash them together at a boy’s school where he was teaching as a part-time teacher, he thought: “What is that?! What are they doing?!” and was unable to accept what had happened. Later, he experienced a similar happening at Junior High School B. Two female pupils who were members of his club saw two male members of the club holding each other, and told Teacher A that it was “disgusting.” If this occurred before the “Gender Pedagogical Practice,” he would have displayed the same mental rejection as those female pupils, like himself in the past as a part-time teacher. Now, Teacher A says that he can respond to those pupils with statements such as “well, everybody has their own story, don’t they? There are many kinds of kids, don’t you think?” Reflecting upon his time as a part-time teacher, Teacher A came to reconfirm and possess some different opinions from before regarding the diversity of male pupils’ roles, such as “those kids might have longed for someone who have something that he doesn’t possess,” and “I wonder if quite a few kids have such feelings.”

4. Discussion

4.1. *“Gender Pedagogical Practice” generating conflicts*

Experiences as a pupil during his junior high school age had largely contributed to the formation of Teacher A’s “substantial self,” which is closely related to his “self as person” and his “self as teacher.” This experience might be considered a major epiphany. Experiences as a teacher after being transferred to Junior High School B are connected to his previous experiences and values, and during this period, his confidence regarding the concept of both his “self as person” and “self as teacher” seems to have been enforced. After Teacher A was transferred to Junior High School B, he kept widening his vision of “human rights education” and reinforcing his values toward “anti-discrimination” so that he might have a certain level of confidence over his practices and attitudes. In such situations, what his associate teacher pointed out actualized an aspect of gender discrimination in his “substantial self” that Teacher A hadn’t been aware of. This comment exposed the coexistence of two contradicting values of anti-discrimination and gender-discrimination within his “substantial self,” which created a conflict. The comment that Teacher A’s associate teacher which made a great impact on him must also be considered a major epiphany experience.

Teacher A, who was caught in the conflict of contradiction in his “substantial self,” tried to solve the actualization of his gender-discriminatory aspects by strongly depending on the values of anti-discrimination in his existing “substantial self,” and the “self as teacher” that was bound thereby. The consequence was, though it was temporary, that only the value of anti-discrimination in the “self as teacher” was independently focused upon and prioritized at first. The extreme supposition is that various values including gender in the “substantial self,” which Teacher A nurtured in his life was suppressed, and he might have let only “self as teacher” work on practices. Because of Teacher A especially holding a strong anti-discrimination values and becoming more confident about them, his conflict and suppressions must have grown even stronger.

A comment that “gender may as well not exist as long as it continues not to be consciously raised as an issue”²⁸⁾ where gender relationship is configured daily means that the discrimination caused by gender is difficult to be understood as an actually existing matter. Also for individuals, being constantly aware of or self-conscious towards the “substantial self” or the matters it represents, which are values and attitudes, is not easy. Following that logic, gender-discrimination aspects incorporated in the “substantial self” is doubly difficult with respect to recognition. That is why Teacher A, who is sensitive to discrimination and interested in various “human rights educations” centering on “studies on outcasts,” might not have been able to recognize his own values regarding gender until he became the subject of criticism in his associate teacher’s “Gender Pedagogical Practice.” Moreover, because the unrecognized aspect of discrimination suddenly became actualized, conflict was generated after he failed in his immediate address.

4.2. *“Gender Pedagogical Practice” as a Transforming opportunity*

Teacher A recognized his pupils’ diversity from his efforts in “Gender Pedagogical Practice,” and through this process, he reassured his way of looking at his students as “unique children.” Through the attitude of others, such as his pupils, Teacher A made objective assessments of his own self, which leads to the recognition of contradicting values such as anti-discrimination and gender-discrimination in his “substantial self,” and of his effort to tackle his values of his “self as teacher.” Finally, he was able to keep a certain distance with compulsive idea of his “self as teacher.” Truthfully, the “substantial self” cannot be transformed easily, and even the objectified self cannot make significant value changes nor lead to the dissolution of gender discrimination facets. Teacher A has acknowledged that. However, he became self-conscious regarding gender-discrimination facets in his “substantial self” through the “Gender Pedagogical Practice,” and integrated the gender-free perspective into his “self as person” so as not to expose his fixed gender image. He became able to critically reflect upon his own attitudes, allowing him to intentionally question his own fixed gender image and his own practices.

As seen above, Teacher A has generated an “emergent reflexivity” through the “Gender Pedagogical Practice” and objectified himself introspectively. He reviewed his existing “substantial self,” and generated new values such as self-awareness of gender-discriminative aspects within himself, and bred an attitude such as critical reflection. This all suggests that “Gender Pedagogical Practice” functioned as an opportunity to transform Teacher A’s “substantial self.” A segment where we can observe just the tip of the transformation was his change in his way of looking at the abovementioned sexual minorities²⁹). In the past, when Teacher A worked as a part-time teacher, the behavior of male pupils were not acceptable, and it could have been a subject that he rejected; however, the “Gender Pedagogical Practice” allowed him to accept the diversity of male pupils.

However, this transformation will not be generated spontaneously because of the conduct of the “Gender Pedagogical Practice.” According to A14, Teacher A’s drastic change wasn’t due to the main experience of epiphany experience, either. Teacher A reinterpreted that the “Gender Pedagogical Practice” played out as an opportunity with all other factors such as his study for the effort, a group of associate teachers in cooperation to the practice, school culture that support such practice, and changed students through the practice and its results. It is thought that “Gender Pedagogical Practice” played out as a re-experiencing epiphany to generate transformation.

5. Conclusion

As discussed above, the relationship between Teacher A and “Gender Pedagogical Practice” is not simple, and the process of Teacher A’s transformation was not a flat one. The “substantial self” that Teacher A has cultivated for a long time in his life, and the “self as teacher” and the “self as person” controlled by it have been built through a course of intricate relations with others

in the school and with the “Gender Pedagogical Practice.” This precise description of the relationship between individual teachers and the “Gender Pedagogical Practice” was able to be made only because of life history research.

Even though Teacher A, who was the subject of this paper, gives positive feedback on the “Gender Pedagogical Practice” through his conflict and transformation, there is no guarantee that he would not become an agent that regenerates the “Gender Problems” that has been criticized. On the other hand, contrary to the case in this paper, there is a sufficient possibility that the “Gender Pedagogical Practice” brings about only conflict and little transformation to relevant teachers. In this case, discussions and criticisms with the absence of the individual teacher only become fraught with danger that pushes burdens and pressure to the target teachers. To evade such adverse effects, it is necessary to proceed with the study of “gender and education” while designating clear positioning of individual teachers.

The transformation of Teacher A described here is only a part of the expected future process. Teacher A even now acknowledges the swaying condition of his mental processes regarding genders by describing himself as a pendulum. We would like to deepen our research on the possibilities and tasks of individual teachers’ transformation who have experienced pedagogical practices.

References

- 1) Kimura, R. (1999). *Gakobunka to gender*. Tokyo: Keiso-shobo (in Japanese), p42.
- 2) Here, the definition by Connell is in effect: “gender refers to the social relationship structure in terms of sexes and reproductive arena, and it is a series of practices, controlled by this structure that relates various physical differences in reproduction functions with social processes.” Connell, R. W, (2002). *Gender*. Polity Press, = 2008, Taga, F. translation supervisor. *Gender gaku no saizensen*. Kyoto: Sekaishiso-sya (in Japanese).
- 3) Sasatani, H. (2000). Gender no siten wo dounyushita Seweden teacher education. Kameda, A. & Tachi, K (Eds.), *Gakko wo gender free ni*, Tokyo: Akashi-shoten, pp. 287–305 (in Japanese).
- 4) Honoki, K. (1996). “*Gender bunka to gakushyu*” riron to hoho. Tokyo: Meizi-tosho (in Japanese). Kameda, A. (2000). Gender ga kyouiku ni toikaketakoto. Kameda, A. & Tachi, K (Eds.), *Gakko wo gender free ni*, Tokyo: Akashi-shoten, pp. 21–38 (in Japanese).
- 5) Miyazaki, A. (1991). Reconsideration of “Gender Role Socialization”: Sex categorization. *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, 48, pp. 105–123 (in Japanese). Mori, S. (1985). The Interpretive Approach to Studies on Sex-Roles in Relation to Schooling. *Kyoto University Research Studies in Education*, 31, pp. 218–228 (in Japanese). Ujihara, Y. (1996). The complexity of Gender Equality and Sexism in Junior High School: Two “Hidden Curriculum” Levels. *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, 58, pp. 29–45 (in Japanese).
- 6) For example, Ueda analyzes that the difficulty of “gender free education” settlement is due to the

difficulty with settling into social contexts and students' appreciation for where education is taking place, and Ikue Kimura analyzes that the practice of "education of equality between genders" hardly takes root due to the characteristics of the culture of teaching. Moreover, there is an analysis by Taga that reveals the aspect of a situation where the school as a whole is tackling the "education of equality between genders." While the concept of "equality between genders" permeates within pupils and teachers, and actualizes the changes, the teachers' influence must be limited in the dilemma between "equality between genders" and "respect for individuality," the influence of a pupil groups, and families' influence. Ueda, T. (2003). "Gender-Free" wo ikani manabuka?: sougokoui toshiteno jugyou. Amano, M. & Kimura, R (Eds.), *Gender de manabu kyoiku*. Kyoto: Sekaishisô-sya, pp. 170–187 (in Japanese). Kimura, I. (2009). An Analysis of the Structure and Factors of "Culture of Teachers and Teaching" which Hinder Educational Practices on Gender Equalit. *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, 84, pp. 227–246 (in Japanese). Taga, F (2006). Gakko niokeru danjobyodo no shinto to kodomo no teiko: kenkyu shiteiko syiogakko no jirei wo tioshite. Sumida, M. & Taga, F (Eds.), *Kodomo heno gendaiteki shiten*. Tokyo: Hokuju-syuppan, pp. 180–195 (in Japanese).

- 7) Goodson, I.F. (2001). *Life Histories of Teachers: Understanding Life and Work*, = Fujii, Y. & Yamada, H (edited and translated.), *Kyoushi no life history: "jissen" kara "seikatsu" no kenkyu he*. Kyoto: Koyo-syobo, pp. 1–24 (in Japanese).
- 8) Goodson points out that "when you look at a teacher's development, the element that was most needed was teachers' voices." (Ivor F. Goodson, *Life Histories of Teachers: Understanding Life and Work*, 2001, p. 34 (in Japanese).
- 9) Yamazaki, J. (2002). *Kyoshi no life course kenkyu*. Tokyo: Sofu-sya (in Japanese). Tsukada, M. (2002). *Josei kyoshi tachi no life history*. Kanagawa: Seizan-sy (in Japanese). There are also some pieces of research that conducted hair-splitting analysis regarding the difficulty of "gender-free childcare" practices from the life history of childcare practitioners, though this is a case specific to this occupation. Ikeda, T. (2009). Aru josei hoikushi no life history: "Gender-Free hoiku" ni miru jissen no konnan. Mochiduki, N (ed.), *Henka suru syakai to ningen no mondai: gakokyoiku, gender, identity*. Tokyo: Gakubun-sya, pp. 125–150 (in Japanese).
- 10) These are "androcentric" school cultures, "hidden curriculums" that transmit fixed images of gender, and quantitative/qualitative gender biases generated in the interactions between teacher and pupil, which were pointed out in previous papers.
- 11) Jennifer Nias, *Primary Teacher Talking: A Study of Teaching as Work*, Routledge, 1989.
- 12) Nias has not detailed or defined the "circumstantial self." The definition that can be made from context is the malleable "multiple self," which changes according to the individual's surroundings or other aspects in order to avoid conflict with others (especially with authorities) who might sacrifice the important values and attitude of the individual teacher. The "circumstantial self" not only plays a role in facilitating a teacher's practices and in lubricating personal relationships, but it also enables individuals to patch up the moment. For example, when someone calls out a

- teacher who intentionally and differently makes instructions between genders, the teacher can disguise his or her attitude to fix their behavior without changing his or her values. However, what previous studies have pointed out is that a teacher's values, especially the fixed image of genders, influences pedagogical practices consciously or subconsciously. The image of genders is, as explained, something that is established by the "substantial self." Furthermore, this paper observes an individual teacher's transformation process that is largely associated with individual values and standard frameworks. For the reason above, this paper focuses on the "substantial self."
- 13) Ibid., pp. 20–42.
- 14) Mead, G.H. (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society; from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Edited and with an Introduction by Charles W. Morris, The University of Chicago Press, = Inaba, M., Takisawa, M. & Nakano, O (translated). (1973), *Seishin, Jiga, Syakai: syakaiteki kodosyugisya no tachiba kara*. Tokyo: Aoki-syoten, p. 187 (in Japanese).
- 15) Ibid., p. 210 (in Japanese).
- 16) Ibid., p. 212 (in Japanese).
- 17) Jennifer Nias, *Primary Teacher Talking: A Study of Teaching as Work*, Routledge, 1989. pp. 43–61.
- 18) Funatsu, M. (2000). *George H. Mead: syakaiteki jigaron no tenkai*. Tokyo: Toshindo, pp. 64–65 (in Japanese).
- 19) Ibid., p. 70 (in Japanese).
- 20) Ibid., p. 86 (in Japanese).
- 21) An adult pedagogist, Tokiwa-Fuse, based on J. Mezirow's theory, states that when problems or doubts are generated in the existing frame of reference, the frame of reference will transform via reviewing, and through this transformation, "the teacher will be able to exit the narrow frame that was uncritically learned in the past, and will obtain chances to have wider options and be able to make autonomous decisions that utilize discussions and other resources" (p. 102). Tokiwa-Fuse, M. (2004). *Henyoteki gakusyu: J. Mezirow no riron wo megutte*. Akao, K (ed.), *syogai gakusyu riron wo manabu hito no tameni*. Kyoto: Sekaishiso-sya, pp. 87–114 (in Japanese).
- 22) Denzin, N.K. (1989). *INTERPRETIVE INTERACTIONISM*, SAGE PUBLICATIONS, = Katagiri, M. (edited and translated.), (1992). *Epiphany no syakaigaku: syochotekisogosayoron no kakushin*. Tokyo: Mcgrawhill-syuppankabushikigaisya (in Japanese).
- 23) Ibid., pp. 202–205. Epiphanies can be simply described and divided into the following four main structures, and are interdependent on one another: (1) "the major epiphany" which touches every foundation of life, (2) "the cumulative epiphany" which refers to the moment and the strong reactions to long-term progressing matters, (3) the "illuminative epiphany" which secondarily and symbolically indicates main problematic moments during interaction between people, and (4) "relived epiphany," whose effects are indirect but give meaning in the form of recollection or vitalization of the event later.
- 24) Imazu claims that the necessity of focusing on the personal aspect of the teacher as well as the

occupational aspect based on Nias's discussion. A good example of something that focuses on the personal aspect is in Yamasaki and others' (10). Imazu, K. (1996). *Hendo syakai no kyoshi kyoiku*. Nagoya: Nagoyadaigaku-syuppankai (in Japanese). There are also pieces of research that focus on the teacher's self-disclosure and feelings that refer to Nias, such as Yu Kimura's research. Kimura, Y. (2009). Secondary Teachers' Self-Disclosure to Students. *The Japanese Journal of Educational Research*. 76(1), pp. 33–43 (in Japanese). Kimura, Y. (2010). How Do Emotions of High School Teachers in Collaborative Learning Classes Relate to Their Professionality?: A Grounded-Theory Based Phenomenon Model. *Japanese Association of Educational Psychology*, 58(4), pp. 464–479 (in Japanese).

- 25) I had never met with Teacher A. After the practice report meeting, I asked him for an interview permit so that I could conduct one. In order not to identify Teacher A, data has been modified without impacting the data itself.
- 26) In the Kansai area, education on issues such as human rights related to discriminating outcasts (e.g. history, literacy issues, and discrimination in marriages) has actively taken a firm hold as a part of human rights education for a fairly long time. In many cases, learning about outcasts has been developed within the course of other human rights issues, without limiting issues to just the discrimination of outcasts.
- 27) In this prefecture, practice and effort related to "Gender Pedagogical Practice" is called "Gender-equal coexistence education."
- 28) Connell, R.W, (2002). *Gender*. Polity Press, = 2008, Taga, F. translation supervisor. *Gender gaku no saizensen*. Kyoto: Sekaishiso-sya, p. 94 (in Japanese).
- 29) The example in this paper introduced only homosexual activities engaged in between male pupils, but during the interview, Teacher A shared an experience regarding a transgender friend of his, and his awareness regarding sexual minorities were observed as something that was not strictly limited.